

Minutes

General Education Implementation Committee Meeting
December 2, 2003
Graham Memorial 011

Members in attendance: Dean Carolyn Cannon, Dean Karen Gil, and Dean Thomas Tweed (Chair), David Lanier, Joseph Bray, Bobbi Owen, Clayton Koelb, Tom Bowers, Jeanne Morris, Gary Pielak, Stephen Farmer

1. The meeting was called to order at 3:05 pm.
2. CLARIFYING THE 10 PAGE WRITING GUIDELINE : The Committee considered a request from the Classics Department (and passed on less formally by other units) concerning the guideline in the Criteria document suggesting that general education courses involve 10 pages of written work. The committee considered simply deleting point #4, which described this guideline, but they decided in the end on a compromise: to include more flexible wording that accounts better for the variety of disciplinary and institutional contexts and to fold the old point #4 under point #3. So the committee approved the following revision to the goals section of the Criteria document:

Curricular goals of General Education courses:

1. Whenever possible, preference is given to small classes that make regular use (at least weekly) of discussion in or out of the classroom, use problem-based or essay examinations, and contain ample student-instructor interaction.
2. The foundational skills of English composition, quantitative reasoning, and foreign language require small class sizes for effective learning so 19 to 25 students per class for these entry-level skills courses is desirable.
3. *Course content and assignments should be significant within the rubric of each particular academic discipline, including but not limited to research papers, electronic projects, substantial creative projects, laboratory reports, and mathematical analysis, etc. Where it is possible and appropriate to the disciplinary and institutional context, "significant" may be construed to mean at least 10 pages of written work over the course of the semester; those pages do not include essays written as part of examinations. Although the goals for written work include a composition of at least 10 pages, that work may be composed in an alternative media or format, as long as the materials represent the equivalent intellectual investment of 10 pages of written work.*

3. GERMAN DEPARTMENT'S INTERNAL COURSE FORM: The Committee endorsed the suggestion that we post the German Department's course form on the Implementation Committee web site as an *example* of one way that units might collect course data from their faculty members. The Committee only offers the form as an example of how units might collection the information.
4. BULLETIN COURSE INFORMATION FOR ONLINE FORM: David Lanier reported that the conversations with Publications were going well. He suggested it still seems that we will be able to download course descriptions and prerequisite information from the Bulletin. He expressed concern about the possible need more for labor to make it happen.
5. RENUMBERING AND REVISION FORMS: The team working on the form is on schedule, Joe Bray suggested. Bray assured the committee that "Re-number All" online form was almost finished and soon will be ready for testing in the pilot study. It should be available next week, he suggested, if things go as expected. The "Revisions" form is being tested in house, and they are receiving positive feedback on the form.
6. MEMOS TO DEANS AND CHAIRS: Dean Tweed asked the committee for feedback on when to send the next memo to deans, directors, and chairs. The Committee suggested that we wait until we have firm news about when the online forms will be ready. That will be in January.
7. TRAINING SCHEDULE FOR FACULTY REVIEW COMMITTEES: After a brief discussion, it was decided that Dean Tweed will set up a workshop or meeting with the faculty on the divisional committees in January, when divisional committee members can discuss the Criteria document and ask questions about the review process.
8. SPRING IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE MEETINGS:

Time: 3:00pm-5:00pm
Place: TBA (Hopefully 011 Graham Memorial)
Dates: Tuesday, Jan 13th
Wednesday, Jan 28th
Wednesday, Feb 11th
Tuesday, Feb 24th
Tuesday, Mar 16th
Wednesday, Mar 31st
Tuesday, Apr 13th
Tuesday, Apr 20th
9. FOREIGN LANGUAGE COURSES AS FOUNDATIONS AND CONNECTIONS: The chair of Asian Studies asked for clarification about

whether foreign language courses can count as both foundations and connections requirements. The Committee's answer to this question: foreign language courses should be submitted to fulfill both the foundations and connections requirements (levels 1 through 4), but one course can not fulfill both requirements *for any particular student*. For an individual student a foreign language course must count as *either* a foundations requirement or a foreign language enhancement connections requirement, even though the same course (e.g., an introductory level foreign language course in French) could count as a foundations requirement for one student in the class and as a connections requirement for a student who already had fulfilled the foundations requirement and was starting a second foreign language. So regarding the online course submission forms, departments and curricula should check both boxes (foundations and connections) for foreign language courses levels 1-4, which can all be either a foundation or a connection requirement, depending on the student's situation. The Committee reaffirmed that the faculty review committees also will need to review and approve level 5+ courses for the foreign language enhancement requirement.

10. THE "I" SUFFIX: Clayton Koelb told the committee that state legislation required courses for inmates, and in the past those have been designated with the suffix "I." The Committee asked Amy Rouse from the Office of Undergraduate Curricula to learn more about this, and report to the Implementation Committee in January about whether or not we will need to set aside another suffix, I.
11. VARIABLE CONTENT COURSES: Clayton Koelb raised a concern about courses that have variable content: can these still be proposed as general education courses and, if so, which syllabus should be submitted? The Committee left open the question about whether faculty could propose that these courses be considered for general education credit, since there is a great deal of variation across departments and divisions, but if a unit does propose such a course as a general education requirement, the Committee suggested that faculty submit a *representative* course syllabus, one that fairly indicates the way the course is usually taught.
12. The meeting was adjourned at 4:36pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Amy Rouse
Assistant, Office of Undergraduate Curricula