

## Minutes

General Education Implementation Committee Meeting  
September 9, 2003  
Graham Memorial 011

Members in attendance: Executive Associate Provost Bernadette Gray-Little, Dean Carolyn Cannon, and Dean Thomas Tweed (chair), Stephen Farmer, David Lanier, Joseph Bray, Bobbi Owen, Clayton Koelb, Gary Pielak, Tom Bowers, Glynis Cowell, Daniel Anderson, Jeanne Morris (undergraduate).

1. The meeting was called to order at 3:01pm.
2. INFORMATION SESSIONS: The committee reviewed the tentative schedule of information sessions for faculty implementation leaders in the departments and schools and suggested the first one be slightly later, to allow for sufficient notice. Leif Forer will get rooms for the three meetings and make sure that the appropriate materials are there for those who attend. The three information sessions are now tentatively scheduled for: **Mon 9/22, 3-5pm; Fri 9/26, 2-4pm; and Tues 9/30, 3-5pm.** The second session will be open to all but will try to deal with the special needs of faculty and staff from the professional schools.
3. CRITERIA: It was decided that Tweed, Anderson, Owens, and Koelb would prepare the revised criteria document for the September 24<sup>th</sup> committee meeting.
4. DIVISIONS: Tweed noted that he is calling the Divisional Chairs to seek their advice about the implementation process and pass on information about the process. That should be done by September 12.
5. REVIEW PROCESS: It was suggested that in order to streamline the process we combine the Divisional Committees and the Subcommittee on General Education and ask them to review and approve proposals together. Dean Tweed agreed to bring the idea to the Divisional Chairs. (After speaking with three of the four divisional chairs about this matter after the meeting, Dean Tweed reports that all three of them strongly prefer the original system, with three steps in the faculty review process: Divisions, Subcommittee on General Education, and Administrative Boards).
6. RESPONDING TO ADVICE AT THE CHAIR'S RETREAT (NEW DEADLINES): Dean Tweed noted that some chairs had expressed concern about the February 1 deadline. Recognizing that implementation in fall 2006 depends on a submission and approval schedule that allows for no less than twelve (academic) months for faculty review (at least three or four months with each of the three faculty committees), the Implementation Committee decided to try to accommodate the chair's request as much as possible. Therefore, the Committee decided that the deadline for submission of all **renumbered courses** would be **February 2<sup>nd</sup>** and that the deadline

- for all other submissions for **general education courses** would be no later than **February 16<sup>th</sup>**.
7. ORDERING THE TASKS: The Committee discussed the challenges facing departments and schools and recommended that if units seek advice, we suggest that they proceed by completing renumbering first, turn their attention to Foundations courses second, and then consider Approaches courses. Finally, they might decide which of their Approaches courses—and other departmental courses—might meet one or more Connections requirements. Dean Tweed agreed to add that add this suggestion to the document that offers advice to chairs and deans.
  8. COURSE RENUMBERING AND “NON-INTRODUCTORY” COURSES: The Committee reaffirmed the Course Renumbering Committee’s Model, pending two changes. First, the Committee decided to revise the “special note” that says “courses for meeting the distributive requirement cannot be introductory courses” That sentence should be deleted. We should add the following sentence, which reflects the Committee’s decision to define “non-introductory” courses that meet the Supplemental General Education requirement as “those numbered 200 or above.” So the new special note should read: “The non-introductory courses that meet the Distributive Option of the Supplemental General Education requirement must be numbered 200 or above.” The second revision concerns First Year Honors courses and Capstone courses. The Committee discussed an inquiry from a faculty member about the former, and it decided to expand, not reduce or eliminate, those numbers. Others argued that we also should expand the numbers available for Capstone courses as well, since some units offer multiple capstone courses. Lanier and Anderson agreed to work together to create alternate numbering schemes for First Year Honors courses and Capstone Courses. Those will be submitted to the Committee for the next agenda.
  9. ONLINE COURSE RENUMBERING FORM: Joe Bray from AIS explained the online course renumbering form. The Committee approved its basic design and structure, although the Committee asked for the right to review and revise the language used on the form.
  10. WITHDRAW OPTION: The Committee decided that units should *not* be able to withdraw their course submissions after the form has been routed to the Divisional Committee.
  11. SUFFIXES AND FLAGS: Dean Tweed explained the difference between course *suffixes* (letters that are part of the course number and refer, for example, to Honors or Lab) and general education *flags* (letters designating which general education requirement the course meets). He pointed to the potential confusions that might arise from multiple letters following the course number: e.g., Reli 129 H (H) to designate a religious studies Honors course that meets the general education requirement for historical analysis. The Committee decided that they would not try to eliminate all suffixes, but they would ask units to reduce their use as much as possible. Since they kept suffixes, Committee members decided to endorse the proposal to use

parenthesis to enclose the letters that designate general education requirements for online and printed course descriptions. This was seen as way to minimize the possible confusion between course suffixes and flags. There was a proposal to reserve two suffixes: “H” for Honors and “L” for Lab. But the final judgment on suffixes will await the Committee’s decision on the flags we will use to designate general education requirements. Koelb and Cannon both agreed to provide alternative schemes for the Committee’s review. (Cannon proposed using two letters for each general education requirement; Koelb proposed a scheme that used the H and L that some Committee members want to reserve for Honors and Lab.) Other Committee members were invited to create letter schemes for the general education requirements and to submit those to Leif Forer before our next meeting. Dean Tweed will collect the proposed schemes and submit them for review at the next Committee meeting.

12. The meeting adjourned at 5:03pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Leif Forer  
Assistant, Undergraduate Curricula