

University General Education Committee minutes

20 May 2022 via Zoom

Members: Lando Carter, Amy Sayward, Keith Gamble, Janet Colson, Deana Raffo, Leon Alligood, Keely O'Brien, Warner Cribb, Nicolas Morgan, Sydney Fischer, Mark Frame, Ryan Otter, Laura White, Jenna Gray-Hildenbrand, Sungyoon Lee, Rachel Kirk, Scott McDaniel, Virginia Hemby-Grubb

Ex officio: Susan Myers-Shirk, Chris Brewer, Jeff Gibson, David Carleton, Amy Aldridge Sanford

Guests: Katie Brackett, Kari Neely, Teresa Thomas, Kristen West, Betsy Dalton, Kate Holt, Brian Frank, Tyler Henson

Introductory matters

Lando Carter, chair of the committee, welcomed everyone to the last meeting of the academic year. He thanked everyone for their in the challenging task that had faced the committee this year. He asked if there were any edits or discussion of the minutes from the April 22nd meeting. There being no discussion and no edits, the minutes were approved. He then turned the meeting over to Susan Myers-Shirk, General Education Director.

Myers-Shirk especially thanked those who were cycling off of the committee: Lando Carter, Laura White, Ryan Otter, Janet Colson, Scott McDaniel, & Deana Raffo, Sidney Fischer and Nicolas Morgan. She then reviewed the committee's obligations under MTSU Policy 32. She reminded the committee that the two-week campus comment period had ended. She then moved to the values that the committee had identified at the beginning of the process, including flexibility, core knowledge & skills, student engagement & exploration, relevant & innovative content, and inclusion & intercultural competence. The committee was now at the point to determine what model best aligns with the values (listed above) and best meets the needs of the students and faculty. If 2/3 of the voting members of the committee (14/20 members) approve a model, then that recommendation would go to the General Education Director and the Provost. The goal of the discussion today is to achieve a high level of consensus. She then reviewed the two revisions offered to the campus community: the True Blue Core with Blueprints and the True Blue Core with Explorations and Blueprints. Both models are transfer-friendly, resemble the existing General Education curriculum, and guarantee that students will meet all eight outcomes without an additional advising load. Myers-Shirk completed her presentation by asking, what would happen if the committee approves neither of the two revised models? She then differentiated between what some campus comments meant by the "current curriculum"—with the same categories, hours distribution, category outcomes in the current catalog, the current 62 approved Gen Ed courses, and the current course approval parameters—and what would be possible with the new student learning outcomes approved last academic year, which supersede the existing category outcomes and will require new course approval processes. The category names, hours, and distribution of the current curriculum are the same as Revision 1, but additional work would be required to map the new outcomes onto that structure. She ended by requesting that committee members discuss and refer to the input from the campus community as part of the committee's discussion of the models. She then laid down the guidelines for the day's discussion, which should primarily be a discussion among voting members--which would be moderated by the committee's egalitarian, Jeff Gibson—but clarified that the voting members could ask questions of or request information from the others present at the meeting.

Discussion of True Blue Core with Blueprints (Revision 1)

Gibson stated that his hope was that we would listen to one another in order to learn, that we express our own perceptions, and that we did not aim just to persuade others. He also hoped that we would hear other members' voices. He kicked off discussion in a round-robin format with all voting members speaking or passing to ensure we get through the agenda and all can speak. He asked for responses to be approximately 1-2 minutes in length and address the questions, what do you see as a pro or con of the model? And what hesitancy (if any) do you have about supporting the model? Following the round-robin, there would be a period for further open discussion. The discussion started with the True Blue Core with Blueprints (Revision 1) and called on voting members alphabetically by first name.

Amy Sayward said that a pro of Revision 1 was that it seemed familiar, but on the negative side, it is actually quite different from the current curriculum (the view in the History Department) and is less innovative without the "explorations" options. Deanna Raffo stated that on the plus side it seemed safer and more stable in terms of staffing, but on the negative side, it does not align with the committee's values of student exploration and innovation. However, she did point out that there was opportunity for innovation in both models on the course level and as a result of the reapplication process.

Janet Colson explained that she liked both of the revised models. An advantage of Revision 1 was the greater flexibility, for example in the History category, and it is also transfer-friendly, especially to students from out of state. She did not see negatives in this model and identified herself as an advocate for change in order to produce greater engagement and innovation. Jenna Gray-Hildenbrand asked whether these models could be changed based on the feedback received during the campus comment period. Myers-Shirk responded that changes could be discussed later in the meeting.

Keely O'Brien was not able to respond, because she did not have a microphone on her device. Gibson then moved to Keith Gamble, who stated that he loved this model, which was very responsive to the feedback received during the first university comment period. It especially provided the clarity and simplicity that was requested. He thought it also fit the new student learning outcomes well and was transfer-friendly. He was a strong advocate for changing the names of categories if this model were recommended. Lando Carter reiterated that the model was responsive to the campus comments and was familiar to advisors. The only con that he saw was that it was not innovative enough to reach the committee's "true north" values.

Laura White agreed that it seemed responsive by using a familiar format, but some people felt threatened by this model. She was concerned that not everyone seemed to mean the same thing when talking about this model and that this model does not align as well with the committee's values. She thought that the outcomes were clear but how they would be mapped onto this curriculum left some questions unanswered. She also thought that the committee's commitment to place greater emphasis on intercultural competency and global awareness was not represented by this model. Leon Allgood agreed with a number of points previously made by Sayward, Raffo, Gamble, and White and said that he was leaning toward this model, as it seemed more palatable to our colleagues on campus as a whole.

Mark Frame explained that he liked Revision 1, because it is an incremental change. While he applauded the push to do something revolutionary, he stated that the pandemic and change fatigue meant that significant change was unlikely at this time. He said that Myers-Shirk's presentation pointed out how this was not going backward but was a solid step toward change. General Education can be revised further in the future, and the campus comments pointed him toward Revision 1.

Nicholas Morgan passed on making a comment. Rachel Kirk agreed with the positives identified by earlier speakers, although she stated that she had some concerns about how courses would be mapped in this model. However, overall she liked Revision 1. Rebecca Fischer being absent, Gibson moved to Ryan Otter, who stated that he did not like Revision 1, as it does not go far enough toward the objectives the committee laid out years ago; specifically, it doesn't provide significantly more student choice. While he stated that it might be the best compromise on the table, it is too safe, but agreeing with Frame, he stated that it would be a step forward.

Scott McDaniel expressed his preference for Revision 2 (with explorations), as he believed that students need that additional choice. But this model also maintains disciplinary knowledge. Sungyoon Lee passed on providing a comment, as did Sydney Fisher. Terry Goodin was absent, and Virginia Hemby-Grubb was having difficulty with her connection to Zoom. Warner Cribb stated that he had not heard much comment from his colleagues in the College of Basic and Applied Sciences (CBAS) during the forums or comment period, so he focused his comments on the students outside CBAS that he teaches every semester. He stated that they generally were not interested in scientific principles like radioactive decay, the Periodic table, and the physics of groundwater flow, but he thought such students would likely benefit from a broader set of CBAS course offerings in applied science. He also hoped that the revision to General Education would provide opportunities for smaller departments to offer new courses in General Education. Due to these hopes, he did not support this model. When Hemby-Grubb's connection was restored, she stated that she was leaning heavily toward Revision 2 (with Explorations and Blueprints), which provided greater opportunities for students.

Gibson asked if anyone who had initially passed now wanted to comment. When they did not, he opened discussion for further comments on Revision 1. Sayward elaborated that while most History faculty liked those "neither" on the campus survey, further discussion with her department chair led her to believe that most of her colleagues would prefer Revision 2 to Revision 1. Raffo asked for further explanation of that comment, and Sayward explained that Revision 2, with its Disciplinary Knowledge category, would preserve at least one History course, while Revision 1 (defined only by learning outcomes) would mean a free-for-all in terms of course proposals in each category.

Discussion of Model with True Blue Core, Pathways, and Explorations

Gibson then moved the discussion to Revision 2, and voting members of the committee commented in the same format as before. Sayward said that she thought that Revision 2 offered more student choice, might be even more transfer-friendly for private-college transfers (based on a comment from Ron Henderson during the first comment period in a town hall meeting), and was friendlier to the History Department. Raffo agreed that it offered more student choice and innovation, and therefore it fit better with the committee's values. She had some hesitancy about the definition process for "Disciplinary Knowledge" and "Explorations" courses and how it could lead to further gate-keeping, but she hoped that this could be worked out. Colson stated that she preferred this model, as it was clearer, more user-friendly, gave students more opportunities for exploration, and was easier for transfer students from private colleges and universities. She specifically stated her hope that a course in Nutrition and Food Science in the College of Behavioral and Health Sciences might qualify for the General Education curriculum under the Scientific Literacy exploration category.

Gray-Hildenbrand stated that she believed that as the models were currently laid out that neither set up the faculty work groups (who would define the categories in the fall) for success. She stated that she saw the General Education curriculum as its own program, which should not have disciplinary guardrails or gate-keeping but should give everyone an opportunity to be part of the General Education program. She then listed six different concerns she had about the current models. (1) Gray-Hildenbrand

expressed concern that the description of non-written communication in the “in-the-weeds” accompanying document that Myers-Shirk sent to campus did not clearly express the idea that non-verbal communication were not limited to English and could be embodied or mediated, not limited to speaking and hearing. (2) She also expressed concern that the information literacy outcome was only associated with the written communication category in Revision 2. She welcomed a discussion on this point. (3) She thought that the category titles needed to be reworked to better fit with the outcomes. She specifically pointed to the word “culture” appearing in two different category titles, which she felt rendered the term meaningless. (4) She urged the committee to think more about the Disciplinary Knowledge and Explorations categories, which elicited many campus comments. She suggested possibly calling them “Introductions” and “Explorations” or perhaps “Applied Learning.” (5) She wondered out loud why there was a separate “History” category when other General Education programs did not have such a category. She suggested that it be renamed “Civic Engagement” and moved to the Foundations section. (6) She did not understand why the literature requirement was still in the creative and cultural expression category. She ended by stating that she wanted to discuss all of these issues.

Gamble responded that Gray-Hildenbrand had provided some great discussion topics, but he wanted the committee to focus on the task of choosing a model, not deciding everything connected to General Education at this point. He reminded the committee that last year, the committee had made a decision on student learning outcomes, not the course approval process or the many others issues that were related and had been discussed by the committee. He defined this as a significant step forward that allowed this year’s committee to move forward in choosing a model to house those outcomes. Gamble then stated that he liked and supported Revision 2, especially valuing its transfer-friendliness. He also thought that it was clear and simple compared to the more change-oriented models that he preferred. He did not like the additional difficulty of distinguishing Disciplinary Knowledge vs. Explorations courses in this model, however, he thought that both Revisions were better than the current model, which does not fit well with the new outcomes.

Carter thanked his colleagues for their input, which he him shifting some of his ideas. He stated that he was primarily weighing “not enough change” with incremental change. White summarized that there was lots of agreement that Revision 2 is better aligned with the committee’s outcomes and goals, especially flexibility and innovation. She shared the concern that having Disciplinary Knowledge vs. Explorations courses builds some confusion into the system. She stated that there were significant concerns in the campus comments about the role of disciplinary knowledge in General Education, which moved beyond simple “turf” questions. White also stated that she understood Gamble’s comment that the committee cannot address also questions now, but she did want to ensure that there was sufficient information for the faculty to be excited about and participate in redesign. Allgood passed on making a comment.

Frame stated that he thought Revision 2 was a good, more progressive compromise. He agreed with White in the concern about not enough people on campus being comfortable to take that leap forward. Speaking of disciplinary knowledge in General Education, he explained that you cannot have cross-disciplinary knowledge without disciplines. Especially in General Education-level courses, we compartmentalize to make material easier to learn, often moving to more integrative and cross-disciplinary approaches at the upper-division level. Therefore, there is still a pedagogical argument for maintaining disciplinary knowledge in general education. Acknowledging these disciplines was also an avenue to greater faculty buy-in. Morgan passed on commenting. Kirk said that she liked that Revision 2 offered more opportunities for creativity, but she thought both models lacked clarity in terms of mapping. She thought that a better model than either currently under consideration could be created based on the additional feedback received to date. Otter passed on making a comment.

McDaniel agreed with Gamble in terms of moving forward without knowing everything that will follow. Although there were some items that likely need further clarification, he stated his preference for Revision 2. Lee passed on making a comment, as did Sydney Fisher. Hemby-Grubb circled back to the beginning of the process of General Education redesign, with the meetings with student, faculty, and others to identify the skills and abilities that were most important. Myers-Shirk affirmed that there had been faculty focus groups, a student survey, and some information from employers that led to the outcomes approved last year. Hemby-Grubb stated her concern that the committee was now picking apart something that had been carefully and thoughtfully constructed previously, without remembering those core skills. She stated that Revision 2 provides the comfort of the traditional with added flexibility for students, which is needed given the increasing restrictions placed on student exploration by financial aid. This was also something that students asked for at the beginning of the process. She concluded by stating that the committee had worked its way to this model, which could be built upon and modified.

Cribb stated that he favored this model, specifically because it is best for all students across the university in terms of being successful in Science courses. To illustrate, he stated that in a Scientific Literacy Explorations course on Climate Change, for example, he could show students graphs and have them assess trends and draw conclusions—both quantitative and qualitative, without the students having to know how or why greenhouse gas works (information that is embedded in basic chemistry and physics). The College of Basic and Applied Sciences can do both well—course for Science majors in Chemistry, Physics, and Biology as well as applied course like Climate Change and Environmental Science. His opinion was that Revision 2 offered the best opportunity to modify the suite of science courses available to students across campus and create courses that would be more interesting to non-science students. This model also allows departments and chairs to make decisions about future courses that will reflect their resources. He welcomed the opportunity for smaller departments to offer smaller-enrollment courses that would be part of the General Education curriculum in the future as chairs and departments agree that resources are available.

Gibson paused to ask if anyone who had previously passed wanted to now make a comment. Then he opened the floor to general comments. Carter stated that Sayward's comment about Revision 2 being the more conservative model had surprised him, as he had considered Revision 1 more conservative initially. Sayward stated that she agreed with Gray-Hildenbrand on the need to change the titles of some categories if Model 2 is preferred by most of the committee. Gibson then asked what the preference of the committee was in discussing the legacy General Education model, which could be handled in the same round-robin method or by open comments. Gray-Hildenbrand asked if the order (per the agenda) was to discuss the legacy model, take a break, and then have a preference poll? Gibson stated that there would be a discussion if there was consensus on doing that. Gray-Hildenbrand said that most of her comments were based on feedback from the campus comment period. She especially thought that the committee should take the time to address those issues, especially the lack of clarity between Disciplinary Knowledge and Explorations courses as well as why Literature was in the category it was. She asked if that could be tacked before the preference poll.

Gibson asked if there was any feedback on the legacy General Education program first. Frame stated that by virtue of how the redesign process had unfolded, Revision 1 is a step forward framed by the legacy curriculum rather than making a new and significant effort to figure out how the legacy model could be altered to fit the new outcomes that have been approved, which would be a lateral step. He stated that Revision 1 shows concretely that the committee did see and hear and acknowledge and comprehend those important campus comments. Kirk then expressed her view that it would not be difficult to add Blueprints and the new outcomes to the legacy curriculum. Gibson asked if there were any other comments about the legacy curriculum before thinking about Jenna and Rachel's questions.

Gray-Hildenbrand asked Myers-Shirk if there was a specific reason that the hours and outcomes in Communication had been laid out as they were in the Revisions. Myers-Shirk answered that the mapping of the hours was copied from our legacy curriculum for Revision 1, as were History and Literature. She also reminded the committee that the College of Liberal Arts (CLA) chairs had asked for the same distribution of hours. The question of where the D2 (information literacy outcome) would/should go in Revision 1 and 2 was a good one. The primary goal of the Design Team had been to ensure coverage of all eight outcomes, however, that outcomes could make sense elsewhere as well and could certainly be open to revision. Gray-Hildenbrand said she understood the reasons for the mapping as it was but would like to see some additional changes to the category titles. She concluded by saying that she had respect for all that the committee had done so far, but thought it would be essential to the efficient working of the faculty work groups next year that there be a clear definition of Disciplinary Knowledge and Explorations courses. Gibson said that this discussion was best held in the second half of the committee's deliberations, which would get into more specifics, while this first part of the discussion was really about hearing one another about preferences and the pros and cons of the two Revisions following the campus comment period.

The committee then took a ten-minute break from 2:39-2:49 p.m.

Preference Polling and Follow-up Discussion

When the committee reconvened, Myers-Shirk reminded the voting members that the goal of the preference poll was to gauge what people were thinking so that we could judge what might be needed to move toward broad consensus. She then moved the non-voting members to a break-out room so that the voting members could cast their ballots anonymously. The members then ranked Revision 1, Revision 2, and the legacy curriculum in their preference poll, placing the most preferred at the top. Gray-Hildenbrand asked if the preference poll still allowed the possibility of changing things in the model, and Gamble reiterated that it was a non-binding poll. And while the polling was still taking place, Otter reminded the committee that something that was ranked as a third preference might not be a preference at all, which was something to keep in mind when looking at the results. After some challenges with the new polling method, 18 votes were recorded:

- Revision 1 was nobody's first choice, the second choice of 87.5%, and the third choice of 12.5%
- Revision 2 was the first choice of 87.5%, the second choice of 12.5%, and the last choice of no one.
- The legacy curriculum was the first choice of 12.5%, the second choice of no one, and the third choice of 87.5%.

Gibson then stated that it would be logical to focus discussion on Revision 2, which was the first preference of 87.5% of the voting members of the committee. He then asked people to raise their hand if they wanted to speak, particularly if you did not prefer that model and would like to talk about what might be needed to gain your support. Carter stated that he was really split in what decision to make, but the many comments about needing a model that lived up to student choice tipped him in favor of Revision 2. Otter asked if those who voted Revision 2 as their third choice meant that they would not vote for it. Gray-Hildenbrand said that she was confused, as she thought that the models could still be changed to be more receptive to feedback from the campus community. She asked specifically about changing the names of the categories and clarifying that the D2 (information literacy) outcome in Foundations does not have to be tethered to the written communication area. Sayward said that she was also interested in possibly changing a category name, and Kirk suggested possibly changing

Commented [AS1]: These numbers don't add up. 87.5% of 18 people is 15.75 people, and 12.5% of 18 people is 2.25 people.

Disciplinary Knowledge courses to “Introduction” courses (paired with “Explorations” courses). Gibson then handed the meeting over to Carter, as chair, as the committee moved more toward a Robert’s Rules of Order style of motions and amendments. Carter lauded Gibson for his work before opening the floor to motions based on the discussion.

Discussion of Revision 2

Gamble then made an overarching motion to frame the discussion about Revision 2. His motion focused only on the structural elements of Revision 2 that fall under Policy 32 and its requirement for a 2/3 majority of the committee voting in favor. These structural elements included the new category names with associated hours and student learning outcomes as well as the distribution of Disciplinary Knowledge courses and Exploration courses:

Motion for new category names with associated required, learning outcomes:

Foundational Skills (12 hours)

- Written Communication (6 hours) A1, D2
- Non-written Communication (3 hours) A2
- Quantitative Literacy (3 hours) D1

History, Peoples, and Cultures (6 hours) C2

- Disciplinary Knowledge in History (3 or 6 hours)
- Explorations in History, Peoples, and Cultures (0 or 3 hours)

Creative and Cultural Expression (9 hours) C1

- Literature (3 hours)
- Disciplinary Knowledge in Fine Arts/Humanities (3 or 6 hours)
- Explorations in Creative and Cultural Expression (0 or 3 hours)

Human Society and Social Relationships (6 hours) B1

- Disciplinary Knowledge in Social and Behavioral Sciences (3 or 6 hours)
- Explorations in Human Society and Social Relationships (0 or 3 hours)

Scientific Literacy (8 hours) B2

- Disciplinary Knowledge in Natural Sciences (4 or 8 hours)
- Explorations in Scientific Literacy (0 or 4 hours)

He later clarified that this focus on the structural elements was the reason that Blueprints were not part of the motion; they were voluntary and did not fall under the Policy 32 voting strictures. Otter seconded the motion, and the floor was opened for discussion and possible amendments to the motion.

Information Literacy and Communication Courses

Kirk stated that she was not committed to the term “Introductions” but would rather avoid the language of “Disciplinary”; she therefore suggested possibly “Primary” as well. Sayward said that she did not support the term “Introduction” or “Primary”—at least for the category where History courses were, as they were not an introduction to the Explorations course in the category—and she stated that it would be good to have symmetry in the language throughout the categories. Gray-Hildenbrand said that she still wanted to unlink outcome D2 (information literacy) from written communication so that it could perhaps be covered by students’ non-written communication course. Myers-Shirk said that ENGL 1020

currently deals specifically with research, and that was the primary reason that the Design Team had assigned outcome D2 to written communication. She stated that Gray-Hildenbrand was right that this outcome could also be an outcome of a non-written communication course. Kirk stated that it was her understanding that information literacy is also very much a part of the current public-speaking course. White explained that mapping the outcomes in Revision 2 was a way to guarantee that all of the outcomes would be covered; however, outcome D2 would not (in Revision 2) be the “property” of ENGL 1020, as other courses could also be included in this category. Additionally, other courses could have this as a secondary outcome, and she anticipated that the faculty learning communities in the coming academic year would likely define these outcomes more thoroughly. Gray-Hildenbrand then stated that she had thought that there were six hours of written communication because that category had two outcomes but now realized that the number of credit hours were a separate issue from the outcomes.

Discussion of the Title of the “History, Peoples, and Cultures” Category

Sayward made a motion to change the title of the “History, Peoples, and Cultures” category to “Civic and Cultural Engagement” that was seconded by Gray-Hildenbrand. Carter asked what was gained or lost with that change. Raffo stated that it would clarify the category, but that change would also have to be included in the name of the Explorations course in the category as well. White stated that it might help with the issue of redundancy with the term “culture.” Carter expanded that one would more clearly be about “cultural understanding” as opposed to “cultural expression.” Kirk said that she thought that this issue had been raised in the comments. Carter warned that last year’s committee had spent a lot of time thinking through the category titles. Gray-Hildenbrand stated that she thought the new title helped to clarify the distinction, was more clearly tied to the new outcomes, and would move the faculty defining these categories next year in the right direction. Raffo stated that she recalled a lot of concern last year about using the term “civic engagement.” Gray-Hildenbrand then suggested perhaps “Civic and cultural literacy” as an alternative, which Sayward accepted as a friendly amendment. White stated that she did not think that helped, as the key concern was about the word “civic.” This was not accepted as a friendly amendment to Gamble’s motion, so the committee voted on the amendment. Seventeen voting members voted; eleven members were needed for a majority (out of the total membership per policy). The motion failed 53% (9 members) in favor, 35% (6 members) opposed, and 12% (2 members) abstaining.

Vote on Revision 2

Discussion then returned to the main motion on approving the structural elements of Revision 2. There was a short discussion of abstaining, which was effectively a “no” vote given that 2/3 of the committee (14 members of the committee) had to vote in favor for the vote to be successful under the policy. Gamble clarified that the effect of his motion would be to take all other structures off the table; this motion would establish the new structure of the General Education curriculum. However, there would still be a lot of work remaining for the committee. Katie Brackett clarified that this would be a Zoom poll rather than an anonymous poll, because some the voting members could not participate in the vote via Forms. Myers-Shirk clarified that it would be an anonymous-facing poll and that she would erase the results as soon as the poll was over. Gray-Hildenbrand stated that while she understood the desire for anonymity, the need for all members to participate in the vote was more important.

The outcome of the vote (17 members voting) on Gamble’s motion—to adopt the structural changes connected to Revision 2—received 13 votes in favor, 2 opposed, and 2 abstaining, so the motion failed by one vote, as 14 votes were needed to attain the 2/3 majority of all committee members required by policy.

Extension of the Meeting

Carter then requested a motion to extend the meeting to 4:30 p.m. so that the committee could conclude its business. Myers-Shirk said that the primary item of business, given that the committee has not adopted a model for the new outcomes, was to establish an agenda—a way forward—for the committee in the fall. Carter moved to extend the meeting, Sayward seconded, and the vote on the motion to extend the meeting passed 14-2-1.

Gamble asked if there was any adjustment that could be made to Revision 2 in order to change a “no” vote to a “yes” vote. Frame said that he was worried about the many implications that adopting Revision 2 would have. Gray-Hildenbrand said that she thought the structure needed to be clearer and more consistent.

Carter asked about the agenda for next year to guide the committee’s work, and he said that a motion was needed to have Myers-Shirk and Brackett advance the work started by the subcommittees over the summer in order to prepare for the committee’s work in the coming academic year. Frame asked if Myers-Shirk and Brackett wanted to perform this work over the summer. Myers-Shirk responded that they had requested the motion so that the committee can hit the ground running in the fall. She stated the further need to know what the next step(s) should be for the committee’s work. Given the failure of the motion for adopt a new model, the committee would likely have to revert to the remnant of the General Education curriculum without a True Blue Center or Blueprints. She requested direction for implementing the outcomes.

Reconsideration of Revision 2

At this point, Sayward stated that what would be lost was overwhelming and made a motion for a revote on Revision 2. Frame thought that there was a place in between, but Otter seconded Sayward’s motion. Carter opened the floor to discussion. Cribb argued that there needed to be a new motion to differentiate it from the previous motion. He suggested discussing the central of the True Blue Center in terms of assessment, helping the faculty and departments with the workload connected to redesign, and the important task of maintaining assessment data. Sayward agreed and phrased the motion as, to provide a structural basis for assessment of the new General Education outcomes by a center, I move that we accept the structural changes from Revision 2; Otter also agreed to—and seconded—the amended motion. The vote on this motion was 14 in favor, 2 opposed, and 1 abstention, so the motion passed.

Myers-Shirk stated that she would communicate the proposal passed by the committee to the Provost and then communicate with the committee. Carter then moved and Gamble seconded the previously-discussed motion for Myers-Shirk and Brackett to forward the work of the subcommittees over the summer, which passed by acclamation before the meeting adjourned at 4:31 p.m.