

GE/GR Policies Minutes
10/4/2021

1. Call to Order – Introductions.

2. Open Forum

3. Approval of the Agenda - Angela approved and Ana seconded

4. Approval of Minutes – Angela approved and Marie seconded

5. From the Chair – Last year we decided to have a chair and cochair but the senate doesn't allow co-chairs. For this reason, Jeff agreed to be the chair. Is the race and ethnicity redundant with area F of GE. Senate will decide and Jeff will let us know if it will come back to us. GE assessment – this committee sent forward the assessment and senate will review it and will send it back. Learning objectives are not assessable- the executive committee might send it back for us to review the language.

6. Elections:

a) Liaison to GE Course Review Subcommittee – We need to select a Liaison to GE review subcommittee – what is the nature of the position? The expectation is that you are joining another committee. When does this committee meet – Wednesdays from 3 to 4:30 (2nd and 4th). GE/GR meets the 1st and 3rd Mondays. They meet the opposite week that we do.

The reading and writing meet on Wednesdays as well. Angela is interested in serving on this committee.

b) Liaison to Reading & Writing Subcommittee – This committee meets regularly and they meet Wednesdays 10:30 to 11:30 am (meets for an hour) Hogan Hayes is the chair and is very mindful of getting the work done. Marie has volunteered to serve on this committee. They meet the 2nd and 4th Wednesdays from 10:30 to 11:30 am.

7. ENGL 20 Learning Outcomes – The outcomes – The current outcome are goals and they are built upon English 1A- build on a course that is no longer being offered. #4 doesn't have a verb and that may be a problem, are they measurable? In writing across the curriculum, students understand writing rhetorically and disciplinary frameworks. They are discourse communities that are organized by the programs and trying to understand the different conventions. Faculty may do a research component and get students ready for the writing intensive course. Can #4 be change “to demonstrate use of conventions And should the following be removed: “no more than 20:1 and the footnote and best practices”. The wording of this was discussed. Suggestion was to highlight the working conditions – reasonable and equitable working conditions. Keeping the focus on students.

Was the kerfuffle based on the 20 to 1 ration? For Eng. 20 enrollment cap is 30. Suggestion was to maintain the student ratio as best practice within the discipline. Should we remove the footnote? Find a way to keep that footnote. We should let people know what the expectations are by the accreditation bodies. How can we say it without jeopardizing this going through? The national council of teachers of English recommend that This way we can call out the university for not following best practices.

The bottom section are Best practices – Senate only reviewed the A2 outcomes. GE/GR committee created best practices. A2 outcomes in order to pass GE/GE assessment took out the best practices and they only looked at the outcomes. English 20 was sent to the whole campus for feedback and the committee looked

at their feedback. This is what this organization believes and the university can disagree and can site other sources to counter this. Will having a footnote like this, will this sabotage this document? It does make a marker but it doesn't establish a rule. It is easier for a senator to see it as a footnote. The footnote doesn't mandate like the previous language did. Get rid of the language within the text and keep the footnote.

Angela will send a clean version to Jeff.

Ana moved the motion to approve this document- Alex seconded

Votes- unanimous = it passes.

8. Adjournment – meeting adjourned at 3:57