

**General Education Committee
Minutes
January 8, 2024**

Present: A.I. Ross, Teri Walker, Michael Braunstein, David Zuckerman, Marty Blackson, Elaine Glenn, John Neurohr, Mike Gimlin, Yoshiko Takahashi, Amber Darting

Absent: Brita Williams, Janie Zencak, student representative, Nathalie Kasselis

Guest(s): None

Meeting was called to order at 3:12 p.m.

Michael B moved to approve the December 4, 2023, minutes with the amendment "Michael Braunstein recommended that the GEC prepare and submit to the Executive Committee several different options for GE program outcomes with proc, cons and rationales for each identified. A.I. seconded and motion carried.

Chair report – John received a new query about a new PADstone course. Eric Cheney asked if he could submit a PADstone course at this point. A.I. indicated they would like to have them wait until next year.

No student petitions.

Dean Takahashi indicated she did not receive any additional feedback on the assessment timeline and rubrics. NTT faculty will be encouraged to join the review group and they will receive workload for their participation.

GE listening session – Dean Takahashi went over the student listening sessions and surveys they have done. Two areas of concern for students are the pathways and the two courses from the same department rule. The committee talked about the two-department rule and potential suggestions.

The committee discussed how many petitions are put forward for students who get caught in the two-department rule.

There was discussion about the potential of eliminating the pathway rule of students needing a minimum of three courses in a single pathway as the majority of students automatically hit at least three courses in one pathway. Suggestion was made to limit a course to one pathway. Currently the pathway criteria are hard to assess as there is not good commonality amongst the criteria that faculty are teaching in classes.

The committee talked about developing a survey to faculty. Show both pro and cons of Pathway. Students typically meet the pathway rule of three courses without much effort. Positive: One less rule a student has to worry about. Simplifies the process for students. The requirement gives student perceived complexity. Con: Set of collective values of the faculty. Having those pathways gives guidance for curriculum development. Taking away the pathways takes away some of the basic guidelines regarding those values. Why would faculty need to submit a course for a pathway if it is not required for students? Still have a Gen Ed program on paper still look like it is complicated and removing a rule that was not causing issues for students.

Potentially renaming pathways to themes or focus of subjects, etc.

General questions to ask:

Have you taught a General Education course since fall 2019?

If yes, what areas have you taught?

Would you be in favor of removing the three courses in a single pathway requirement?

Would you be in favor of renaming pathways to themes.

Answers:

Yes, No, No basis for judgement.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:16 p.m.