

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE MEETING
Minutes – November 17, 2004

The General Education Committee met on Wednesday, November 17, 2004, from Noon to 1 p.m. in the Provost's Conference Room.

Members Present: Jim Brink (Provost's Office, ex-officio), Kambra Bolch (Honors), Jim Clopton (Arts & Sciences), Pamela Elrod (Visual & Performing Arts), Du Feng (College of Human Sciences), Ernest Fish (Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources), Linda Krefting (Business Administration), David Lamp (Arts & Sciences), Roger Saathoff (Mass Communications), Ben Shacklette (Architecture), and David Roach (Arts & Sciences, presiding), Julie Thomas (College of Education).

Absent: Bryan Camp (Faculty Senate), Ray Desrosiers (Engineering), Frank Durso (Arts & Sciences)

1. Announcements.

- * Fall Meetings: December 15th - not a need at this time. Committee members will be sent notice if something comes up and we need to have a December meeting.

- * Roach will write a letter on behalf of the committee to Jim Brink recommending that the writing intensive course definition and enforcement be renewed.

2. Review of minutes from the last meeting.

Ernest Fish moved that the minutes be approved. Pamela Elrod seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

3. Old Business

a) Measuring Student Learning Outcomes report has already been submitted. Waiting to hear feedback.

b) Sue Couch – Quality Enhancement Plan – Sue's committee would like for the Gen Ed Committee to begin thinking about formulating a statement of how ethics are evaluated in the core (with thoughts of how this could be enhanced).

c) Committee decision last time to start reviewing the Individual and Group Behavior courses. We will look at if and how ethics are included in these courses. Other issues for potential examination will include: prerequisite courses, writing intensive, etc.

4. New Business

- * No new proposals submitted at this time.

- * Examination of Core Courses in the Individual or Group Behavior category.

- Group 1 – reviewed AAEC 2305, ANTH 1301, ANTH 2301, and ANTH 2302. All of these courses were approved to remain on the IGB list.

- * Issue was raised that syllabi really need to contain information that allows the committee to make informed evaluations as to whether or not the course matches the core category definition. Some syllabi lack information sufficient for the committee to make this judgment; e.g., lack of 1) clear statements of course descriptions that match the TTU catalog, 2) listing of courses objectives, and 3) outline of course coverage. In these cases where syllabi have insufficient information, further information will be required from the departments. In future evaluation cycles, the need for these areas of information listed above, will be specifically stated in the call letter.

- * The procedures for submitting proposals to the General Education Committee will be amended such that the current bullet #2 will include the following additional language: "Proposals must include a course description, course objectives, and must clearly demonstrate how the proposed course fits the Core Curriculum category objectives."

- * Idea discussed that we might put a model syllabus on our website to serve as a format example. Idea discussed to keep an archive of course syllabi that we have approved in the basement of the admin building.

5. Meeting adjourned at 12:58.

Addendum: Frank Durso was inadvertently not assigned to a review group. He will be a part of review group #2.

NOTE THE FOLLOWING PROCEDURES FOR PROPOSALS
TO THE GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE:

- Proposals for changes in the Core Curriculum must come to the General Education Committee (GEC) from the office of the dean of the originating college and with an indication of the dean's approval. Proposals not bearing the approval of the dean's office will be returned to the college without action.
- Proposals to add or delete a course from the Core must be accompanied by a current syllabus and may have additional supporting materials. Proposals must include a course description, course objectives, and must clearly demonstrate how the proposed course fits the Core Curriculum category objectives. Proposals not accompanied by a syllabus will be returned to the college without action.
- To ensure that proposals are considered at a meeting of the GEC, they should arrive in the Provost's office (attention Brink) no later than the beginning of the month during which they will come before the GEC. Proposals that do not arrive by this deadline may be considered, depending on the number of items on the agenda for the meeting. If late proposals cannot be included on the agenda for the meeting, they will be considered at the next meeting.
- Sponsorship of proposals is done by the GEC representative of the originating college. The presence of additional sponsors is neither necessary nor desirable unless specifically invited by the committee. GEC recommends that proposers consult with their college's representative on the GEC.