**General Education Committee**

**Meeting Agenda**

**March 11, 2019 at 3 p.m.**

**HSS 3035**

1. Meeting minutes from February 25, 2019 – Bethany Seaton motioned to approve and Dr. Tunno seconded. All approved.

**Old Business**

1. Book of Committees proposals—Ms. Rebecca Oliver, Dr. Zahid Hossain – Our plan today is to discuss and vote on the proposals. Dr. Zhou said that the GEC is a little different than UCC and GC. They think the less people that are on the committee, the better the communication would be, but the committee would also be losing representation from departments. Other than that, there was not a lot of feedback from the Science and Math College. Marc Williams heard similar things from his group. There is a college level curriculum committee, but not a college level GEC committee. Dr. Yanowitz said that they would prefer the one vote per college because it seems more straight forward and would give equal votes. They also were concerned about whether the honors college would should have the ability to vote. They also brought up the ex-officio for AAR and Assessment. They thought that we should move the AAR and Assessment to non-voting members as well. Dr. Wimberley said the majority of the people that she talked to were in favor of the one college one vote. There were a few people that said it didn’t really matter. Dr. Harding mentioned that the people in his college are against the one college one vote, because their college is so large. He does not think that the single college single vote is equitable. Dr. Schichler said that the LAC wants to have as many representatives as possible. No one wanted the one vote per college. Dr. Seot said that their college supports the one college one vote and he wanted to add that it is important to focus on who the customers are. Beathany said that Dr. Simons thought it would be very important for the university college to be a voting member because of the college algebra is now running through the UC. Dr. Fears says that their subsection of the LAC college is in favor of the larger representation. Dr. Harding wanted to make sure that the correct voting members are voting. The vote for structure won as proportional 8 to 5 and that honors college should be a non-voting member. So now we need to decide whether University college should be a voting or non-voting member. Dr. Guhu votes to leave the proposal as is. Dr. Seot asked how many students come from the University College. Dr. DeProw mentioned that we had a large number of graduates from the University College. Bethany made a motion to approve the University College as a voting member on the proposal. Dr. Yanowitz seconded. The vote was inconclusive. Bethany amended her motion that University Studies should be a voting member. Harding seconded the motion. All approved. Dr. Harding made a motion AAR and Assessment be ex-officio non-voting members. Dr. Yanowitz seconded. All approved. Dr. Seot asked if there was any way to make the proposal so that when the college structure changes, the committee doesn’t need to change. Dr. Harding said that we are just going to have to be reactive to structural changes. We may be back at this same place once we decide how we want the actual general education program to look.
2. General Education Strategic Plan—Dr. Karen Yanowitz – The
3. Another Update on Teaching Award—Assessment Office, Dr. David Harding, and Dr. Karen Yanowitz – We had some progress on the website and made a jotform, but we decided there are pieces missing. We have to go back to the drawing board on this.
4. Intro to Psychology amended report should arrive after spring break – There were further complications with this report, and we expect it after Spring Break.
5. Process refinement: Changes to assessment plans and GEC notification
   1. Did Composition and Theatre handle this well? Could this be our model for future changes? We looked at the Theatre letter and voted and then sent an email out to the department. They sent us a memo. Is this good enough? Would we like them to put in a whole new plan? The comp came and presented and it went well. Any modification is going to be different. I think there should be a deadline for changing the assessment plan. Should we define what change means? Most people think that to put a percentage on it would be difficult. The instrument nor the process changed significantly. We hope that this could be included in the report. We would have a history recorded as to why it looks different.
   2. Plan for the next meeting on April 1st. Adjourned at 3:53.

**Old Business for Future Meetings**

1. Professional Development
   1. Arkansas Course Transfer System
   2. ADHE requirements for general education
   3. Transfer student success
   4. Report on ULOs
   5. Report on *Leaving the Den* survey