Meeting Minutes

1. Introductions were made
   - Election of committee chair, approval of previous minutes, etc., will occur at the next meeting. The sole purpose of this meeting is to approve operational rubrics for each of the 11 LE Core Outcomes.

2. Approve Operational Rubrics for Each of the 11 LE Core Outcomes
   - Background:
     - Draft rubrics were created in summer 2013 by 3-4 faculty
     - In spring 2014, a group of 62 faculty/staff, 10 assigned as consultants to work with any faculty member(s) requesting help
       - Attended a workshop in January (or met with A. Stombaugh individually), brought syllabus, reviewed elements in each rubric, compared them to the current GE
       - Were asked to take syllabus and the rubric and pilot it in their course(s) during spring 2014
       - Faculty/staff were assigned to an outcome and met 5 times throughout the semester to discuss how things were going, make recommendations; first 2 meetings to get used to and discuss rubrics, as semester progressed, began to look at and discuss language
       - During the process suggestions were made and the pilot rubrics were created
       - All piloteers knew they could make recommendations for changes to the Outcomes, but they could not be changed (changes need to be approved by Senate)
       - Involvement with the pilot project/writing summaries, syllabi, etc., were put into a portfolio which L. Kieffer and the consultants then used to create the Consultant Summaries. A Stombaugh created the Pilot Summaries, which were also approved by the piloteers
       - Binders were created and distributed to ULEC members this summer; the “Questions” at the end of the binder need to be determined by ULEC but won’t be discussed today
       - Artifact reading was completed this summer for all Outcomes, except two
   - Questions:
     - Why do all rubrics seem to have to fit the same format?
       - Were told they shouldn’t change the format, but they could add to them
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- How were the piloteers selected?
  - M. Goulet recruited through department chairs, some piloteers were told they were going to participate, other department chairs provided the information to the faculty and asked for volunteers, some were approached due to course(s) they were teaching

- Discussion/Focus on rubrics only. Clock set for 20 minutes, warning when 5 minutes remain, vote at 20 minute intervals.
- L. Kieffer compiled a list of those involved with LE reform during the past few years, 200 individuals. These individuals put a lot of energy, passion, and conscientious work into the rubrics, what is in front of us is for the greater good of students and campus, these people are now experts, honor their work.
  - Needs to be in comprehensible terms though for us who aren’t experts
  - Very serious discussions occurred in regards to the verbiage that would work for all disciplines involved, even the smallest word choice would set off a half-hour discussion, K4, for example
  - No wordsmithing during this session, look at rubrics in their entirety

- Integrative Learning Outcome
  - Motion to approve the unchanged Integrative Learning Draft Rubric as operational (M. Stadler), seconded, discussion
    - Motion approved 8-1
    - M. Wood opposed

  Discussion:
  No changes were made to the rubric

- Knowledge Outcome 1
  - Motion to approve the piloteer version of the K1 rubric as operational (T. Kemp), seconded, discussion
  - Motion to amend the original motion to change all singular verbiage of data to plural/“data is” to “data are” (S. Drucker)
    - Motion to approve the piloteer version of the K1 rubric as operational, as amended, was approved 9-0

  Discussion:
  Appreciate the added asterisked note at the bottom

- Skills Outcome 1
  - Motion to approve the piloteer version of the S1 rubric as operational (C. Brandt), seconded, discussion
    - Motion approved 9-0

  Discussion:
  R. Miller, on behalf of Library staff, requested that Item #2, under Considerations for Faculty Implementation, on the LE Pilot Summary, be changed from Jill Markgraf to include the entire department/the entire department is available to assist.
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- **Responsibility Outcome 3**
  - Motion to approve the piloteer version of the R3 rubric as operational (T. Kemp), seconded, discussion
    - Motion approved 9-0

  Discussion:
  Service-Learning was removed (Element D), now a separate entity/its own requirement

- **Responsibility Outcome 2**
  - Motion to approve the piloteer version of the R2 rubric as operational (M. Stadler), seconded, discussion
    - Motion approved 9-0

- **Knowledge Outcome 2**
  - Motion to approve the piloteer version of the K2 rubric as operational (M. Johnson), seconded, discussion
    - Motion approved 8-1
    - A. Smith opposed

  Discussion:
  × Element A and B will always be together, University Assessment was okay with doing an artifact for A and another for B
  × A. Smith’s primary concern is that the phrase “this discipline” in Element B completely disassociate the element from the outcome, and could be construed to exclude IDIS courses, multidisciplinary courses, and experiences that are not disciplinary course-based.

- **Knowledge Outcome 3**
  - Motion to approve the piloteer version of the K3 rubric as operational (A. Smith), seconded, discussion
  - Motion to amend the original motion to remove “ability to” from Element B, Benchmark not met (M. Stadler)
    - Motion to approve the piloteer version of the K3 rubric as operational, as amended, was approved 9-0

  Discussion:
  × *Theory and/or methodology* added, felt some disciplines would go away from doing these things if they aren’t articulated
  × Under *Element B, Benchmark not met*, eliminate “ability to”, ability can’t easily be measured
  × A matter of precision, what they are able to understand, eliminating “ability” makes it more precise, helps to clarify
  × There are inconsistencies with Rubrics and Outcomes--ULEC can make suggestions to Outcomes later, Senate will need to approve
  × Piloteers wanted to add an additional element, *historical* stayed in with a slash to portray both
Skills Outcome 3
- Motion to approve the piloteer version of the S3 rubric as operational (C. Brandt), seconded, discussion
  - Motion approved 7-2
  - M. Johnson and G. Peters opposed

Discussion:
- Added possible examples on bottom, was hard in the sense that it is kind of broad, try to capture true nature of S3 without leaving it open
- Have heard people discuss it could apply to all different disciplines, more applicable to music now, it’s written in a way that it applies to the art
- Removing Element 3 implies that it can be met by something in a major, not tied to art. The original goal seemed to be for students to have an experience in arts/creative; this is a large change. The Chancellor approved the LE Proposal with one S3 experience that could be met in the major, though the LE Core is not about the major.
- Could not offer enough seats if restricted to the arts, M. Wood voted against it in Senate, ULEC will need to review a course carefully when asking to be included in S3/ULEC will need to determine what meets the spirit of the Rubric and the Element
- Will include research, but not chemistry courses
- Experiences occurring in Student Affairs (e.g. LLC), music groups such as Audacious, student director of Vagina Monologues; all of these require a tremendous amount of creativity, might potentially be included in LE Core
- The word art was never discussed, direct people to those disciplines
- Ensembles will be included with the removal of Element C

Knowledge Outcome 4
- Motion to approve the piloteer version of the K4 rubric as operational (C. Brandt), seconded, discussion
- Motion to amend the original motion to include the verbiage currently eliminated from Elements A, B, C (“Student...”) (M. Johnson)
- Motion to amend the original motion to change artifact to artifact(s) (A. Smith)
- Motion to amend the original motion to change framework to context for consistency (M. Wood)
  - Motion to approve the piloteer version of the K4 rubric as operational, with all amendments, was approved 9-0

Discussion:
- Spent a lot of time looking at words, some words were offensive to their discipline; e.g., beautiful
- Language of rubric was consistent with western works of art, this time period; wanted to eliminate ideas of art, function of art, art is an assuming thing, many cultures don’t have that word, need to written in a general way that was applicable
- Do not like removing the word “student” in the Elements, all other rubrics elements contain sentences, these Elements are phrases/topics, will make the Elements much clearer
Very helpful to hear internal discussion reflected here, how overly-narrow rubrics were before, traditionalist, and impossible to understand

Creative Writing seen as an art

Element A says context, benchmarks state framework, change for consistency

The artifact = a piece of art (e.g. Mona Lisa), understand it differently, the artifact reading, use artifact(s) instead for clarification, goal was to not use the words art or masterpiece

Skills Outcome 2

- Motion to approve the piloteer version of the S2 rubric as operational (A. Smith), seconded, discussion
  - Motion approved 9-0

Discussion:

- Piloteers included four math faculty, a philosophy professor who teaches logic, and one faculty member from computer science
- If math competency is moved out of the Outcome, philosophy and computer science could still meet it

Responsibility Outcome 1

- Motion to approve the piloteer version of the R1 rubric as operational (C. Brandt), seconded, discussion
- Motion to amend the original motion to add a dash between social and group
  - Motion to approve the piloteer version of the R1 rubric as operational, as amended, was approved 9-0

Discussion:

- Won’t be able to deliver it in this way, will need to insure that courses offer supportive evidence of their ability to really deliver
- 30-35 instructors were assigned to R1, there is a breadth and depth of folks who have helped with this
- Some disciplines won’t be able to meet it
- Rubric is now stronger and clearer
- We learned last year in discussions that we approve courses and not instructors, there will be opportunity for faculty development/it’s out there, will continue to be pushed out there, hope departments take advantage of it
- We need to be patient and supportive of individuals and the process, we’ll get there
- Major change appears to be that there is less emphasis on a student to delve into their own sense of identity, was the main idea that couldn’t be agreed upon
- Piloteers would have made it longer, added columns, if they could have
- Some disciplines were very uncomfortable with asking students to self-reflect on oppression, if this rubric passes, still needs to be discussed
- Was a divide between upper- and lower- division within piloteers
- It’s not about cultural diversity alone but also about understanding systems of privilege and where you sit in them
3. **Upcoming Meeting(s)**

- A. Stombaugh will provide M. Goulet a list of topics discussed at this meeting for possible agenda items of upcoming meetings (e.g. the “Questions” in the back of the binder, a discussion surrounding the process of forwarding proposals needs to be discussed, who is involved, etc.)

**Adjourned at:** 3:00 PM

**Submitted by:** S. Forcier

**Approved:** 9.8.15