



Faculty Senate Archives

Faculty Senate

Academic year 2018-2019

General Education Committee Meeting Records September 24, 2018

General Education Committee Minutes

September 24, 2018

Present: Shirlene Small (SS), Kathy Delker (KD), Aaron Rife (AR), Mathew Muether (MM), Kim Sandlin (KS), Amy Drassen Ham (ADH), Rannfrid Thelle (RT), Linnea GlenMaye (LGM), Roy Myose (RM), Becky Nordike (BN), Gina Crabtree (GC), Steve Oare (SO)

- Welcome by the committee chair – Shirlene Small—started with short list, grew over the weeks, we will deal!
- Introduction of new committee member - Roy Myose—replacing Kamren, from Engineering. Everyone introduced themselves.
- Approval of minutes from 9-10-18 committee meeting—KD: correct change on general syllabus template—under purview of fac. Sen. Fixed Mathew's name. Notes approved.
- Request from Faculty Senate President – Betty Smith-Campbell regarding the Gen Ed. foundational math requirements (i.e. Algebra).
 - SS: This is something the faculty senate has been looking at—ongoing question why Math 110, 112, needs to be a gen ed requirement. We may not tackle this today, but we should be looking at it, perhaps address next meeting? Would like Amy to take a look at suggestion of removing algebra as a gen ed requirement, report to us at next meeting.
 - KD: This was brought up by Carolyn (past senate president) last year, we did not have time to address. SS: Well then, could you Kathy take a look at the issue instead of Amy and report next meeting. MM: I work with Math dep't, happy to help out or talk to people if need be.
 - RM: Are we looking at removing Algebra as a gen ed? Discussion—whether math requirement needs to be Algebra—confusion over context, exact issue here. LG: This intersects with the gen ed revision committee, something to keep in mind—would like to know exactly what Betty is requesting here.
 - SS: I am going to forward her email to the committee (us). We will visit it in the next meeting, if we can get somebody from Math at that time, that would be great.
- On- going Business:
 1. Discussion and Approval of Study Abroad Courses (I&P/Further Studies)
 - a. GC: For study abroad/gen ed issue, we get syllabi, take to dep't chair to get decision. Sally and I tend to go back and forth on this issue, as we help people get gen ed from a study abroad, but not give gen ed necessarily to transfer. Two courses for today—Holocaust and Naturalism.
 - b. ADM: So if we say no, say to Holocaust, the student can still use the credit in some way? GC: Yes, for another requirement, or at least for credit towards

graduation. Should we defer back to departments on these? KD: At least for designations?

- c. MM: Did we get department recommendations on these two? GC: No—but they said yes on English and no on History. (?) Some discussion on this.
- d. AA: Regardless of department opinion, not sure these would pass our own committee if sent directly. GC: Yes, departments may not pay so much attention to requirements/outcomes. KD: I am with Aaron, the gen ed outcomes are not here.
- e. GC: If they need to hit outcomes, then perhaps the study abroad program needs info on the outcome requirements for gen ed. KD: The gen ed homepage describes that courses must meet the gen ed outcomes. LG: If History department has a 318 question about if a gen ed course, then they need to request/submit the course to the committee.
- f. Discussion of where the courses came from, difference between equivalency and gen ed. GC: Right now, Registrar's office is making equivalency decisions based on similarity to existing gen ed courses, not running by gen ed committee, per authority of gen ed committee. So this process is different, particularly for courses from other countries. KD: This is the case in most registrar's offices.
- g. LG: So would this student go through exceptions if gen ed committee denies? GC: No, but exceptions committee could allow workaround (fewer gen ed courses), but gen ed would have final say on if course counts or not.
- h. RM: Something to be said about experience a student would get by taking a class in another country. GC: Yes, that is part of the reason why this process exist.
- i. AA: So we are deciding for these two courses today, right? SS: English: Naturalism in American Lit.—similar to English 232M (Ecology and the Wild)—Motion to approve gen ed attribute—RT moved, ADM second. Approved (6 to 3).
- j. History: Media and Memory, Representing the Holocaust. SO: Move that we reject course based on it resembling a non-gen ed. ADM seconded. LG: We may be blurring lines on equivalency here, as English course was tied to a really broad course, and passed, but Holocaust course is more specific and may not apply? RM: If Holocaust is a follow up to another history class, it follows spirit of Further Studies and gen ed. Discussion about value of course, experience it would provide. KD: Move we accept Holocaust as a gen ed I&P course, RM seconds. Approved (8 to 1)

2. Curriculum change form:

WSUD 102C FYS Creativity and Problem Solving

- a. KD: Description of gen ed goals could be expanded to tell more about assessments beyond percentages. Literacy/research is weak, could add something about assessment. What about oral communication and library use.
- b. ADM: The syllabus says items will be covered in class/blackboard—we are nitpicking elements instead of looking at spirit of course and program. KD: But the pilot program is ours, and anyone who teaches it needs to demonstrate how they are meeting requirements. ADM: So the crosswalk provided is not enough? KD: No. BN: Me neither.

- c. BN: FYI, Informative Outline—here is a copy for everyone. I have a problem with grading on class participation without outlining how. ADM: Could come from discussion board. Also, have to be cautious with how we look at participation/oral component. Discussion about being cautious and sensitive to student needs versus layout of gen ed/FYS course.
 - d. LG: I am looking at FYS course website about requirements—such as writing (no oral) MM: This course has a lot of writing, which goes into the writing and oral category. Discussion about whether distinct skills or same area. SO: I think we decided last year that writing and speaking goes together. Small debate over writing taking preference over speaking. RT: To complicate, “oral” is a style of writing as well! BN: The oral component feels vague, needs more details. MM: But if I got that feedback, I wouldn’t know what to do. Discussion about how to be more specific with goals. Question about who has ownership of gen ed FYS form.
 - e. SS: Motion? KD: Closest this comes is presentation on social media. I think we should ask for more details on speaking and information literacy. AR and MM: Nothing about library in course schedule. KD: Motion to deny per need more details on how his course will meet the speaking and information literacy outcomes/library research. BN: Second. Passed—send to Dr. Granada asking for changes in library research component and speaking. Let him know to get back by October 8th or 22nd there is time for the course to get on schedule for Spring.
3. Discussion and changes to the FYS syllabus template—table for next agenda, KD will email to the committee. LG: The gen ed committee does not need approval for the model syllabus (FYS).
 4. Comments/Information – Registrar’s Office
 - a. Gina Crabtree/Sally Fiscus – CIM Demonstration and Discussion—copy of form given out, are there changes we can make. Take and think, address in a future meeting. ADM: Assessment perhaps—to make more proposals more acceptable?
 - b. SS: Let’s look at this for the next meeting as well. Motion (SS) Seconded (AR), passed.

As may arise—RM: You sent us the document from Faculty Senate? SS: This is part of the math issue we will look at next meeting.

- Set next meeting date – October 8—RT: I will be absent.
- Adjourn