

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE MEETING

February 18, 2004

The General Education Committee met on Wednesday, February 18, 2004, from Noon to 1 p.m. in the Provost's Conference room.

Members present at the meeting were Kambra Bolch (Honors) Jim Brink (Provost Office), Jim Clopton (A&S), Ray Desrosiers (Engineering), Pamela Elrod (Vis & Per Arts), Ernest Fish (Agri Sci & Nat Res), Cathy Duran (BA), David Lamp (A&S), David Roach (A&S), and Ben Shacklette (Architecture). Members absent from the meeting were Pamela Halsey (Faculty Senate), Linda Krefting (BA), and Julie Thomas (Education).

1. Announcements.

None

2. Review and approval of the minutes from the last meeting.

* Minutes were approved.

3. Review of HDFS 2320 discussion.

- Last year the gen ed committee reviewed the oral communication requirement and agreed that courses fulfilling this general education requirement should have the following criteria:

"We are generally looking for three formal speeches each of which should be an individual formal presentation. It is expected that the students will receive instruction in how to prepare and deliver effective speeches, and that students will receive feedback on the quality of their speech performances from the instructor. The speech requirements should constitute a major portion of the grade in the course."

- HDFS 2320 was found to not meet these criteria.

- A letter was sent from the gen ed committee to HS regarding the fact that HDFS 2320 did not meet necessary requirements to be classified as a gen ed course for oral com. Requests were made for additional information. No response was received.

- In view of this, the gen ed committee voted and recommended that this course be removed from the gen ed list of courses satisfying the oral communication requirement. If this recommendation is approved by the Provost, this change will be seen in the fall catalog

- a letter noting all of this is to be sent to Busby and copied to the gen ed committee

4. New Business

a) Committee discussion of Cathy Stalcup's assessment instrument arrived at a general consensus that her instrument, though good, really does not measure learning outcomes for the core that the committee needs for SACS evaluation. The committee decided that this is not the instrument we need. Jim is going to visit with Cathy to share this.

- an idea was discussed that faculty of core courses might be encouraged to put learning outcomes on their syllabi and how these learning outcomes would be assessed.

- For next meeting, we need to review the Coordinating Board document (the one Jim sent to all of the committee that outlines the questions to be answered in the October report to the Coordinating Board) and come ready to discuss the relevant points.
- b) There was a question raised as to whether Biblical courses from other universities could be transferred to TTU as humanities courses. The general discussion seemed to be that though these courses are probably good, transferring them to TTU as humanities is not appropriate. This prompted a suggestion that in the future, the committee might review “what constitutes humanities” in course credit.
- c) There was question at the end of the meeting about Science Seminar Courses in the Honors college. The point was made that the gen ed committee generally reviews a course to see if it should count in the core. Honors college approves their courses for the core. The discussion seemed to arise from a science seminar syllabus approved through the Honors college that did not seem to meet the expectations of a science course that counts in the core. More discussion is needed on this in the next meeting.