GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE
224th Meeting
Thursday, September 17, 2015

MINUTES
Approved

Present: B. Coller (EET/MEE), M. Daniel (EDU/LEED), D. Gorman (LAS/ENGL), E. Klonoski (Ex-officio, Acting Associate Vice Provost), B. Montgomery (HHS/FCNS), A. Polansky (LAS/MATH), M. Quinlan (VPA/ART), D. Smith (Catalog Editor), K. Thu (LAS/ANTH), L. Zhou (BUS/FINA)

Guest: R. Siegesmund (VPA/ART)

The meeting was called to order by GEC fall chair Coller.

Introductions were made.

I. Adoption of Agenda
Thu made a motion, seconded by Gorman, TO ADOPT THE AGENDA FOR THE SEPTEMBER 17, 2015, GEC MEETING. Coller asked if ARTE 109 could be up on the agenda since there is a guest. Motion passed unanimously as amended.

II. Approval of Minutes
There were no minutes for approval.

III. Old Business

A. PLUS Update. Klonoski provided an overview of the PLUS changes through handouts and PowerPoint presentations. Specifically he addressed what eventually will be baccalaureate requirements, e.g., writing infused courses, required UNIV 101 course or equivalent, engaged learning, career success, and e-portfolios. He also gave an overview on the changes to the general education curriculum. He pointed out the new writing in the domains courses. He gave an overview of Pathways. Klonoski reported that six Pathways applications were received plus one he is still expecting.

B. Subcommittee for GEC reorganization. No report.

IV. New Business

A. Pathways Applications. Coller announced that committee members can start evaluating the Pathways applications, which are loaded on Vibe. The GEC should be prepared to discuss the applications at the October 15 meeting. Applications for new courses for general education are due September 30, but many new course applications have already been received. It was noted that there is a separate application for new non-Pathways general education courses. It was clarified that if someone wanted a new course to go in a Pathway, they would have to work with the Pathway coordinator. There was a question about whether or not there would be a disadvantage to be in general education but not in a Pathway. Coller responded that courses that aren’t in a Pathway might not be as attractive to a student who wants to complete a Pathway. Coller took GEC members through one of the Pathways
applications and the rubric. The application was developed as an outcome of the grant development money that was awarded last spring (2015). Coller noted that he, Klonoski, Kot, and Vander Schee worked on the application and rubric over the summer. Each Pathway has a leader and four team members and it was these groups that carefully developed their respective Pathway proposals. It was explained that each Pathway has a list of questions that will be addressed and each course in a Pathway should address at least one of the questions. Thu asked if the GEC would be deciding if a course is appropriate for a Pathway. Coller responded that that decision was up to the Pathway coordinators and team members what courses would be included, so the GEC won’t be specifically looking at that. He added that the GEC’s most pressing concern is if the new courses for the general education program fit in the knowledge domain selected for that course. Thu also asked if the Pathways go through the curricular process and it was clarified that they only go through the GEC, then to the Undergraduate Coordinating Council (UCC). However, any new courses will have to also go through the Committee on Undergraduate Curriculum (CUC). It was also explained that for a new course to be added to a Pathway it must be offered often enough for it not be a barrier to completing the Pathway. Committee members also need to consider that there’s a breadth of upper-division courses offered so that students can complete the minor once it’s approved. Coller asked that as GEC members review the Pathways application, they rate each application as either a) acceptable, b) acceptable with minor revisions, or c) acceptable, but major revisions are necessary and this Pathway may not be able to be offered in fall 2016. Gorman asked if there was a target number for how many Pathways would be offered and Klonoski said that all eight of the proposed Pathways could be offered next fall if they are approved. Daniel asked if the GEC should consider more than a 25-course maximum for each Pathway and it was decided that at this time, to keep them manageable, the Pathways should be limited to 25 courses.

B. New course application. Coller shared the new course application with the GEC. All the new courses have to be reviewed and approved by the November GEC meeting in order to be included in the 2016-17 catalog. He asked GEC members to make progress on doing that by the October meeting. There was a discussion on what the GEC needs to approve, and it was clarified that the GEC will determine what knowledge domain a course goes into, not whether or not it fits within a Pathway. Klonoski added that GEC members should make sure that there is a collaborative learning component and a signature assignment for each new course application. Subcommittees for evaluating the new course applications were formed. For Creativity and Critical Analysis: the subcommittee is Gorman, Kot, and Quinlan; for Nature and Technology: Coller, Thu, and Polanski; and for Society and Culture: Daniel, Montgomery, and Zhou.

C. Assessment. No report.

D. ARTE 109. Coller explained that last semester, due to the changes in the general education program, the general education courses at that time needed to be moved to the new knowledge domains and departments provided rollover forms for each course to identify what knowledge domain they felt that course should be placed in. The GEC approved most of the rollover forms, with the exception of a few courses. For ARTE 109, the school proposed the course be place in Nature and Technology, but GEC members weren’t quite sure that it fit there. However, they felt that there was merit to that proposal and told the instructors for ARTE 109 that if they wanted the course in Nature and Technology they would need to revise the course description so it better aligned with the course content and to provide an additional rationale for why they thought the course belonged there. Richard Siegesmund gave a presentation on ARTE 109 as well as a new rollover form and updated syllabus. Siegesmund presented the statistical ideas that are covered and how the course looks at the interaction of quantitative data and how one can create visuals that display
quantitative data. Discussion followed to better understand what students are expected to do. They do learn statistical vocabulary, develop hypotheses, and apply statistical concepts, but they don’t perform statistical calculations. Siegesmund was asked if he checked for similar courses on campus. It was clarified that the course as it currently exists has already been approved, however, the revision to the description has yet to be approved through the curricular process. It would there (CUC) that issues of duplication could be addressed. Siegesmund said he will work to be sure this course is distinguished from other statistics courses. It was suggested that Siegesmund check with the Division of Statistics as well as the Department of Geography since they do something similar with GIS. Klonoski said that there are two processes. First, the GEC can approve the move to the Nature and Technology knowledge domain for ARTE 109 pending it goes through the curricular process. Then the course revision also needs to be approved by the CUC. However, Polansky pointed out that the course description is being revised to specifically address the GEC’s issues with the course rollover from last spring. Klonoski said that any duplication between ARTE 109 and other courses is for the CUC to decide. The GEC’s role is to determine where the course fits in the general education program. Discussion followed regarding whether or not ARTE 109 could be moved to the Nature and Technology knowledge domain and if a course in Nature and Technology must address the scientific method. Committee members agreed that a course need not meet every point in the description of a specific knowledge domain. There was a question if a course in this knowledge domain should have students doing science as opposed to describing terms. Montgomery made a motion, seconded by Gorman, TO APPROVE ARTE 109 FOR THE NATURE AND TECHNOLOGY KNOWLEDGE DOMAIN PENDING THE APPROVAL OF THE COURSE REVISIONS BY THE CUC AND UCC. **Motion passed unanimously.**

E. Pathways Minor. Klonoski reported that he will have the catalog language by the October GEC meeting. A new minor will need to be approved by the CUC, UCC, University Council, and Board of Trustees.

V. **Adjournment**

Thu made a motion, seconded by Kot, TO ADJOURN. **Motion passed unanimously.** The meeting adjourned at 2:50 p.m.

The next meeting is scheduled for October 15, 2015.

Respectfully submitted by Donna Smith, Catalog Editor/Curriculum Coordinator