# General Education Committee Minutes, 3/14/18

## Call to Order / Roll Call

Members present: B. Clough, D. Parson, P. Muench, G. Peters, J. Randall, A. Sala, T. Wheeler, J. Wilkinson

Members Absent/Excused: L. Ametsbichler, B. Durnell, B. French T. Gregory, S. Bradford,   
Ex-Officio present: N. Lindsay, M. Opitz

The minutes from the 2/28/18 meeting were approved.

## Communication

* Two courses were submitted this spring for general education designations.

## Business Items

* The courses below were assigned reviewers.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Course | Title | Group | Reviewers |
| [SOCI 260 U](https://winapps.umt.edu/winapps/adminfin/eCurr/CourseForm/Index/1910) | Intro to Juvenile Delinquency | Social Science | Travis Wheeler |
| GH 291 | Goddesses | Literary and Artistic Studies | Chair Randall Jaci Wilkenson Paul Muench |

* Instructors of the pending courses have not provided additional information. The *Rise and Fall of Apartheid* (HSTR 291) course requires very little revision. It is simply a matter of addressing the correct learning outcomes on the assessment section of the form. The Instructor of ANTY 126 *Anthropology and Global Health* thought the course had already been approved by the Senate.
* The Committee briefly discussed the draft letter to the UPC. Professor Wilkinson will draft an additional sentence that acknowledges the budgeting /accounting structure as a barrier to an interdisciplinary focused innovative change to the general education framework. Given the current budget contraction departments want to retain their FTE generating general education courses / groups. Programs are competing for student FTE.
* There was no additional information to consider regarding adding a Computer Programming / Data Analytics requirement to the current program. President Bodnar asked Professor Wheeler why there was not a Computer Science requirement.
* Chair Randall met with Associate Provost Lindsay to discuss the assessment tracking needs for accreditation. Originally, Moodle was being considered to archive the general education forms, but it requires setting up users. Box is easy to use and has a note feature that could be helpful for subcommittees to keep track of their comments on courses. Revised forms will need to uploaded so samples are available for the accreditation report. The Writing Committee has a rubric that is used to Assess Intermediate Writing Courses. It provides data regarding the review that is included in the UPWA report. The Committee could have a similar rubric for each group that could be summarized for the rolling review. Camie will try to draft an example over the break.
* The Office for Student Success provided the Data Analysis group with expanded data. It now includes the department, college, term, and section. The analysis should be able to determine enrollment in courses each semester, the distribution across campuses, and the number of offerings in each group for fall and spring semesters. This overview may be helpful for the UPC in the future.   
    
  At some point the Committee may want to look at attrition and completion rates. It would be interesting to know why students take courses. Students that submit writing papers for UPWA complete a survey that provides additional information regarding student behavior.
* The Committee approved the draft communication template appended below. Professor Wilkenson used a correspondence from Professor Clough for the draft.
* The draft FAQs were briefly discussed. Chair Randall asked for input on a few of them. He will continue working on the draft.
* The Committee briefly discussed ECOS’ Appeal Policy. It would like clarification regarding the use of “deference “ in the guidelines for subcommittees.

1. Subcommittee recommendations go to the committee as seconded motions. The committee can discuss, but must give deference to the subcommittee’s decision.

Also the use of “bias” as a reason to appeal was questioned. In the case where there was bias a person would only be able to appeal if that bias was itself prejudicial, meaning the bias determined the decision and it was a mistaken decision. It is also not certain the General Education Committee should be under ASCRC.   
  
It suggested a small edit to procedure 201.3.4 Requesting Reconsideration of a Rejected Curriculum Proposal. Camie will take these issues to ECOS for consideration.

* The next meeting will be April 4th.

## Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:23p.m.

I realize I wasn't that clear today about what I meant by "prejudicial bias." I think what I had in mind was that in the case where there was bias a person would only be able to appeal if that bias was itself prejudicial, meaning the bias determined the decision and it was a mistaken decision. So you could have a case where there was bias, which might itself be sanctionable, but it wouldn't necessarily follow that the decision should be overturned even with bias. There might be overwhelming evidence that the decision is correct regardless of the presence of bias. The mere presence of bias, even if confirmed, wouldn't in itself warrant classifying a course as meeting a particular gen. ed. if, say, it obviously didn't on the merits (in terms of learning outcomes, etc.). A complaint might still legitimately be filed about bias, but that would be separate from an appeal to have the committee's decision overturned--unless the appeal could show that the bias itself had prejudiced the outcome.