

**University General Education Council
December 8, 2021, 3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Adams Center Classroom**

Present: K. Witemeyer, J. Smith, R. Rama, J. Jones, J. Prather, S. Sanders, R. Brown, C. Flanders, M. Atkinson, S. Talley (via Zoom), K. Jang, L. Sharp-Penya

Absent: D. Flanagan, M. Straughn, R. Ashlock

Ex-officio: E. Gumm, C. Riley, S. Macaluso (L. May, B. Smith were absent)

Guests: D. Counts

The meeting began at 3:30 p.m.

- Call to order by J. Smith
- Prayer by J. Smith
- Minutes from 11/10/21

Motion to approve the minutes by J. Prather; seconded by R. Brown; all in favor; motion passes.

Action Items

1. General Education Expanded Outcomes

J. Smith - We began work on the outcomes last session. Robert Brown shared some specific recommendations, and those are shared on the blog. R. Brown - The first item deals with Cornerstone. I spoke with Trey Shirley about what Cornerstone is meant to be and mapped those key objectives to our outcomes. That is on p. 3 of that document. The mapping wasn't originally part of the document. J. Smith - I will note that the critical thinking and skills objectives were present with our previous outcomes. The mapping shows that these are still relevant there. R. Brown - Projecting something from UGEC onto Cornerstone might not be recommended, but what we've shown in the document fits what Cornerstone already does. J. Smith - We might not want to give quite so much specific detail, however, to give the course the flexibility to grow and change. R. Brown - I agree that we wouldn't want to place undue limitations on the course. E. Gumm - I agree. Critical thinking is a key part of the course. The skills objectives have the most room for adjustment. I like the idea of capturing the essence without enumerating the details. J. Smith - We can skip the multidisciplinary piece. We could go forward with the first two sentences. Then add a summary sentence. R. Brown - That would leave us 5 assessment connections to the university outcomes. D. Counts - I'm hesitant to list specifics since the CORE 115 course at Dallas doesn't mirror the Abilene course completely. I'm concerned with the communication piece. J. Smith - There doesn't have to be multi-modal communication. Written communication should fulfill that need. E. Gumm - I think the three-sentence version would address both courses well. J. Jones - I

worry about mapping one course to 5 learning outcomes. That would make it difficult to assess. R. Brown - Removing C2 would make sense. C1 fits with critical thinking. E. Gumm - I think striking A3 would make sense as well. That would leave C1, A1, D3. J. Smith - The most important artifact from Cornerstone is the annotated bibliography. We have a good system for sampling and assessing those and giving feedback to the faculty. I think those would map well to CORE 110. The CORE 115 might be a little different.

R. Brown moves to change cornerstone outcomes as discussed (first two proposed sentences with a third summary sentence as crafted in the meeting) and mapping to C1, A1, D3. J. Jones seconds. All in favor. Motion passes.

R. Brown - I'm not a fan of C4. It sounds like creating new research, but I don't think that is what the intent was. In an attempt to get at the intent of the outcome, I proposed three different options for tweaking the wording. J. Smith - So it gives the impression we are seeking a higher-level outcome than what would be expected from an undergraduate course. Something like a graduate research course. I see your options on p. 4. R. Brown - I spoke with Autumn on this to get a feel for their intent. J. Smith - My observation about the options - Option 1 is stated the most simply and might be able to be assessed most easily. Any time, we add "and" we add new levels to assess. R. Brown - C4 is most targeted with the science courses. C. Flanders - I don't think we assess their "practice". R. Brown - We have labs, so there are some practice elements there. J. Smith - We don't want to lock into something that we don't know if we do or not. We can assess knowledge easily. How they interact with the world. R. Brown - Revise to cut C4 - presented as "Integrate new data into their existing knowledge." J. Jones - C4 is also mapped to math courses, and practice is harder to demonstrate in those courses.

M. Atkinson - This is the bare minimum that I see as a librarian of what we would ask for the students. It seems to be missing components like collaboration. Collaboration is necessary to address problems. The other thing is in C2 analyzing quantitative data, but there is no mention of qualitative data. Maybe that is applied elsewhere. J. Smith - It is fairly common among universities to focus on quantitative data. S. Sanders - Potentially "practice" could entail using the data and not just the skills. J. Smith - There is room to revise when we look at how we are performing moving forward.

J. Prather moves to accept the change of language to C4 to state "Integrate new data into their existing knowledge." C. Flanders seconds. All in favor. Motion passes.

R. Brown - I think B2 is too huge. In conversation with Stephanie Hamm, interconnectedness and celebrating difference are the two most important items. We could move the posture of humility to B3. I think it would fit better there. I also have an issue with "interconnectedness." I would like to explain that a little better to make it clear what we are addressing. The change of wording to B1 was my effort to make the goal abundantly clear. J. Smith - It could be perceived that instead of clarifying we are adding another outcome. J. Jones - The only place we map B1 is to cultural literacy

where we have no courses populated yet. I think we need to make sure that the outcomes are as simple as possible since we don't know which courses will populate. J. Smith - We want the outcomes to be clear so that the criteria committee can set the expectations for populating that menu.

K. Jang - I had a conversation with Stephanie Hamm as well. I am very uncomfortable changing the wording since they had a strong stance on using that specific wording. I would want to get their input before changing anything. L. Sharp-Penya - I don't think we want to tack anything onto the first competency. It works as originally presented. R. Brown - I'm happy leaving B1 as is. The key thing for B2 is moving the "posture of humility" to B3. The other wording changes are not as important to me.

J. Smith - We can certainly see the addition and value of adding that language to B3, but what is the value in removing it from B2? R. Brown - To simplify. There are too many things going in B2. K. Jang - I wonder if they tried to encompass a full picture of interconnectedness by using humility as a joining idea. L. Sharp-Penya - I see how humility helps with interconnectedness. If I were to choose, I would think it would fit better in B2 in the common-but-different context. It seems to imply community. B3 seems to be more within oneself where humility is not as big of a factor. C. Flanders - I see that it needs to be in B3 because if you are going to interrogate your own views, you have to have humility. K. Jang - We discussed that humility cannot be assessed. Using humility to interact with others and reflect on yourself. It works with both. R. Brown - I think it would be easier to assess in B3 than in B2. The posture of humility fits in all three, but it creates a challenge for assessment in B1 and B2. By moving it to B3, we make it easier to assess and preserve this important idea. J. Smith - It is always helpful to focus on what is most important. I can imagine an assignment where we addresses all the elements. I think there are ways to do this. J. Jones - We are assessing B2 in history, humanities, cultural literacy, and social/behavioral science. We might be tying it to too many areas. It is our most mapped outcome. J. Smith - We don't measure something every time we do it, but if we are expecting this to happen in all of these places, we need to keep that in mind. J. Prather - Who originally wrote this outcome? J. Smith - Stephanie Hamm and Sara Salkil. J. Prather - It bothers me that this was crafted by diverse voices and I feel uncomfortable changing it without input from a more diverse population.

L. Sharp-Penya - I'm not sure why this is mapped to social science in general. J. Smith - The question of whether we want to map this to social science is reasonable. L. Sharp-Penya - Can we change that? J. Smith - We can. L. Sharp-Penya - I'm concerned that having so many outcomes attached to social science could be problematic when it comes to populating the menu. R. Brown - What about striking it from History? L. Sharp-Penya - I do think we need to incorporate diverse ideas into all of our courses.

J. Jones moves to remove the mapping of B2 to the social/behavioral science menu. R. Brown seconds. 5 in favor, 3 against, 1 abstention. Motion passes.

C. Flanders - B2 seems like two separate outcomes. R. Brown - I asked Stephanie that question, and she said it was important to keep them together.

R. Brown moves to remove the mapping of B2 from History/Political Science. No second. Motion failed to carry.

C. Flanders - Without input from History/Political Science, I would be hesitant to change that. J. Smith - I think they can address this from the difference in time element.

M. Atkinson moves to change wording to Arts and Humanities from Art and Humanities within outcome B in the final sentence of the description. R. Rama seconds. All in favor. Motion passes.

Motion to approve the explication of the outcomes as they have been presented and amended in council discussion by J. Jones; seconded by S. Talley; all in favor; motion passes.

J. Smith - We will create an amended version to pass along to the next level of approval. We will preserve the original proposal as well as a support document. When we return next semester, we will look at requirements for specific degrees. Because those are not common for all students, it won't be part of the faculty vote.

2. Degree Requirements Discussion

Not discussed.

The meeting adjourned at 4:59 p.m.