

Item	Description
Name/Title	General Education Review Committee
Date	April 1, 2015
Time	11:00-noon
Location	200 McKenny
Members Attending	Zenia Bahorski, Doug Baker, Chris Foreman (co-chair), Christopher Gardiner, Lisa Klopfer, John Koolage (co-chair), Peggy Liggitt, Bob Winning
Absent	Konnie Kustron, Gerald Newberry, Mary Rearick

Meeting Notes

Discussion of the final report continued.

Overall report:

- The report should address past assessment efforts to show what has been done over time and what did and didn't work.
- The term "Instructor questionnaire" needs to be used consistently.
- With regard to the technology recommendation:
 - Replace reference to "no course" with no single individual course and make it clear that Technology Intensive should mirror Writing Intensive.
 - **Motion:** Moved by John Koolage that the recommendation be made stronger. Instead of stating that a committee be formed to investigate this recommendation, state that it implement this recommendation. **Motion carried.**
 - Decide on umbrella term to use such as digital technology. Define what the committee means by technology in an endnote.

Criterion One: Mission

Address why the format of this section does not follow that of the other criteria in the executive summary. Also explain SWOT analysis there.

Criterion Two: Integrity: Ethical and Responsible Conduct

- The Library representative will rewrite certain references to the Library including: correcting the Library name; making clear that it is an academic unit with faculty supporting General Education; clarifying current resources it utilizes in support of academic honesty and changing technologies.
- Threat 2.2b regarding faculty load to be taken out as it is not specific to General Education.
- Recommendation 2.4b: community colleges should be referred to as "partners."
- Recommendation 2.4c: remove "through the internet to achieve 21st century outcomes."
- Recommendation 2.4d: rewrite for consistency with other references to changing technologies. Make sure such references are in harmony throughout the sections.
- Recommendation 2.4e: change alignment with program standards to alignment with professional discipline based organizations.
- Weakness 2.2b: rework ethical use of information and academic honesty into an opportunity where the General Education Program can provide a starting point.

Criterion Three: Teaching and Learning: Quality, Resources and Support

Threat 3.3a: rework threat on lines that there is a misconception that the General Education program is remedial.

Next Steps:

- Changes will be written up and sent to Doug by Monday, the 6th. Doug will send out the revised draft by Friday the 10th. Committee members should check that their changes are included.
- Chris and John will work on the Executive Summary.