

**MTSU University General Education Meeting
Minutes for April 30, 2021**

Committee members attending: Samuel Blumer, Janis Brickey, Lando Carter, Warner Cribb, Mark Frame, Jenna Gray-Hildenbrand, Terry Goodin, Virginia Hemby-Grub, Rachel Kirk, Ryan Korstange (Chair), Kevin Krahenbuhl, Aliou Ly, Tammy Melton, Greg Nagel, Ryan Otter, James Piekarski, Deana Raffo, John Sanborn, Laura White

Ex-officio members attending: Chris Brewer, Nita Brooks, Jeff Gibson, Susan Myers-Shirk (Director), Steve Severn

Design team members attending: Michelle Boyer-Pennington, Katherine Brackett, Cristabell Devadoss, Kristen West, Louis, Woods,

Guests Attending: Meredith Funderbunk (GA)

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 2:02 pm by Ryan Korstange, Chair.

Roll Call

Deana Raffo, Recording Secretary, called roll with all 19 voting members present at the start of the meeting.

Approval of Minutes

The March 26, 2021, April 02, 2021, and April 23, 2021 minutes were approved.

Introduction and Review of Procedure

Ryan Korstange reminded the committee that a motion is on the table to approve the learning outcomes and that we are voting on amendments. As with last week, the executive team offered proposed language in a draft based on feedback. Last week, we left off with a motion to change “civic engagement” to “civic literacy” for Objective C Intercultural Understanding.

Continued Discussion of University Community Comments on Proposed Program-level Student Learning Outcomes

Objective C: Intercultural Understanding & Civic Engagement Text

Susan Myers-Shirk shared that the executive team made some suggested changes including the “civic engagement” definition (second bullet). They changed it to “civic literacy” throughout the document and worked to come up with a definition for civic literacy. However, in this process it became apparent that “civic literacy” is defined in the literature as a more narrow concept than what we discussed last week. This narrower definition is also defined in the political realm.

Discussion ensued about the terms “civic learning,” “civic engagement,” “civic literacy,” and “civic understanding.” Main points included that the term should encompass multiple contexts and that the definition is meant to be inclusive

Susan shared the University mission statement where one of the design team members highlighted MTSU parts of the mission statement that refers to either civic engagement or community. Much of the language in the outcomes is in the mission statement. When engagement came up in the focus groups and workshops, faculty said that they want Gen Ed to align with university mission statement.

Ryan said that he thinks the challenge with the term of engagement is that in education we mean involvement, but the public commentary seemed to interpret activism and said that civic engagement could be defined to be “acquired knowledge, skills, and values.”

Tammy said that she expressed faculty concerns about “engagement” last time. She said that if the activist language is removed, it would help.

Ryan said that there seemed to be an emerging consensus to go with “civic engagement” and use the suggested definition we have for civic learning.

John Sanborn made a motion for an amendment to define “civic engagement” as “is the acquired knowledge, skills and values individuals need to be civically and globally responsible citizens who can choose to contribute to their community, build healthier communities, and address community problems. Communities can be geographic, interest-based and even “virtual” and are local, national and global.” Greg Nagel seconded.

Deana Raffo read the amendment as follows:

Civic engagement is the acquired knowledge, skills and values individuals need to be civically and globally responsible citizens who can choose to contribute to their community, build healthier communities, and address community problems. Communities can be geographic, interest-based and even “virtual” and are local, national and global.

The amendment passed with 18 voted yes, 1 no.

There is no need to change the title, since the draft title is currently “civic engagement.”

For C2, Ryan asked about changing “using” instead of “acquiring” and removing “their.”

John Sanborn made a motion for an amendment for the C2 language to include “using.” Warner Cribb/Mark Frame. Friendly amendment was made for a title change for “engagement,” accepted.

Deana Raffo read the amendment as:

C2: Students will demonstrate civic engagement by using knowledge, information, and understanding to comprehend civic identity and civic obligations in local and global contexts.

The amendment passed unanimously with 19 yes votes.

Mark Frame made a motion to amend that in the “Why these outcomes and why are they paired?” section that the last sentence is only change? Warner Cribb seconded.

The amendment passed unanimously with 19 yes votes.

Table C1: Intercultural Understanding

Ryan reviewed the suggested changes that included replace bias with perspective and reflecting the changes made last week in written and nonwritten outcomes in the verbal/nonverbal section.

John Sanborn made a motion to amend. Virginia Hemby-Grub and Mark Frame seconded.

The amendment passed with 18 yes votes, 1 no.

Table C2

Ryan reviewed the suggestions that involved removing the activist overtones.

Mark Frame made a motion to define “Civic Identify and Civic Commitment” be defined as “Describes learning as it relates to a growing sense of personal civic identity and responsibility.” Kevin Krahenbuhl seconded.

John Sanborn made a friendly amendment that in the title, “commitment” be changed to “responsibility.” The friendly amendment was accepted.

The amendment passed with 18 yes votes, 1 no.

Kevin Krahenbuhl made a motion to amendment other title changes in the C2 table that included “Civic Communication, “Analysis of Knowledge,” and “Analysis of Civic Action.” Tammy Melton seconded.

The motion passed unanimously with 19 yes votes.

Approval of Student Learning Outcomes

Ryan said that the original motion to approve the student learning outcomes as amended is on the table from last week. He reminded the committee that a two-thirds majority vote is required to pass, which means 13 yes votes.

Samuel Blumer asked is there a benefit to sending this back out to the university for comment. Ryan answered that sending it out again would require that the committee vote no. Nita Brooks

told Susan that if the committee makes significant or substantial changes, it would need to go back out for public comment. But if the committee feels that the changes are not substantial, then a second public comment period is not needed.

Greg Nagel called the question to approve the outcomes as amended. Mark Frame seconded.

The committee unanimously approved the approve the student learning outcomes as amended with 19 votes.

Discussion of General Education Outstanding Teaching Award for 2020-2021

Ryan Korstange said that the tabulated results revealed a significant difference between top 2nd and 3rd place scores. Ryan Otter said that given the complexity and amount of input, he recommends going strictly by the numbers. John Sanborn asked if there was an option to give two awards. Susan replied no, but people can reapply.

Tammy Melton made a motion to make the selection based on the higher average, Jenna Gray-Hindenbrand seconded.

The committee voted unanimously to approve that the award go to Sadler with 17 yes votes.

Recognition of Members Completing their Term of Service

Susan said that she has letters of thank you to send to members rolling off and thanked the executive team, the committee, and the design team.

With no new business, the meeting adjourned at 4:13 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Deana Raffo, Recording Secretary