# General Education Committee Minutes, 2/22/17

## Call to Order / Roll Call

Members present: L. Ametsbichler, S. Bradford, B. Durnell, J. Randall, G. Peters,

Ex-officio members present: B. French, N. Lindsay

Members Absent/Excused: B. Clough K. Graham, C. Greenfield, P. Muench, T. Ravas, T. Wheeler, L. Yung

Guests: G. Weix

There was no quorum so the minutes were not approved. [A subsequent email vote was taken to approve the 2/8/17 minutes.]

## Communication

* Chair Bradford informed the Committee that the revision to the Historical Group was approved by Faculty Senate with no controversy or edits.

## Business Items

* Course Review. Chair Bradford reported on the status of the pending review items. The ANTY 150 course was reviewed by a second subcommittee consisting of Chair Bradford, Dave Beck, G.G. Weix, Keith Graham and James Randall; all of whom agreed that the revised course materials met the Group X criteria. In addition, communications from Paul Muench indicate that two of the Ethics courses held over from last year’s review (EDU 407 and SW 410) both met the Group E requirements, but were delayed until we resolved the 400-level issue. These three courses are recommended for review.

The members present discussed how to proceed without a quorum. It would be nice to get the courses moving to the next consent agenda, but ASCRC meets next Tuesday which may be the last chance to get items on the March consent agenda. A follow-up vote by email was proposed to approve the designations for ANTY 150X, EDU 407 and SW 410. [These courses were later approved in a follow-up vote via email canvass of the full committee.]

This leaves 3 additional Ethics courses and 2 science courses still pending. Professor Weix volunteered to help mediate the appeals for ANTY 326 and HSTR 272. The two natural science courses are both awaiting additional submissions; Chair Bradford will follow up on the biology course, which is in her department, and Camie will contact the Chair of physics.

* Language Requirement clarification. At the previous meeting we discussed whether the language requirement needed some clarification to address whether this entails a specific number of credits or just the second semester of any language. In the past, Irish required completion of a third semester because it was delivered in 3-credit courses and the other sequences were all 5-credit courses. The variety of sequences is more varied now and there are more 4-credit and 3-credit language courses. The reasons for this varies, but often reflects that some languages have only a spoken or written component, rather than both; there are also different preferences among the several faculty members on how best to structure their courses. The current discussion is about whether we should simplify the requirement and require the second semester of a language, regardless of credit hours (test out provisions would stay the same). This needs to be vetted with language faculty outside MCLL, including Irish. The committee considered some draft language to address this in the catalog. Professor Ametsbichler will reach out to the Director of Irish Studies for feedback. Camie noted that a formal proposal should include some context and be in a form for Senate approval.

It would be interesting to have a graphic (pie chart) that shows how many majors require language. The Office of Student Success may be able to gather this information.
* Guidelines for testing out of languages that are not taught at UM are needed. Currently the burden falls on the Chair of the Modern and Classical Languages to find heritage speakers on campus to confirm the student’s proficiency level. It seems like there should be additional resources, perhaps the Critical Defense Language Program, for example. This could be an issue for the International Committee to look into.
* Chair Bradford would like feedback on the Assessment Proposal. She discussed it with ASCRC on February 14th and hopes to meet with ECOS soon to get broader feedback. One goal is to make the process more meaningful. The addition of assessment on the form caused lots of confusion among faculty. Many faculty have also expressed that resubmitting for rolling review every 3-4 years is too frequent. Another goal is to provide a forum for faculty that teach in the same general education group, so they can communicate better and share ideas about how to teach the learning objectives. The spring workshop would be an opportunity for peer review and mentoring. This would be voluntary, but everyone teaching within the group should be invited to participate. The Writing Committee has found that coordinating assessment is a lot of work, which is why the proposal recommends a program coordinator be assigned to facilitate.

Better communication is needed for new faculty and others who teach general education or inherit a course with a designation, but may not be aware of what this means. A suggestion was to create a flyer for general education and writing to include in new faculty orientation that can be posted to the website. Mentors for faculty new to UM’s general education program and system of review could be helpful.

* Associate Provost Lindsay shared the Draft Demonstration Project Report and distributed the accreditation template for the report. He requested the committee’s feedback. UM’s participation in the project is in lieu of the 7 year accreditation report. The goal is to develop a tool box for institutions undertaking general education assessment. There will be accreditation guests on campus May 1st and 2nd from Idaho and Oregon State that may wish to meet with members of the General Education Committee. Camie will contact Jasmine to get the schedule.

## Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:30 p.m.