

Present: John Allred, John Belk, Anne Diekema, Daniel Eves, Shak Gaisoa, Randy Johnson, Jon Karpel, Katya Konkle, Johnny MacLean, Krystal McCoy, Jim Mock, Michael Ostrowsky, James Sage, Paul Schneider, and Alison Adams

I. Approval of Minutes

- A. Minutes from April 23, 2018 GE Committee Meeting – in Canvas
 1. Approved unanimously
- B. Previous minutes showcase the influence and work of the committee, the discussion and decisions made affect almost every student at SUU and a majority of the faculty. It is important to continue to dialog with those we represent, and is important to remember that the Committee looks at the GE program from a University perspective.

II. Announcements

- A. Welcome new GE Committee members
 1. Members starting a new term are:
 - a) Shak Gaisoa – SUUSA Representative
 - b) Jim Mock – College of Education and Human Development
 - c) Randy Johnson – Academic Advising
 - d) Anne Diekema – Library (Starting a new 3-year term.)
 - e) John Belk – College of Humanities and Social Sciences (Starting a new 3-year term)
 2. Question regarding the process for replacing members at the end of their term.
 - Policy states that the GE Committee Chair works with the college dean and the Faculty Senate to fill the committee.
- B. Introduction to the Committee
 1. Committee breaks up into three work groups
 - a) This allows for the use of general meetings for committee wide work, summaries of group work, and voting on pertinent items.
 - b) Majority of the committee's work occurs in these groups
 - c) Work groups are: Assessment, Curriculum Management, and Resources
- C. Conferences
 1. There are two upcoming GE related conferences
 - a) What is an Educated Person?
 - i. November 1st – 2nd, 2018
 - ii. Conference is in its 21st year and will be held at the Zermat Resort in Midway, UT
 - iii. James will support anyone from the Committee who would like to attend.
 - iv. There is a special session for new GE Committee Members that serves as an introduction to the state wide GE conversation. Johnny encourages all members, old and new, to attend this session.
 - v. If you would like to attend the conference, send Johnny and Katya an email.
 - The deadline to sign up is the end of September
 - b) AAC&U

- i. February 14th – 16th, 2019 in San Francisco
- ii. Have funding for three committee members to attend. Will make the decision at a future meeting.

D. Goals for Work Groups

1. Assessment

- a) Collaboratively revise the ELO-to-KA map
 - i. Will work with the Faculty Senate
 - ii. Likely starting over with a clean slate (*see section III. B.*)
- b) Streamline the Canvas reporting process
 - i. This work will take place mostly with the help of Jennifer Hunter from the Office of Online Teaching & Learning (OTL).
- c) Create modules for ELOs
 - i. Jennifer Hunter has already begun this work; group will collaborate with her.

2. Curriculum Management

- a) Continue the review cycle
 - i. Fall 2018: Social and Behavioral Science
 - ii. Spring 2019: Fine Arts
- b) Manage new GE proposals
 - i. Includes courses with new, changes to, and removals of GE designations.
- c) Collaborate with First Year Experience
 - i. Includes the 6-credit GE courses
 - ii. Any other curriculum management needed

3. Resources

- a) Previous focus included things like the GE website. Previous workgroups have cleaned it up enough that the work can be managed in Johnny's office. The focus this year will be on larger campus wide issues.
- b) Consider future enrollment and faculty needs in GE courses
 - i. Make recommendations to the Provost's Office regarding how many faculty members we might need in a particular knowledge area.
 - ii. Will need to look at best practices in course scheduling, such as number of sections and maximum student enrollments.
- c) Consider GE bottlenecks and the online environment
 - i. Find ways to project needs to provide information to decision makers
 - ii. Consider how online GE offerings might contribute to SUU's growth scenarios
- d) Consider CSIS 1000 and LM 1010 needs
 - i. CSIS 1000 is being replaced and is currently in a transition period to SUU 1000. This new course is part of the first year experience and will not only be GE but also a University requirement.
 - ii. The decision was made last year to keep LM 1010 and pair it with English GE courses. Group will need to consider the Library faculty resources and how many faculty members will be

needed to meet the LM 1010 needs of a growing student population.

- The same considerations need to be made in regards to SIEL faculty for SUU 1000

E. New Curriculum Forms

1. Katya wanted to give everyone a head's up that the new Curriculog from doesn't have a specific form for GE approval. The approval is now incorporated into the new course or course modification form.
2. The forms the committee sees will look different than last year.
3. New forms can be found on the Provost's website.

III. Discussion Items

A. Establish Work Group Memberships

1. Assessment Work Group
 - a) Lindsay Fullerton – Chair
 - b) Emma Schafer
 - c) Jim Mock
 - d) Paul Schneider
2. Curriculum Management Work Group
 - a) Jon Karpel – Chair
 - b) Michael Ostrowsky
 - c) Shak Gaisoa
 - d) Randy Johnson
3. Resources Work Group
 - a) Krystal McCoy – Chair
 - b) Anne Diekema
 - c) Daniel Eves
 - d) John Allred
 - e) John Belk
4. Chairs will schedule workgroup meetings; groups should meet between regularly scheduled Committee meetings.

B. GE Assessment Strategy Discussion

1. Brief history of current assessment strategy:
 - a) At the last accreditation review in Spring 2014 the lack of assessment in the GE program was noted. The GE Committee at the time quickly put together an assessment strategy that became our current assessment strategy.
 - b) Through the current strategy a lot of data has been collected. However, problems have arisen, such as faculty being unhappy with the assigned ELO's, ability to utilize the data, and questions and inconsistencies of assessment and reporting.
2. Last year the committee began to assess the strategy and realized that the approach wasn't the most appropriate and it is time for a revised strategy.
 - a) Question regarding if the idea to revise the assessment strategy has been run by North West.
 - a. James is meeting with a reviewer and colleague in mid-September and will run the idea past her for initial reactions, he will report back.

- b. Christian Reiner has also give the revision a thumbs-up.
- 3. Draft of new strategy discussion
 - a) Handout - This is still a working document and not for decimation.
 - b) Part C is the new strategy that needs to be discussed in the Assessment workgroup, within the Committee as a whole, and the Faculty Senate.
 - Commitment was made to the Senate to run any revisions by them.
 - c) Previous assessment had the “jelly bean diagram” that assigned ELO’s to knowledge and core areas. The new strategy would allow faculty the freedom to choose the two ELO’s they feel best fist into their course.
 - a. Allows us to collect authentic information.
 - b. Sacrifices complete coverage, all student might not get all ELO’s. However, assessment data that is collected will be more robust and more meaningful.
 - c. The committee can than identify the ELO’s the GE program isn’t focusing on.
 - d) Question regarding faculty who teach the same course. Do all faculty have to cover the same ELO’s for the same class?
 - a. Current discussion is to just open it up and see what happens
 - b. Once we know what is actually happening, we can make more informed decisions.
 - e) Whatever strategy is adopted; it will need to be used for multiple semesters.
 - f) Question about the challenges that were encounter in the previous assessment strategy.
 - a. Using Canvas was regarding as an issue, however the new strategy keeps reporting in Canvas.
 - b. Will work with Jennifer Hunter from OTL to streamline the process.
 - g) Question regarding how much of a role the department should play in curricular consistency.
 - Depends on the program, maybe consistency with one ELO and variation with the other. Would like to leave flexibility with faculty to see what happens.
 - h) Would like to see standardizing what ratings mean on the rubric
 - Current assessment strategy is based on the level of class and faculty expectations.
 - i) Last four years of assessment were not a waste of time, and were an essential step to get to where we are now. We can continue to use that information as we move forward. Previous data has shown strengths and weaknesses that have allowed us to move in a different direction.
 - j) This is a healthy example of the University evolving and trying something new.

IV. Adjourn

- Meeting adjourned 5:15 pm

Present: John Allred, John Belk, Anne Diekema, Dan Eves, Lindsay Fullerton, Shack Gaisoa, Jon Karpel, Katya Konkle, Johnny MacLean, Krystal McCoy, Jim Mock, James Sage, Paul Schneider, and Alison Adams

- I. Approval of Minutes
 - A. Minutes from September 10, 2018 GE Committee Meeting – sent via email
 - Approved unanimously

- II. Announcements
 - A. What is an Educated Person Conference – November 1st – November 2nd, 2018
 1. Overview of attendees.
 2. Next GE Committee Meeting attendees will briefly discuss what was learned at the conference.
 3. Discussion on transportation.
 - B. AAC&U Conference:
 1. Coming up, February 14th – 16th in San Francisco
 2. There are currently two empty spots to attend this conference.

- III. Discussion Items
 - A. Assessment Workgroup
 1. Update on the ELO-to-KA map discussion
 - a) Have decided to go away from the ELO map, dropping the requirement from three assigned to two ELO's of the faculty member's choice.
 - b) Hoping for a Spring transition and will start to track the data in the Fall.
 - c) Hoping the change will make it so faculty will be able to put in ELO's that are more meaningful for the content.
 - d) Will watch to insure we have full coverage.
 - e) Will take the proposal to Faculty Senate and Dean's Council.
 - f) The ELO choice will be solely from the faculty member and not assigned by class.
 - g) Would want to encourage departments to keep parity across the department, though it will not be a mandate.

Motion to accept the proposal

- a) Discussion
 - i. We will need to communicate really clearly, not just to Faculty Senate but also to colleges and departments.
 - ii. Will need a dissemination/communication plan.

Vote – Passed

- b) Assessment workgroup will continue to work with OTL to create ELO modules in Canvas.
- c) Question about rubrics in Canvas from previous meeting

- i. Brought up to OTL, incorrect language is part of the Canvas LMS language. Will continue to have the discrepancy, as it is unlikely the issue will rise at Canvas.
 2. Curriculum Management Workgroup
 - a) Waiting for survey results to call sub-committee meeting to go over and go through normal review.
 - b) Have not had any GE proposals yet, five 6-credit courses will go through curriculum from SIEL.
 - i. Curriculum deadline is this Friday, October 12, so it is likely the committee will have approvals soon.
 - c) Engineering 1010 – In Humanities Knowledge Area: need to change/remove GE Designation or change to meet the humanities designation.
 - i. Johnny will bring up again with their department.
 3. Resources Workgroup
 - a) Discussion of GE Enrollment Data
 - i. Group discussed their findings from an analysis of past enrollment numbers in the GE program.
 - ii. They will provide a summary sheet to the committee – *See page 3*
 - iii. Johnny is meeting with the Provost next week and will bring back any related recommendations to the workgroup.
- IV. Adjourn
 - A. Meeting adjourned 5:30 pm

GE RESOURCES
2019-2020 Faculty Hirings Forecast
As of 10.10.18

| Knowledge Area | Recommended Faculty Hire (TT) | Supporting Statement |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------|---|
| American Institutions | 0 | Current low fill rates will absorb extra seats in the fall. |
| CSIS | 0 | New trend due to SUU 1000, in contact with SIEL. |
| ENGL 1 | 1 | Could be covered by potential TT line already requested. |
| ENGL 2 | 0 | |
| Fine Arts | 2.75 | Recommended in highest serving areas: ART and MUSC. |
| Humanities | 1.5 | Recommend in COMM currently serving 800 seats. Perhaps .5 taken on by more graduate assistants? Hire someone to teach online and mentor graduate assistants? |
| Life Sciences | 2.25 | Watch for new trends in decoupling labs and lectures. There will likely be 9 more GE sections in Fall 2019; given space constraints, it would be helpful if new sections were offered online. |
| LM | 0 | Concern that data projects no changes with rise in population. Perhaps ENGL1010 and LM 1010 co-sections are the reason? |
| Math | 0.75 | Predicted for Spring 2020 only, no change needed in Fall 2019. |
| Physical Sciences | 0.75 | Watch for new trends in decoupling of labs and lectures. |
| Social Sciences | 2 | Recommended in highest serving areas: PSY and FLHD. |

Present: John Belk, Anne Diekema, Daniel Eves, Randy Johnson, Jon Karpel, Katya Konkle, Johnny MacLean, Krystal McCoy, Michael Ostrowsky, James Sage, and Alison Adams

- I. Approval of Minutes
 - A. Minutes from October 8, 2018 GE Committee Meeting – sent via email
 - Approved – pending addition of page 3 report.

- II. Announcements
 - A. AAC&U Conference
 1. Currently have funding for three people to attend, two spots are remaining
 2. First come, first served for those who didn't attend last year
 3. Email Johnny if interested in attending

- III. Discussion Items
 - A. Review of *What is an Educated Person?* Conference
 1. By attending, participants get an overall view of higher education in Utah, allowing them to gain a better understanding what is happening in the field. Those who can are encouraged to attend next year.
 2. Reports by those who attended
 - a) John Belk – SUU is not alone in our GE efforts, but what we're doing is also unique
 - b) Randy Johnson – Appreciation of learning for learning's sake
 - c) Anne Diekema – Theme of conference was equality and inclusion, something we don't really focus on in this committee. Would like to see SUU's involvement in the conference next year. Anne provided a report of her conference experience – *See page 4*
 - d) James Sage – Has plans to have SUU participate in presentations next year.
 - i. If you have ideas for the types of activities, programming, subject matter, and how to get SUU involved next year let James or Johnny know
 - e) Johnny MacLean – What makes HIP's high impact, and how we can use the features of those practices at any scale. Features can also be used to guide mentorship efforts.
 - f) **Action Item** – Randy will gauge interest in advisors attending next year if funding would be provided by the Provost's Office.
 2. Reports by those who attended
 - B. Workgroup Reports
 1. Assessment
 - a) Update on the assessment strategy
 - i. Johnny presented the new assessment strategy to Faculty Senate – It was approved unanimously.
 - ii. James was able to contact someone at NWCCU who was on our mid-point review committee, and she thought it was a good example of closing the loop, and doesn't expect us to experience any accreditation difficulty with this change.

- iii. A communication will come out fairly soon so faculty know how to plan their Spring semester courses.
- iv. The way the GEC is set up lends to the committee being responsive to accreditation and legislative changes, as well as feedback from faculty.
- b) Update on Canvas language
 - i. Language in Canvas in mastery reports was misleading.
 - ii. Instructure has created the ability for institutions to change the language, OTL will change the language at the end of the semester.
- c) ELO Modules
 - i. Jennifer Hunter from OTL is creating a Canvas module for each ELO that includes the assessment rubric.
 - ii. The idea is to make the modules general enough that anyone across campus could import the module, make a few adjustments, and use the module in their courses.
 - iii. This is a resource for faculty.
 - iv. The Assessment Workgroup will look at a few of the modules and provide feedback so Jen can continue. The workgroup will present more complete modules to the committee for feedback sometime this academic year.

2. Curriculum Management

- a) PHIL 1350 - removed from agenda
- b) Starting review of Social & Behavioral Sciences, hoping to meet the week after Thanksgiving.
 - i. Syllabi and survey review are uploaded to the Google Drive.
 - ii. Expecting to see minor issues similar to last semester.
 - iii. Although listing the “right” ELO’s will not matter due to the new assessment strategy, syllabi should still have the correct language and ELO’s listed. Biggest issue is not assessing any ELO’s
 - iv. Next semester is an assessment of Curriculum Management and Assessment Strategies. The committee should take this time to reflect on the process and note stats. Recommendations for professional development could also be passed on to the CETL based on the experience.
 - i. Idea to consider reviewing the GE Committee policy next semester.
- c) New course, MATH 2000 Algebraic Reasoning
 - i. Adding a course that lines up with other USHE institutions, and provides flexibility for specific majors.
 - ii. Introduction today, the workgroup will consider this. If you have specific comments let Jon K. know.
 - iii. The Committee will vote on this course at the December meeting.

- iv. When considering the course it is important to focus on the core area definition.
- d) HSS Curriculum committee will vote on a 5-credit version of ENGL 1010, ENGL 1010E, it would be valuable to look at the syllabi over the next month, to be able to vote on the course at the next GEC Meeting.
 - i. Question to consider: Since the course is 5 credits, do we grant 3 credits or 5 credits as GE. Would have to add the two credits in as possible in the overall GE program credits?
 - ii. The combination of ENGL 1010 with ENGL 990 mainstreams students much faster than the previous sequence.
- e) FYE Partnership
 - i. FYE folks will consider putting a module into the FYE program explaining GE and why it's important.
- f) 6-Credit effort
 - i. Effort is moving forward, there are a few proposals in the curriculum approval pipeline.
 - ii. Working with Christian Reiner, John Allred, and Bruce Tebbs to make sure the SCH, ICH, and program fees get back to the appropriate department.
- 3. Resources Workgroup
 - a) Update on enrollment and faculty forecasting in GE courses
 - i. Resources Workgroup's recommendations were presented to Provost Cook and Bruce Tebbs, and the Provost asked for a group of people who have access to more data to jump into a more robust modeling effort. The Budget office, Institutional Resources, Academic Budget and IT are using the workgroup's information.
 - ii. The GE Committee's recommendations are shown in the budget priorities.
 - b) Looking at the data in the context of core and knowledge areas can be challenging because of the combination of departments in each area. Working on organizing the data by department, this information will be shared with the workgroup.
 - i. Presentation of the data by department
 - ii. Resources group can start looking at the data, and work to understand the context behind it, and present to department chairs as needed.
 - iii. Looking at DFW rates could also provide some context.
 - c) Update on CSIS 1000
 - i. The decision has not yet been finalized to remove CSIS 1000 from the GE program. However, we can operate under the assumption that it will be finalized before Fall 2019.
 - i. There will be a teach-out for students on older catalogs.

IV. Adjourn

- Meeting adjourned 5:28 pm

Present: John Belk, Dan Eves, Lindsay Fullerton, Randy Johnson, Jon Karpel, Katya Konkle, Johnny MacLean, Krystal McCoy, Jim Mock, Michael Ostrowsky, and Alison Adams

- I. Approval of Minutes
 - A. Anne sent in updates via email, will make those changes
 - B. Minutes approved, pending changes

- II. Announcements
 - A. Fall Semester accomplishments
 1. Assessment Workgroup
 - a) Revised the assessment strategy
 - b) Streamlined the process to import rubrics
 - c) Spring semester goals
 - i. Look at ELO modules and finalize six.
 2. Curriculum Management Workgroup
 - a) Reviewed Social & Behavioral science
 - b) Draft reports are completed
 - c) Considering a number of new GE designations
 - d) Spring semester goals
 - i. Review Fine Arts knowledge area and consider any new proposals
 3. Resources
 - a) Made recommendations for faculty lines which helped inform the budget process
 - b) Spring semester goals
 - i. Possible revision of the GE policy and other goals as identified
 - B. AAC&U
 1. Krystal, Randy, Anne, and Johnny will attend

- III. Workgroup updates
 - A. Assessment
 1. Update on ELO modules:
 - a) Sample ELO assignments
 - i. Creating a module with a sample assignment for each ELO. Working on determining what sample assignments should be and ensuring they're what we want to be endorsing as a GE Committee.
 - i) Working to make sure the assignments are standardized to a point where it does a good job, meets the criteria, but isn't too much of a burden
 - ii) Should the sample assignments follow the basic/main point definition or the sub points?
 1. Committee feels we should stick with the simple definition
 - ii. Will keep working with Jennifer Hunter to finalize.

- iii. Goal is to have six assignments done next semester.
- iv. Assignments will demonstrate best practices as endorsed by the GE Committee.

B. Resources

- 1. Able to put recommendations forward for new faculty hires for next fall.
- 2. Decided to go a little further and analyze the data by department.
 - a) Determining what to do with the data. The intent is to assist and provide data to ensure effective and efficient GE programs, and to help foster informed decision-making.
 - i. Johnny will take the data and present it to Department Chairs.
 - b) Work is not to pass judgement, but to provide the data so decisions can be made.

C. Curriculum Management

- 1. Update on review cycle – Social and Behavioral Sciences
 - a) Finished writing up the review, met last week to go over the review.
 - b) Reviewed 25 syllabi. The group was impressed with the quality of the syllabi.
 - c) Only a few minor issues came up in the review, and will be positively addressed with the Chairs.
- 2. Will review fine arts next semester.
- 3. Johnny will send out invitation to submit syllabi in January.

IV. GE Proposals

A. MATH 2000

- 1. Increases flexibility for Elementary Education majors to create more pathways for majors to meet their requirements.
- 2. Biggest concern is the number, matches USHE numbering.
- 3. With GE status, any student can take the course, the hope is that advisors will point students in the right MATH direction.
- 4. Same pre-requisites as MATH 1050.
- 5. If an Elementary Education major decides to change majors, is their GE requirement met?
 - a) Yes, they'll still have the GE credit.
- 6. Motion to vote
 - a) Motioned by Michael Ostrowsky second John Belk
 - i. Unanimously approved

B. ENGL 1010E

- 1. Combination of ENGL 990 and 1010.
- 2. Passed by English department and UUCC.
- 3. E letter could be confused with elective credit.
- 4. Should grant 3 credits of GE 1010 and two elective credits – John Belk will follow up with the Registrar to insure that is the case.
- 5. Concern that the two elective credits will increase the number of credits students possibly will have at graduation.
- 6. New model frees up rooms and helps students get through the writing sequence as quickly as possible.

7. Question regarding registration: how are students who do not need the extension kept from registering for the class?
 - a) Students who place into the 1010/990 can only register for the E section.
 - b) 5 Credits is the only designation that will show students it's different.
 - c) Thought to consider hiding sections until freshman registration opens up.
 - d) Consider coding the student attribute differently.
 - e) Not concerned that if a student who does not need it gets in, they will still get the same ENGL 1010 curriculum.
 8. Will transfer to other institutions as just ENGL 1010
 9. Motion to vote
 - a) Motioned by Michael Ostrowsky second by Lindsay Fullerton
 - i. Approved unanimously with the assumption that the credits can be split, 3 credits to GE and 2 credits to lower-division electives.
- C. 6-Credit Courses
1. Discussion
 - a) Five teams are ready to propose their integrated courses.
 - b) Any special topics that fit into the integration can be proposed to the GE committee once approved by the curriculum process.
 - c) Concern from the advisors that we're combining GE credits that many students already come in with courses and wouldn't need a 6-credit GE.
 - i. Advisors see the most student need together Physical Science and Fine Arts.
 - d) Committee is voting on whether the proposal is an appropriate fit for the knowledge areas.
 - e) SIEL is approving them through the curriculum committees.
 - f) All ICH and SCH and program fees will be divided back to the colleges/departments.
 - g) Who is in charge of quality insurance?
 - i. Will come from the front end when a section is approved by the GE Committee.
 - h) How will combined courses fit into the review process?
 - i. Will review twice when the KA's comes up.
 - i) Credits will be split by knowledge area.
 2. Humanities and Life Science – SUU 2250
 - a) Topic: Examples Exploring Humanities Through Nature and Western Women in Medicine
 - b) Motion to vote
 - i. Motioned by Michael Ostrowsky second by Jon Karpel
 - j) Approved Unanimously
 3. Humanities and Social and Behavioral Science – SUU 2240
 - a) Topic: Advances and Struggles in the LGBT+ Community
 - b) Topic: Environmental Justice and Public Health
 - c) Motion to vote
 - i. Motioned by Michael Ostrowsky second by Jon Karpel

i) Approved Unanimously

V. Future Agenda Item

A. ENGR 1010

1. Currently In Humanities Knowledge Area.
2. There is some concern about the course being in the humanities area.
3. Johnny has been in communication with the Department chair, and we need a justification on how it fits in the humanities, a change in the course to make it fit, or a removal of the course from the knowledge area.
 - a) The department has presented their justification.
4. The department chair would like to defer to the GE Committee to make the decision regarding the designation.
5. Please review the proposal so we can make a decision at a later date.
6. Speaks to a larger issue, what is our role as a GE Committee to “police” the GE curriculum?
 - a) Are their USHE guidelines for this issue?
 - i. USHE doesn’t dictate on the type of course, just the knowledge area definitions.
 - b) Something to think about, a discussion we need to have in the Spring.
7. January GEC meeting will discuss the proposal and the broader topic.
8. Do we have an audit of majors that require GE credits?
 - a) Yes, will be shared with the Committee. Important to consider in the conversation.

Meeting adjourned 5:04 pm

Present: John Allred, John Belk, Sam Crittenden, Anne Diekema, Dan Eves, Lindsay Fullerton, Randy Johnson, Jon Karpel, Katya Konkle, Johnny MacLean, Krystal McCoy, Jim Mock, Michael Ostrowsky, James Sage, Paul Schneider, Emma Turner, and Alison Adams

- I. Approval of Minutes from December 3rd, 2018
 - A. Requested corrections made
 - B. Minutes approved

- II. Announcements
 - A. AAC&U February 14th – 16th, 2019
 1. Krystal, Randy, Anne, and Johnny will be attending.
 2. They will provide an update at GEC meeting following the conference.

- III. Discussion Items
 - A. Lunch with Advisors and the General Education Committee
 1. Goal is to build relationship between the committee and Academic Advisors.
 2. Building a stronger relationship will create a better ability to serve campus.
 - a) Can also help identify and solve potential issues more quickly.
 3. Hoping to have the lunch before Fall semester registration starts.
 - a) Will try for March 7th, Johnny will keep everyone updated.
 - B. ENGR 1010
 1. This course was added to the Humanities knowledge area when the Interdisciplinary area was removed. Since then, there has been concern over an Engineering course fulfilling the Humanities requirement.
 2. The committee was asked to decide if this course belongs in the Humanities knowledge area or if it should be removed.
 3. This decision will set a precedent regarding how classes outside of their intuitive knowledge area will be handled.
 4. Discussion on issue.
 - a) Could it be combined as a 6-credit course to meet humanities and some other knowledge area?
 - b) Who takes this class?
 - a. Primarily students who are in Engineering majors, specifically CAD/CAM majors. Success Academy also likes the course.
 - c) How much of a class needs to focus on Humanities to be considered a Humanities GE course?
 - d) Do students need an exploratory course to decide on Engineering as a major?
 - a. Not likely, as students would lose a year.
 - e) Do other humanities courses stack up against the questions?
 - a. Most courses in the knowledge area have more formalized instruction
 5. Motion to vote to remove ENGR 1010 from the Humanities knowledge area.
 - a) Motioned by Anne Diekema second by Jon Karpel
 - b) Vote: 8 in favor, 1 Opposed – Motion passes

6. Johnny will email the department chair and Provost Cook with the committee's recommendation.
- C. ENGL 1010E
1. The credits cannot be split between GE and just general credit in Banner like originally stated, so the course would have to grant five GE credits. In the vote at the last meeting it was passed with the idea that the credit could be split. Need to make a new decision.
 2. All majors will have to show increase in possible credits.
 3. Motion to vote to pass ENGL 1010E as a five credit GE course.
 - a) Motioned by John Belk Second by Michael Ostrowsky
 4. Vote: Approved unanimously
- D. CSIS 1000
1. First year experience course, SUU 1000, will handle the digital literacy ELO in integrated learning, which would deem CSIS 1000 unnecessary in the GE program.
 2. The question is, should we recommend to remove CSIS 1000 from the GE program, or not?
 3. Will transfer students need CSIS 1000? SIEL is in the process of possibly creating a corollary course for transfer students.
 4. Who would keeping the course serve and who would it hurt to remove it?
 - a) Serve: Very few people, if anyone
 - b) Hurt: Unaware if it would affect anyone negatively
 5. There will be a teach out for students on older catalogs.
 6. Keeping it as a GE option would allow students to change catalog years if needed without having to take more classes to fulfill the GE requirement.
 7. How will students not taking CSIS 1000 affect the BS requirements?
 - a) Likely will be able to be absorbed by elective or other major requirements.
 8. Some programs may continue to require CSIS 1000, as pre-requisites/major requirements.
 9. How does this affect Success Academy? How do they meet the knowledge area requirement without taking SUU orientation?
 10. Motion to keep CSIS 1000 in the GE Program, until the issue is revisited next year.
 - a) Motioned by Emma Turner, second by Anne Diekema
 - b) Vote: Approved unanimously.
- E. Assessment Work Group
1. Will focus on modules for ELO's this semester.
- F. Curriculum Work Group
1. Will work on the Fine Arts knowledge area review, and assessing the overall review process
 2. Collaborations with SUU 1000 and the 6-credit effort

- a) Checklist on how to propose a 6-credit course was sent out with the agenda. If you have interest, and would like to provide feedback, let Johnny know. The checklist will be disseminated to Department Chairs.
- 3. Resources Work Group
 - a) Will check GE Policy and see if revision is needed.
 - b) Will also focus on GE Online, and work to identify where it would be the most beneficial to develop online GE courses.

Meeting adjourned 5:30 pm

Present: John Allred, John Belk, Sam Crittenden, Anne Diekema, Daniel Eves, Lindsay Fullerton, Randy Johnson, Jon Karpel, Katya Konkle, Johnny MacLean, Krystal McCoy, Shauna Mendini, Jim Mock, Michael Ostrowsky, Alisa Petersen, Ravi Roy, James Sage, Paul Schnider, Emma Turner, Nichole Wangsgard, and Alison Adams

- I. Approval of Minutes from January 7th, 2019
 - A. Minutes approved

- II. Announcements
 - A. Luncheon for GE Committee & Advisors – March 7th 11:30 am – 1:00 pm, Whiting Room
 1. This kind of event will help build relationships across Academic Affairs and Student Affairs. Sharing of perspectives will be beneficial.

- III. Discussion Items
 - A. Arts 3900
 1. Idea for possible proposal in the GE Knowledge Area of Fine Arts. Presented by Dean Shauna Mendini, Associate Dean Nichole Wangsgard, and Alisa Petersen.
 2. Elementary Education majors are currently one of the highest credit programs and takes students five years to complete.
 3. CPVA and COEHD have been working to bring credits down in secondary education and are now looking at elementary education.
 4. All Elementary Education majors take a course in every arts discipline, art, theatre, dance, and music.
 5. Students take movement and theatre in one semester, then music and art together in the next and finalize the sequence with a course on creative arts integration.
 6. SUU has set a standard for arts education in elementary education across the state.
 7. Purpose today is to introduce the idea, and allow GE Committee members to ask questions and vocalize concerns. Then, find a way to move forward.
 - a) Is it possible to give GE designation to the ELED 4000?
 - i. It wouldn't fit the GE requirements as it's a methods course not teaching arts.
 - b) The 3900 courses push students of their comfort zones and into a knowledge area.
 - c) The options are to either make all four courses GE or waive/satisfy the Fine Arts GE area for the major after the courses are completed.
 - d) If we don't make it GE, if a student changes their major they'll need to take a fine arts GE Course.
 - e) Is there a downside to other majors taking these courses? Would they get as much enrichment as a student in another fine arts GE?
 - i. It would be valuable for anyone interested in the courses
 - f) Are the Fine Arts learning outcomes and ELO's already integrated into the course?
 - i. Yes, could satisfy the creative thinking, teamwork, and/or lifelong learning ELO's

- g) Is there something about the courses that make them 3000 level
 - i. We don't currently have 3000 level courses in our GE program
 - ii. Do students need to be at the 3000 level to take the course?
 - iii. Freshmen are probably not ready for the courses
 - h) What is the preference for designation?
 - i. Either works.
 - i) Waiving the fine arts requirement would keep freshman from taking the courses. Could also put a prerequisite or registration restriction.
8. If a proposal comes in, the Curriculum Management workgroup can thoroughly vet the proposal and there could be a vote at the next meeting.
- a) Johnny will let Shauna know the suggested course of action

B. New Course Proposals

- 1. SUU 1776
 - a) Motion to approve the requested GE designation by Emma Turner second by Anne Diekema
 - b) Approved
- 2. SUU 3000
 - a) Course for transfer students and students who don't fit well into the SUU 1000 course.
 - b) Proposed as 1 – 3 credits, a student taking 1 credit would bring the GE total below 30. Might need to ask them to change the credits to 2 – 3 credits
 - c) Currently considering making SUU 3000 a university requirement to require that all students take it or SUU 1000.
 - d) SUU 3000 was designed to meet a specific need for students who wouldn't be taking SUU 1000. The vast majority will take SUU 1000. The idea of these courses is to help student acclimate to SUU.
 - i. SUU 3000 is for students who aren't first year freshmen, the students the course is designed to serve are likely to not be happy having to take a 1000 level course. Designed to help the transition to SUU
 - e) Motion to approve GE Designation for the course with a 2 – 3 credit range by Jon Karpel. Motion not seconded: motion failed.
 - f) Concern over 3000 level in GE – Discussion
 - g) Can we accept the knowledge that this course can be taken and waive the GE requirement?
 - i. Someone would need to own the process to waive the requirement.
 - ii. Who would make the waiver decision?
 - iii. We don't usually substitute GE courses.
 - iv. Waiving would require the proper authority and responsibility to be aligned
 - h) Why can't the course be SUU 2000?
 - i. Transfer students don't want to have to take a 2000 level course.

- ii. By listing it as SUU 3000 it provides something students are less likely to resist before even enrolling.
 - i) Do we want to make the decision to not approve upper division GE in general?
 - i. Straw Poll – Should SUU remove the possibility to have 3000 level GE Courses? Should we restrict GE to the 1000 and 2000 level?
 - ii. Results split between, yes, no, and unknown
 - j) What would be the function of restricting the course levels in the GE Program?
 - i. If it's GE – anyone can take it
 - ii. 3000 level classes assume a base of knowledge
 - iii. Does previous experience change the assumption that all freshman are all the same level?
 - iv. Should it be decided at the departmental level?
 - v. Does the interdisciplinary element of SUU 3000 change the thoughts on the upper-division limit
 - vi. USHE system already has a precedent for upper-division GE
 - k) Waiving requirements?
 - i. Can we waive requirements and a student not earn those credits?
 - ii. Waivers are non-transferable, if a student transferred to another school the GE requirement would be unmet.
 - l) Will table the discussion until the next meeting and plan to vote at the March 4th meeting.
 - 3. Next month the committee will discuss 3000 level courses in GE and Waiving vs satisfying.
- C. Workgroup update
- 1. Assessment workgroup update
 - a) Working on ELO modules
 - 2. Resources workgroup update
 - a) Working on prioritizing GE in the online environment
 - 3. The three work groups should meet before the next Committee meeting.
- D. Meeting adjourned 5:35 pm

Present: John Belk, Sam Crittenden, Anne Diekema, Dan Eves, Lindsay Fullerton, Randy Johnson, Jon Karpel, Katya Konkle, Johnny MacLean, Krystal McCoy, Jim Mock, Todd Petersen, Emma Turner, and Alison Adams

- I. Approval of Minutes from February 4th, 2019
 - A. Approved

- II. Announcements
 - A. Todd Petersen will join for SUU 3000 discussion to answer any questions
 - B. Removal of Arts 3900 proposal, Dean Mendini has withdrawn her proposal for these courses. She did not feel that the courses fit into the knowledge area description.

- III. Discussion Items
 - A. AAC&U Conference
 1. Krystal, Anne, and Johnny attended this year and shared some key takeaways:
 - a) Importance of networking in the employment world – Need to encourage students to interact in GE courses, networking is important.
 - b) Importance of student voice on GE Committees
 - c) Idea to have a GE Learning Community
 - i. Resources committee will start working on creating one
 - d) Anne’s notes – see attachment
 - e) The committee has created a baseline of work and has become efficient – ready to start moving forward with ideas and efforts that improve GE across campus.
 - i. Committee members should brainstorm ways that we can improve
 2. Luncheon for GE Committee & Advisors: March 7th 11:30 – 1:00 pm in Whiting Room
 1. Krystal has taken lead on how it will go
 2. Krystal shared potential questions
 - a) How can we bring everyone to an understanding of the importance of general education?
 - b) “T” model – General education is giving you the breadth, major is giving you the depth.
 - B. Assessment Workgroup Update
 1. Five of fifteen ELO assignments completed, student worker will start getting them into Canvas. By the end of the year, twelve will be completed.
 - a) Currently missing critical thinking, digital literacy, and knowledge of human cultures and digital world. If you have a good idea for an assignment, let Lindsay know.
 2. Resources Workgroup Update
 - a) Created a prioritized list for new courses online
 - i. Consulted many stakeholder such as Deans and Advisors.
 - ii. Identified some courses that want to go online
 - iii. Life Science and Fine Arts were the most requested online knowledge areas.

- iv. Idea to ask if faculty want to create a new online GE course instead of always taking a face-to-face course online.
- 3. Tabled possible policy revision for the time being
- 4. CETL Learning Community
- D. Curriculum Management Workgroup
 - 1. SUU 3000
 - a) Continuation of discussion from previous meeting.
 - b) Introduction to the FYE discussion that sparked SUU 3000 by Todd Petersen
 - i. Students can be frustrated that previous experience isn't recognized and makes students feel like they're not moving forward if they're expected to take a 1000 level class upon transfer.
 - ii. SUU 3000 could give them the sense of having progressed
 - iii. Registrar's office sees that transfer students make expensive and critical errors because they think they already know how to go to College and often opt out of student support services.
 - iv. Working to create something where students feel that there is value.
 - c) Curriculum Workgroup take away
 - i. Can be tailored to different individuals
 - ii. Help them get used to our University
 - iii. Feels like it's SUU saying, "yes, we value your experience"
 - d) Hoping to be student focused, and set parameters on what upper division GE would mean.
 - e) Are the requirements of SUU 3000 vs 1000 course different enough to justify the upper division course?
 - i. In SUU 1000 students read a relatively short book, 3000 level classes uses a more advanced book.
 - ii. Requires students to look further ahead
 - iii. More rigor
 - f) Are they working to make it a university requirement?
 - i. Yes
 - ii. Requires students to still need it as a university requirement even if they come in with a GE certificate
 - g) Why the variability in the course?
 - i. Were not sure what the institution wanted from the course.
 - ii. Intent is to have it be 2 credits, wanted to build in the ability to make changes if needed.
 - h) Motion to approve SUU 3000 with change to 2- 3 credits John Belk second by Anne Diekema
 - i. Approved Unanimously
 - 2. Update on GE Review Cycle
 - a) Fine Arts curriculum review is under way – received surveys and syllabi from most if not all courses.
- IV. Meeting adjourned 5:09 pm

Seismic Shifts in San Francisco by Anne Diekema

Upon invitation of the SUU General Education Committee I attended the Association of American Colleges and Universities Conference a conference on general education and assessment. The conference, themed *Creating a 21st-Century General Education: Responding to Seismic Shifts*, took place in San Francisco from February 14-16, 2019. Approximately 850 people attended from all areas of higher education making for an eclectic mix of attendees committed to improve general education one way or another. Not surprisingly, I found several fellow academic librarians in attendance. The conference was rather intense with pre-conferences, poster sessions, several plenary sessions, and 69 different regular sessions of various types to choose from. Never a dull moment! Below are my takeaways from these intensive three days.

1. It takes a village

GE initiatives cannot be driven by just a committee alone. The more people you have on board who understand the power and purpose of a general education the better. This includes advisors, administrators, faculty, and the students themselves. One way to achieve this is to have regular conversations among GE stakeholders, perhaps a GE learning community. It is also helpful to collaborate across disciplines and to get agreement on what skills and dispositions are important for students to have to succeed in their future majors. Often, faculty can get agreement on these skills and dispositions because they transcend the disciplinary silos (see also #2 below). In some cases, students can drive GE program changes as happened at the University of Alaska at Anchorage where students drove a Native Alaskan GE curriculum.

2. Pay attention to the transition between GE and the majors

Sometimes GE programs are seen as a hurdle to overcome or as separate from the rest of a student's education. To help students and faculty understand the connection between their GE courses and their future majors some institutions are working to make those connections more explicit. When GE works well, students gain transferable learning proficiencies and outcomes that are portable across contexts and disciplines. Some universities use so-called "flags" for GE courses that make clear what students get out of it that would be good for their future major so they can create their pathways picking up valuable skills on the way.

3. Soft skills and hard skills

A number of so-called soft skills (leadership, communication, collaboration, and time management) are highly prized by employers according to LinkedIn's George Anders who wrote *You Can Do Anything: The Surprising Power of a "Useless" Liberal Arts Education* (2017). Focusing only on content knowledge in the major will hurt students in their future prospects. People need to be able to perform work that machines can't do: involving creativity, curiosity and empathy. Increasingly our graduates will be working beyond the resume in a fluid and unpredictable job market that is becoming contractor project-based rather than steady-job based. How to prepare students to be able to gather insights, solve complex problems, read the room, and persuade and inspire? GE needs to start that process. Students need to run their own seminars, interact with alumni, and be able to build social capital. Getting jobs is all about

networking. This can be challenging for Generation Z students who appear to avoid personal contact.

4. GE assessment is in its infancy

How can we make assessment part of faculty culture instead of creating a culture of compliance. Perhaps make a clear connection to the reported assessment data and whatever we want to do to improve student learning through GE? We can also think about what we can assess beyond the ole learning outcomes.

Assignment design is an important aspect of assessment but often ignored. Workshopping assignments could be offered by CETL. National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment (NILOA) has great resources to help with this. NILOA Assignment Design Framework, TILT Transparency in Learning and Teaching, and the Cognitive Leaps Framework can all help faculty with assignment design.

5. Equity versus equality

It is increasingly important to recognize that equity is required to make sure that all our students will be successful. Equality, giving everybody the same opportunities, is leaving certain people behind. How can we make sure they all students get where they need to be? We need to provide students with the soft skills they need and also with the networks they need in order to succeed post graduation.

Present: John Belk, Anne Diekema, Dan Eves, Lindsay Fullerton, Randy Johnson Jon Karpel, Katya Konkle, Johnny MacLean, Krystal McCoy, Michael Ostrowsky, James Sage, Emma Turner, and Alison Adams

- I. Approval of Minutes from March 4, 2019
 - A. Approved

- II. Announcements
 - A. Committee Membership
 1. This is the final meeting of this Academic Year, so membership will change after this meeting.
 2. Thanks to Jon Karpel, Emma Turner, Michael Ostrowsky, Dan Eves, and Sam Crittenden for their service.
 3. What is the process to form the GE Committee?
 - a) Chair works with the Faculty Senate President and Dean to find a suitable representative.
 - b) Johnny has reached out to Dean's and Faculty Senate.
 - B. 2018 - 2019 Successes
 1. Updated ELO Assessment strategy – Should be beneficial all around.
 2. ELO Assessment modules
 3. New GE designations: ENGL 1010E, MATH 2000, SUU 1000 and 3000, and 6-credit integrated GE courses
 4. GE Removal: ENGR 1010
 5. Reviewed Social/Behavioral Sciences and Fine Arts Knowledge Areas
 6. Data-informed faculty forecasting: Received funding for almost all faculty lines. Many people point back to the work the GE Committee did
 7. Prioritization of online GE course development
 8. Members attended *What is an Educated Person?* and *AAC&U's General Education & Assessment Conferences*
 9. Luncheon with Academic Advisors
 10. GE Learning Community Idea
 - C. ENGL 1010 credit for ACT Score of 29
 1. English will now grant ENGL 1010 credit for an English ACT score for 29 or higher.
 2. The department used to waive ENGL 1010 and then have to substitute a writing intensive class. Will just now grant three credits for the score.
 3. What about SAT?
 - a) Automatically converted to an ACT scale.
 - D. CSIS 1000 update
 1. President Wyatt has made the decision that CSIS 1000 will no longer be in the catalog as a GE course effective in the 2019-2020 catalog.
 - E. SUU 1000 update
 1. Funds were not allocated for the faculty lines to teach the SUU 1000 course. This means SUU 1000 will not get any more faculty beyond the one they currently have.
 2. They will continue to teach the FYE course as a pilot next year and anticipate 300 students.

III. Discussion Items

A. Catalog language to accommodate recent developments

1. SUU 1000 has GE designation, so those students will earn GE credit, but it cannot be required of all students.
2. This means that in our Integrated Learning Knowledge area – Will not have SUU 1000 or CSIS 1000, which takes our minimum GE Credits to 29. We must be at a minimum of 30 credits.
3. Need to make a decision on how to proceed so our minimum GE requirement stays at 30. Discussion of potential options:
 - a) Could create GE electives to allow students to fulfill the 30 credits. Electives could be a way to house things like SUU 1000/3000, financial literacy, diversity, wellness, and other things that don't fit into the current knowledge areas.
 - i. What would go into an elective knowledge area? Right now just SUU 1000/3000, eventually others might propose classes.
 - b) Why can't SUU 1000 stay in Integrated Knowledge Area?
 - i. Then students might have to take SUU 1000 or not take LM 1010.
 - c) New knowledge area needs to be elective, that way students can take two classes in another knowledge if they want to fulfill the credit requirement.
 - d) Can we change the integrated studies category would say SUU 1000 (optional) INFO 1010 (Required) and change integrative learning to 1 credit. Note that students are required to have 30 minimum credits.
 - i. How do we insure that students have to take INFO?
 - ii. Robust language indicating 30 credit requirement.
 - e) Motion to change the language to require INFO 1010 in the Integrated Learning Knowledge Area and to put SUU 1000/3000 as optional in the same knowledge area by Lindsay Fullerton, Second by John Belk.
 - i. Motion approved
4. Need to insure the language is clear that lets students know the BS requirements. With taking CSIS 1000 out, students might not have enough science credits to complete the degree requirements.

B. Curriculum Management Work Group Update

1. Work group got together and looked at Fine Arts review, only 10 or so syllabi were submitted. Nothing came up as a major issue. Survey showed sections reporting data for the most part.
2. Assessment process – feel that the process is pretty good. Assess all categories in three years.
3. Review of syllabi has improved each semester, message has gotten out and more syllabi are being explicit about ELO's.
4. Don't feel that there's anything different that we should be looking for in the next three-year review round.

C. Policy 6.49 *Graduation Requirements* – Proposed Update and Related Wavier Request

1. The Registrar let us know about catalog language for GE that states a student can't get GE credit in two different knowledge areas with the same course

prefix. Integrated 6 credit course gives credit in two different Knowledge Areas with the same prefix. Registrar suggests removing the language.

2. Discussion on the suggestion
 - a) Removing the language would put more responsibility on the GE committee to insure courses are placed in the correct Knowledge Areas.
 3. Due to resource demands, Jumpstart required COMM courses for differing Knowledge Areas in the same jumpstart program. Registrar is asking for a waiver to allow students to count both COMM classes.
 4. Motion to strike the sentence from the catalog for next year and allow it to act retroactively in the case of COMM and Jumpstart by Emma Turner second by John Belk.
 - a) Concern that advisors were upset that we didn't retroactively change labs. Unsure if we can do retroactive changes in the catalog.
 - b) Should we follow precedent and not make it retroactive, and make waivers as needed. Motion sets the precedent of a case by case basis.
 - i. Approved.
- D. Debrief – Luncheon for GE Committee & Advisors
1. What is valuable?
 - a) Yes – good chance to have discussion with advisors
 - b) It was good to start to build the relationship with advisors. Need to follow up with conversations about training.
 2. During finals week Krystal and Randy are going to give a sheet to advisors that shares the information that was discussed as well as meet with the other advisor trainers and get on their agenda.
 3. We need to keep it up, the ball will always be in our court.
- E. Assessment Work Group Update
1. One more meeting for the year, will have 12 modules done.
 2. Over the summer they will finish up the last three modules.
 3. Should be fully operational by Fall.
 4. Will work with OTL to figure out the best way to manage the modules so faculty can put it into their courses.
 5. Can also work with CETL to put into new faculty orientation and will talk about in GE Learning Community
- F. Resources Workgroup
1. Idea to create a GE Learning Community
 - a) Presenting idea to CETL. Planned for four hour to hour and a half session. With the following draft schedule:
 - i. First session similar to advisors luncheon
 - ii. Second session Professor Belk – Bridging lessons – Future oriented activity that helps students think about how the things in the course will benefit them in their major. Hoping to walk away with a lesson they can implement.
 - iii. Third – Assessment – Assess the lesson they just planned
 - iv. Fourth – Reflection on how teaching the lessons went and addressing needs they might have that the GE Committee is not aware of.

- b) Potential change in the academic calendar and 3-year degree will likely impact GE. We don't know what the answer will be, likely on the agenda for next year to accommodate changes.

Meeting adjourned 5:10 pm