

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE  
MINUTES  
JANUARY 6, 1999

Absent: Antenucci, Harvey, Hunter, Levin, Mauch, Mosca

The Committee met to discuss some feedback received from the Arts and Sciences chairs meeting and from other faculty members.

It was decided to do the following:

**GENERAL EDUCATION EDITORIAL CHANGES**

References are to the pages of the Senate agenda.

Page 3, bullet #3

"it is recommended that there be a limit of 25 students in writing intensive and oral communication intensive courses subject to the discretion of the appropriate administrator." Motion passed with Tessier motion and Ritchey second.

Page 6, bullet #4

Delete "Be limited to a maximum class size of 25 students."  
Moneyhun motion with Garr second passed.

Page 6, new bullet #4

"Have Writing II as a prerequisite." Tessier motion with Ritchey second passed.

Pages 6 & 7, oral communication section

Delete that section. Moneyhun motion with Tessier second passed.

Page 9, last paragraph under Mathematics Course

Last sentence to read "Mathematics courses that satisfy these six objectives will address Goal 5 and integrate Goals 1-3. General agreement reached.

Page 12, bullet #2, line 6

Substitute "professional conduct, responsibilities associated with citizenship," for "professional and civic responsibility." Ritchey motion with Garr second passed.

Page 12, bullet #3, line 2

Substitute "that" for "and" in "principles and come" Generally agreed to. Tessier reported back to Jenkins that the change represented the intent of the original wording.

Jenkins reported that he sent out letters to most of the 24 faculty or administrators who had written letters of concern. Some he had simply talked to. New committee members were encouraged to consider attending the next AACU convention on general education, which meets in Tampa Bay, Florida, February 18-20. The General Education Committee will cover the costs. Please let him know as soon as possible.

# MEMO

**TO: GEC Members**

**FROM: Bill Jenkins**

**DATE: 1-7-99**

**SUBJECT: NEXT MEETING ON FRIDAY, JANUARY 15, AT 12 NOON**

All of our meetings in the winter quarter will occur on Fridays at 12 to 2 pm in the Gened Conference Room. We will not meet on January 8<sup>th</sup>, or 29<sup>th</sup>.

## AGENDA:

- Dan O'Neill and the oral communication course
- Discussion on whether all general education courses must be designed for the **non-major** (intensive components and capstone)
- Examination of whether all of the criteria are "must" items, or whether meeting a preponderance of the criteria in a particular category is sufficient
- Course approval form
- Course Processing recommendation
- Science proposal to count the student's having finished the major as meeting the natural science requirements.
- Oral communication course as needing to meet goals 1,2,3

# MEMO

**TO: GEC Members**

**FROM: Bill Jenkins**

**DATE: 1-7-99**

**SUBJECT: NEXT MEETING ON FRIDAY, JANUARY 15, AT 12 NOON**

All of our meetings in the winter quarter will occur on Fridays at 12 to 2 pm in the Gened Conference Room. We will not meet on January 8th, or 29<sup>th</sup>.

## AGENDA:

- ✓ • Dan O'Neill and the oral communication course
- ✓ • Discussion on whether all general education courses must be designed for the non-major (intensive components and capstone)
- ✓ • Examination of whether all of the criteria are "must" items, or whether meeting a preponderance of the criteria in a particular category is sufficient
- Course approval form
- Course Processing recommendation
- ✓ • Science proposal to count the student's having finished the major as meeting the natural science requirements.
- ✓ • Oral communication course as needing to meet goals 1,2,3
- *Sandy Stephens letter - her concern about counting w. i. component + passing it.*

1

**MINUTES**  
**GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE**  
**JANUARY 15,1999**

PRESENT: Castronovo, Funk, Hunter, Jenkins, Maraffa, Mosca, Ritchey, Tessier, White

The committee discussed the previous Senate meeting and reactions to the criteria. Tom Maraffa offered the following resolution to deal with the issue of directing general education courses toward the non-major.

*All general education courses must be designed for the non-major. Exceptions to this principle include: 1) those courses submitted by departments to satisfy only the writing intensive, oral communication intensive, and critical thinking intensive requirements; 2) courses submitted by departments to satisfy the capstone requirement in the major and 3) courses approved as substitutes for general education requirements.*

There was much debate over the question of whether item 3 should be eliminated since the courses could be listed as general education courses rather than as "substitutes." It was decided that such a statement needed to be included in order to communicate to those concerned that courses that might be a more rigorous and generally draw a specialized audience could count if approved. Instead the committee agreed to amend the first sentence to say that *all general education courses must satisfy the goals in a given domain and must be available to the general student body.*

There was also a debate over whether to permit departments to decide which courses could count for their majors in a particular domain. This issue arose because of the possibility of departments wanting to have their students take general education courses within the major in a particular domain rather than branching out into other disciplines. Some argued for breadth; others thought that it was better to permit the department to decide what represented the best interest of the major. It was pointed out that breadth was already available in the creation of multiple domains; others noted that the present system requires students to take courses from more than one department in each area. Jenkins noted that a majority favored allowing departments to decide, and promised to bring back a resolution at tomorrow's meeting.

Darla Funk provided a handout on the programs offered within the music department, and the effect of the new general education requirements on those programs. She noted that each of the three programs would increase because of the conversion of 4 credit q.h. courses to 3 credit s.h. courses. Her greatest concern was with the problem faced if the music history sequence did not count in the Artistic and Literary Perspectives domain. That fact would add anywhere from 8.82 to 14.18 additional credit hours to the program. She argued that these courses should be able to count. This issue relates to the question of whether a department can count its own general education courses for its majors, or whether more breadth is required.

MINUTES  
GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE  
JANUARY 22, 1999

ABSENT: J. Antenucci, R. Levin (on medical leave),

PRESENT: F. Castronovo, D. Funk, J. Garr, R. Harvey, A. Hunter, B. Jenkins, T. Maraffa, T. Mauch, C. Moneyhun, N. Mosca, N. Ritchey, L. Tessier, Nancy White

Daniel O'Neill, chair of the Department of Communication and Theater, appeared before the committee to discuss the plan for implementing a proposal for an oral communication course. O'Neill explained that he had met with Provost Scanlon, Dean McCloud, and Bill Jenkins prior to Christmas and presented a proposal for an oral communication course which would meet the financial restrictions imposed by the administration. His proposal would be dependent upon the granting of a replacement for recently retired Dr. David Robinson in the upcoming allotment of faculty positions next fall. His department is prepared to offer two different courses: 1) a lecture-recitation model with a lecture to 200-300 students once per week and two recitation sections weekly (70% of the students would take this course), 2) autonomous classes taught in the regular manner (30% of the students would take this course). The content of the course would include interpersonal speaking skills, group dynamics (conflict management also), and public speaking. There would probably be 30 courses offered per semester and approximately 16 in the summer. The department would also prepare an advanced placement test for entering students, and perhaps eventually a test to permit placing out of the course. Dr. O'Neill estimated that there would be 2100 students passing through such courses each year. He also believed that the student should take the course within the first 48 hours under the semester system.

Nancy Mosca asked O'Neill whether the Business and Professional course or the Public Speaking course would continue. He indicated that the intention was to drop those courses. Mosca was concerned about the loss of the Public Speaking course since the nurses needed that component more than the interpersonal or group dynamics components mentioned earlier. Jenkins and O'Neill then discussed the problem of losing subsidy for those courses. Maraffa contended that the subsidy issue was a false one since the student would still take other higher level courses in the same proportion as presently done. It was decided that O'Neill should talk to each of the schools or departments affected by the potential dropping of these courses in order to determine how they would be affected and what needs their students might have. He then needed to report back as soon as possible to the General Education Committee

O'Neill offered, as asked for, a new statement of criteria for the oral communication course. It was indicated that the list of criteria offered earlier looked like a table of contents from a textbook. The criteria had also drawn the most criticism in letters received by the committee. The General Education Committee asked O'Neill to include

goals 1, 2, and 3 as required by the model. The committee accepted the proposal as offered, except for rewording that would include "the students will" prior to the bullets, subject to inclusion of wording referring to goals 1, 2, and 3.

Jenkins then asked the committee to consider Resolution 1.

*All general education courses must satisfy the goals in a given domain and must be available to the general student body. Exceptions to this principle include: 1) those courses submitted by departments to satisfy only the writing intensive, oral communication intensive, and critical thinking intensive requirements; 2) courses submitted by departments to satisfy the capstone requirement in the major; and 3) courses approved as substitutes for general education requirements.*

A debate ensued over the wording. Moneyhun suggested that "appropriate" might be better used than "available". After much discussion it was moved by Tessier and seconded by Maraffa to adopt a new first sentence that would read: *All general education courses must satisfy the goals in a given domain and must be designed for the general student body.* The motion passed. Hunter moved and Maraffa seconded the adoption of the amended paragraph. It passed.

Jenkins then introduced Resolution 2:

*It shall be the prerogative of the department or program to decide which of the courses approved by the General Education Committee in each domain shall be required of its majors. The department or program may also choose not to impose specific general education requirements.*

Ritchey motioned and Funk seconded the adoption of Resolution 2. Jenkins argued that it would be better to require within each domain that students take courses besides courses within their majors that satisfied general education requirements. He would like to see greater breadth within the general education program. Others cited the fact that there was breadth already within the program. There was also concern about the music program and its need to count music history. Jenkins indicated that he would grant exceptions to programs that had such a need. He also noted that the music program was the only program so far needing such an exception, so, more than likely, breadth could be achieved in a department's own domain by most of the departments in the university. Science students, for instance, already had courses in other sciences. The motion passed without amendment.

Jenkins noted that bullet 2 on page 1 needed to be changed to include the oral communication course. After much discussion, it was decided by consensus that the capstone course should not be mentioned (rather the committee should depend on the wording later in the document). Hence, the new bullet 2 should read "Writing I, Writing

II, and the oral communication course must incorporate goals 1, 2, and 3.

The next item considered was the question asked by Duane Rost at the Senate as to whether each of the criteria must be met under each domain, or whether a certain portion would satisfy the requirement. The committee felt very strongly that all criteria must be met, and so proceeded to amend certain portions of the document containing the criteria to indicate the necessity of meeting all the criteria. Funk moved and Maraffa seconded a motion to change the wording in the first sentence under Artistic and Literary Perspectives from "should" to "must." The motion passed. Ritchey moved and Moneyhun seconded a motion to change the wording in the last paragraph under the mathematics section from "should" to "must." The motion passed.

Jenkins referred the members to the letter from Sandra Stephan requesting a reconsideration of the rejection of a proposal to require the passage of the writing intensive component in order to pass a course. She believed that it was not good practice to permit failure of this component when the goal of the adoption of writing intensive components was to improve the writing skills of students. Moneyhun moved and Castronovo seconded a motion to require the passage of writing intensive, oral communication intensive, or critical thinking intensive components in order to pass a course. Jenkins would write the appropriate language for the document. The motion passed.

Finally, Jeanette Garr presented the degree requirements in the chemical engineering program and expressed concern about certain courses, such as economics, which were outside the department, but presently met general education requirements, and whether they would be available under the new general education requirements. Jenkins indicated that he thought such courses certain could qualify under the new requirements, but that the departments involved must submit them for certification by demonstrating that they fulfill the goals in a particular domain. He suggested that Garr contact each department and encourage them to seek approval for the courses that chemical engineering needed.



## **RESOLUTIONS**

### **1-22-99**

#### Resolution One

*All general education courses must be designed for the non-major. Exceptions to this principle include: 1) those courses submitted by departments to satisfy only the writing intensive, oral communication intensive, and critical thinking intensive requirements; 2) courses submitted by departments to satisfy the capstone requirement in the major and 3) courses approved as substitutes for general education requirements.*

#### Resolution Two

*It shall be the prerogative of the department or program to decide which of the courses approved by the General Education Committee in each domain shall be required of its majors. The department may also choose not to impose any requirements.*

**MINUTES**  
**GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE**  
**JANUARY 21/1999**

PRESENT: Castronovo, Funk, Hunter, Jenkins, Maraffa, Mosca, Ritchey, Tessier, White

The committee discussed the previous Senate meeting and reactions to the criteria. Tom Maraffa offered the following resolution to deal with the issue of directing general education courses toward the non-major.

*All general education courses must be designed for the non-major. Exceptions to this principle include: 1) those courses submitted by departments to satisfy only the writing intensive, oral communication intensive, and critical thinking intensive requirements; 2) courses submitted by departments to satisfy the capstone requirement in the major and 3) courses approved as substitutes for general education requirements.*

There was much debate over the question of whether item 3 should be eliminated since the courses could be listed as general education courses rather than as "substitutes." It was decided that such a statement needed to be included in order to communicate to those concerned that courses that might be a more rigorous and generally draw a specialized audience could count if approved. Instead the committee agreed to amend the first sentence to say that *all general education courses must satisfy the goals in a given domain and must be available to the general student body.*

There was also a debate over whether to permit departments to decide which courses could count for their majors in a particular domain. This issue arose because of the possibility of departments wanting to have their students take general education courses within the major in a particular domain rather than branching out into other disciplines. Some argued for breadth; others thought that it was better to permit the department to decide what represented the best interest of the major. It was pointed out that breadth was already available in the creation of multiple domains; others noted that the present system requires students to take courses from more than one department in each area. Jenkins noted that a majority favored allowing departments to decide, and promised to bring back a resolution at tomorrow's meeting.

Darla Funk provided a handout on the programs offered within the music department, and the effect of the new general education requirements on those programs. She noted that each of the three programs would increase because of the conversion of 4 credit q.h. courses to 3 credit s.h. courses. Her greatest concern was with the problem faced if the music history sequence did not count in the Artistic and Literary Perspectives domain. That fact would add anywhere from 8.82 to 14.18 additional credit hours to the program. She argued that these courses should be able to count. This issue relates to the question of whether a department can count its own general education courses for its majors, or whether more breadth is required.

**RESOLUTIONS**  
**1-22-99**

Resolution One

*All general education courses must be designed for the non-major. Exceptions to this principle include: 1) those courses submitted by departments to satisfy only the writing intensive, oral communication intensive, and critical thinking intensive requirements; 2) courses submitted by departments to satisfy the capstone requirement in the major and 3) courses approved as substitutes for general education requirements.*

*Change*

Resolution Two

*It shall be the prerogative of the department or program to decide which of the courses approved by the General Education Committee in each domain shall be required of its majors. The department may also choose not to impose ~~any~~ requirements.*

*or program  
specific general education for its majors*

**To: GEC Members**  
**From: Bill Jenkins**  
**Date: 2-1-99**  
**Subject: Meeting on Friday, February 5, 1999, 12-2, in GEC office.**

AGENDA

- ✓ 1. See attached description of committee responsibilities. This paragraph is a suggested add-on to the criteria.
- ✓ 2. See Dan O'Neill's suggested changes for the oral communication area.
- ✓ 3. Intensive courses – can they float? The issue is whether multi-sections courses must have an intensive component in each available section, or might there be only a limited number of designated sections.
4. Course application forms.
5. Course processing. The Senate Executive Committee has a sub-committee which is drafting a proposal for linking the curriculum, program, and general education committees. If they have anything, I will bring it to the meeting.
6. Assessment.

*It is the prerogative of the dept to determine which sections of an approved intensive course will carry an intensive designation(s) for a given semester. (wr, or I, or OC)*  
*Course. Test 2nd minor carries.*

## GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE

It is the responsibility of the General Education Committee to certify courses for general education credit, and to certify writing intensive, oral communication intensive, and critical thinking intensive components either for courses in general education or in the major. It also certifies capstone courses in the major, ~~not for content~~, but for meeting the goals of the general education program. The General Education Committee will make use of the goals and the criteria to make judgments about certification. It will seek ~~always~~ to assure breadth and depth of coverage to insure, to the extent possible, that all the goals of general education are achieved. Departments and colleges are ~~equally~~ ~~accountable~~ for insuring that ~~they~~ ~~major~~ achieve breadth and depth of coverage, and that all the goals of general education, to the extent possible, are achieved.

TWCEC

MINUTES  
GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE  
2-5-99

ABSENT: Antenucci, Garr, Harvey, Mauch, Moneyhun

Jenkins opened discussion of the following paragraph:

It is the responsibility of the General Education Committee to certify courses for general education credit, and to certify writing intensive, oral communication intensive, and critical thinking intensive components either for courses in general education or in the major. It also certifies capstone courses in the major, not for content, but for meeting the goals of the general education program. The General Education Committee will make use of the goals and the criteria to make judgments about certification. It will seek always to assure breadth and depth of coverage to insure, to the extent possible, that all the goals of general education are achieved. Departments and colleges are equally accountable for insuring that their majors achieve breadth and depth of coverage, and that all the goals of general education, to the extent possible, are achieved

He noted that he had rewritten this paragraph, but that it had come through the Dean's Council. A discussion ensued as to whether this paragraph should be presented for information only, as Jenkins suggested, or as a motion. It was decided that the paragraph was explanatory only, and that Jenkins would offer it for information purposes only at the Academic Senate. Castronovo motioned and Mosca seconded that the phrase, "not for content," be removed from the second sentence. The motion passed. Hunter moved and Funk seconded a motion to drop the third sentence, rewrite the last sentence to say, "The General Education Committee, along with departments and colleges, is accountable for insuring that students achieve breadth and depth of coverage, and that all the goals of general education, to the extent possible, are achieved." The motion passed.

The General Education Committee discussed the recommendation being presented to the Academic Senate next Wednesday. Ritchey raised a question about the sentence in the second bullet, which says, "The department or program may also choose not to impose specific general education requirements." Although the intent of the statement was to permit a department to specify none or many courses in a particular domain, some individuals were interpreting it to mean that a department might excuse its majors from all general education requirements. Ritchey moved and Tessier seconded a motion to delete that sentence. The motion passed. It was agreed that the previous sentence covered the intent of the committee.

Jenkins asked the committee members whether they wished to substitute the new section from Dan O'Neill on the oral communications criteria for the one presently in the proposal for next Wednesday. Several members commented that, although the new criteria needed further review, they did not think it wise to substitute the new criteria on the Senate floor. That would be too confusing for senators. Hence, after much discussion, it was decided that Jenkins should pull the old section from the proposal for Wednesday, but not substitute the new section. Rather he would circulate a copy of the new section to senators, note that it was under consideration, and ask for feedback from

senators. The committee would then bring the new section, as revised, to the March senate meeting.

The next question considered was whether intensive courses could "float." Previously the GEC had decided to permit a department to decide whether courses approved with an intensive component (this could include a multisection course or a single-section upper division course) might vary in offering the intensive component from quarter to quarter or from section to section. Questions had been raised about the advisability of the float at the Provost's chairs meeting in January by several deans. Jenkins had asked Clyde Moneyhun to investigate what happens at other institutions. Moneyhun had gotten on a listserv, and had received numerous responses, the large majority of which did allow the float, and saw no problems with doing so. Those who did not permit the float had no experience with it, but one of the coordinators at Arizona State University commented that he wished ASU would switch to the float. Jenkins also talked with Donna Esterly about placing indicators of the intensive components on the student schedule and on the student permrec. She thought that it was possible but indicated that she would confer with some of her people. Castronovo moved and Tessier seconded a motion that "it is the prerogative of the department to determine which section(s) of an approved intensive course will carry an intensive designation(s) (either writing, oral communication, or critical thinking) for a given semester. Jenkins indicated that he would continue to investigate the issue, and bring back any new information.

Jenkins presented a course processing proposal, which he, Jim Morrison of the Academic Senate, Anne York of the University Curriculum Committee, and Craig Campbell of the Academic Programs Committee had agreed to that morning. This proposal would cover only the rest of the academic year. Much discussion arose over the proviso that the department, once having secured semester approval from the University Curriculum Committee, will submit its proposal directly to the General Education Committee. Jenkins indicated that this direct submission would occur only this year. The reasons for the direct submission were the demands of time, and the need for the GEC to survey all courses being presented and to apply the criteria to these courses the first time around. Others argued that courses should proceed through the college curriculum committees prior to submission to the GEC because it was the proper routing. They were concerned that the motion would be defeated otherwise. Debate continued until a quorum was lost. No action was taken.

*Presented to Academic Senate 2-10-99*

## **GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE**

It is the responsibility of the General Education Committee to certify courses for general education credit, and to certify writing intensive, oral communication intensive, and critical thinking intensive components either for courses in general education or in the major. It also certifies capstone courses in the major, not for content, but for meeting the goals of the general education program. The General Education Committee will make use of the goals and the criteria to make judgments about certification. It will seek always to assure breadth and depth of coverage to insure, to the extent possible, that all the goals of general education are achieved. Departments and colleges are equally accountable for insuring that their majors achieve breadth and depth of coverage, and that all the goals of general education, to the extent possible, are achieved.



# Memo

**To:** General Education Committee

**From:** Bill Jenkins, Coordinator

**Date:** 02/09/99

**Re:** Meeting on Friday, February 12<sup>th</sup>, at 12-2pm.

---

## AGENDA:

1. WAC Director – see Moneyhun recommendation.
2. Course processing for 1998-1999. Unresolved question of whether courses must go to college curriculum committees first.
3. General education application forms. Moneyhun form for writing intensive. Should we maintain the narrative form for other applications, or ask for certain specifics, plus a narrative.
4. Assessment.
5. Capstone courses – do intensive components in capstone courses count toward intensive requirements? Past committees have seen the capstone as a culmination, rather than a replacement, of the requirements.

**MINUTES**  
**GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE**  
**2-12-99**

ABSENT: Garr, Harvey, Mauch, and Tessier

Jenkins began with the General Education Certification proposal from the Senate Executive Committee. He noted that the Senate Executive Committee had already instituted temporary procedures for the University Curriculum Committee and the Academic Programs Committee. They would continue following the already established procedures, except for a common circulation, objection and appeals process for programs. It also requires that any course, once accepted for semesters, come directly to the General Education Committee for consideration. If, however, the course title, description, etc., changes, then the course must first go through the College Curriculum Committee.

Jenkins then led a discussion on the Certification proposal. He commented that circulation would come after the Gened Committee had decided whether the course had achieved certification. He would prefer that it come immediately because it would shorten the time required to certify such courses, especially considering that we are already behind in the time line for certifying courses. He also argued that it would make it clear that objections were to be based on the criteria, and not on considerations of turf. Moneyhun did not agree with earlier circulation. He argued that the committee should only circulate those courses already approved because that would reduce the objections, and the paperwork. The Committee decided to maintain the provision that circulation occurs after it had already certified the course.

Jenkins pointed out that the statement, "If the GEC rejects an application, or objections are not worked out..." makes it seem as if the University Curriculum Committee procedure of asking objectors to work out their problems with the proposing department would apply. He stated that the General Education Committee's job was to apply criteria, not to decide turf issues. It was proper for those reviewing circulated courses to object, but only on a basis of not satisfying the criteria or not meeting the goals. Their objections would be presented to the General Education Committee for consideration, but not for negotiation. Moneyhun moved and Antenucci seconded the motion to delete the words, "or objections are not worked out," from the proposal. Motion passed. Castronovo moved and Mosca seconded the motion to accept the proposal as amended. The motion passed.

The committee then discussed the WAC position announcement. Jenkins provided a history of this development. It had begun several years ago when a writing subcommittee had proposed the creation of such a position. The previous Gened Committee had agreed, and recommended it to Provost Scanlon. He had delayed consideration until after the model had passed the Academic Senate. Jenkins had met with Scanlon and Moneyhun in the fall and late winter. This proposal was a result of those meetings. Scanlon had approved the creation of such a position, and it was up to the committee to screen applicants. GEC would make a recommendation to the Provost, who would serve

as the administrator in charge. Through consensus the committee decided to include the wording, "encourage and facilitate writing across the curriculum," as part of the duties of the WAC director. Committee members felt that the director should encourage writing across the curriculum, as well as work on writing intensive courses. Moneyhun moved and Rando seconded the motion that the committee approves the Position Announcement. The motion passed.

Oral Communication Criteria – Dan O’Neill had submitted this proposal to meet the concerns of the committee. Under the Criteria for Oral Communication Intensive Courses, the committee changed bullet 1 to read "attempt to integrate goals 2 and 3 in addition to goal 1..." Moneyhun moved and Castronovo seconded a motion to delete the ninth bullet, and to change the tenth bullet to read, "Teach students to use oral communication skills as a way of learning and thinking critically in a discipline." The motion passed. Ritchey moved and Hunter seconded a motion to delete the second bullet because it was unnecessary considering the other provisions. The motion passed. Hunter moved and Funk seconded a motion to combine the fourth bullet and the seventh bullet so as to read, "Allocate at least 30% of the course grade to oral communication assignments of various kinds (interpersonal, group, and /or presentations). Finally, Hunter moved and Moneyhun seconded a motion to change the fifth bullet to read, "reinforce appropriate interpersonal, group and/or presentational competencies introduced in the Oral Communication course," and to delete the sixth bullet. The motion passed. It was also decided that the last bullet regarding a minimum of 25 students be removed since it appeared elsewhere. Finally, the committee decided to insert a sentence in the Criteria for Oral Communication Course, "Students will be required to:," and that appropriate changes be made for each of the bullets, including the elimination of the word, "numerous," in the fifth bullet, line one, on page one. Moneyhun moved and Hunter seconded a motion to approve the document as amended. The motion passed.

General Education Application Forms – Jenkins explained that our original form for application was a narrative form, but that many committees, when considering specific criteria, had decided that there was a need to have specific questions to be answered. Their experience with having to search for the answer to key questions had led to such a form. On the other hand, it was important that a department have the narrative space to describe how its course would meet the goals. Hunter suggested that Jenkins look at the various criteria and come up with suggested question for committee review. Funk suggested that we number the criteria in each area, and ask for the proposing department to comment on how each of the criteria is satisfied, and then provide a space for the narrative about the goals. It was decided that Jenkins would look at that possibility, as well as others, and return possible proposal forms to the committee for its consideration. GEC also looked at Moneyhun's Writing Intensive Course Proposal form. It was general favorable, but there was some concern about too many questions and that some of the questions were redundant. Jenkins asked that committee members review the form, and come to next week's meeting with suggestions for improvement.

Capstone courses – Hunter removed his objection to the previous committee's decision that the capstone course was in addition to the requirement of two intensive courses in

writing, oral communication, and critical thinking. He saw the value of having two courses, and then the capstone serving as a culminating example of student ability to use those skills. Hunter moved and Ritchey seconded a motion that the capstone course not count toward any of the intensive requirements. The motion passed.

TO: GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE  
FROM: BILL JENKINS, COORDINATOR  
DATE: 2-15-99  
SUBJECT: MEETING ON FRIDAY, 2-19-99, 12:20 TO 2:00

AGENDA:

- 1) Capstone course within each department -- letter from Tackett
- 2) Course approval forms
- 3) Assessment
- 4) Feedback from A&S meeting on Thursday
- 5) Barbara - @ themes

## GENERAL EDUCATION MEETING MINUTES 2-19-99

ABSENT: Castronovo, Garr, Harvey, Hunter, Mauch

Jenkins reported that yesterday's meeting of Arts and Sciences representatives from departments, CASGEC, General Education Committee, and Academic Senate went well. Most of those present were positive about the criteria, and Dean Brothers spoke in favor of getting the recommended criteria passed as soon as possible. Many had their questions answered. Jenkins indicated that he wanted to discuss some possible amendments that came out of that meeting. It was duly noted that such meetings of Arts and Sciences can create a problem for other colleges and their representatives in dealing with charges that Arts and Sciences is seeking to control general education.

The first amendment taken up was that of Jim Andrews of Physics. He wanted to add a sentence to bullet 5 on the first page – **It is understood that the requirements of general education in a given domain may be met by substitution of a more advanced course that has not been designed for the general student body if that course also satisfies the goals for that domain.** Committee members recognized that the use of the word, *substitute*, opened the door to departments who might want to use courses for majors only as general education courses. It was necessary, therefore, to require such courses to satisfy the goals. Disagreement arose over the issue of who constituted the general student body, and whether such courses were gened courses or not. It was finally decided to drop the phrase, *that has not been designed for the general student body*, from the motion so that such courses would be open to any student, although not designed for everyone. Linda Tessier was assigned to check with Jim Andrews on this change and report back to the committee next Friday.

The second amendment, also from Jim Andrews, would change the second sentence on page 5, bullet 4 to read *Examples of these skills include*, instead of *These skills include*. Such language would imply that not all skills had to be covered in one course. The committee agreed with the suggested amendment. Tessier would report our acceptance to Jim Andrews, suggest that he make the motion as a friendly amendment, and that Jenkins accept the friendly amendment on the floor of the Academic Senate.

Charles Singler raised an issue yesterday regarding the last bullet under the oral communication intensive section, *Have the introductory oral communication course as a prerequisite*. He suggested that it could be interpreted to mean that the course with an intensive component would have to list the oral communication course as a prerequisite in the catalogue. The committee agreed that such listing was not our intent, and that it was a headache to do so. However, everyone was concerned that students complete the basic skill courses before taking a course with an intensive component. It was decided to accept Singler's motion to delete, and to ask the Academic Standards committee to consider a resolution regarding basic skill courses and their timing. The committee will discuss this matter further after Jenkins talks with Singler.

Moneyhun commented that he had talked with Charles Singler also, and Singler had indicated a concern about the meaning of *reading journals* in bullet 1 under the Criteria for Writing Courses. Moneyhun indicated that the term was a technical one, and that he wanted it included. However, it was decided that, if Singler offered a motion, that Jenkins would agree to drop the term, *reading*.

Moneyhun noted that Bob Hogue had talked with him yesterday, and that Hogue was concerned about the fact that we had potentially excused faculty from taking training in the written intensive area by the provision that the North Central Standards did not apply to the intensive area. The committee felt that the language was only in regard to North Central standards, and that other language within the document implied that such training, or at least an orientation, was necessary.

Jenkins brought up e-mail from Phil Munro of Electrical Engineering. He continues to have a problem with bullet 5 under the Mathematics Course, and the teaching of the limitations of math and statistics. Ritchey found no problem with the statement, nor did most of his mathematics colleagues. The committee decided to let it remain as it is. Munro also raised a question about whether writing intensive courses had to be on the 700 or 800 level only. He thought that having them on the 600 level was appropriate, and that such a condition would make it easier for the major. The committee did not see the need to change. Finally, Munro asked a question about whether Calculus II would count under Selective Topics and Electives. The response was that the math department would have to submit the course to see if it would merit certification. If it did, then the course could count.

The committee then discussed the sheet entitled the General Education Course Application Form. It was decided to go with the first page, but to add a place to indicate the name of the course, the department, the contact person, the date of submission, any appropriate signatures, the faculty teaching the course, and the indication of disposition. Under item 4 on the syllabus, the committee changed the language to read *a description of student assignments*. No other changes were proposed. A rule was adopted that each department should provide enough copies for the General Education Committee.

**Next meeting will be on Friday, February 26, at 12:20 to 2.**

## **GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE**

It is the responsibility of the General Education Committee to certify courses for general education credit, and to certify writing intensive, oral communication intensive, and critical thinking intensive components either for courses in general education or in the major. It also certifies capstone courses in the major, not for content, but for meeting the goals of the general education program. The General Education Committee will make use of the goals and the criteria to make judgments about certification. It will seek always to assure breadth and depth of coverage to insure, to the extent possible, that all the goals of general education are achieved. Departments and colleges are equally accountable for insuring that their majors achieve breadth and depth of coverage, and that all the goals of general education, to the extent possible, are achieved.



## GENED AMENDMENTS

Page 1, bullet 5, insert at end:

It is understood that the requirements of general education in a given domain may be met by substitution of a more advanced **course** ~~that~~ has not been designed for the general student body <sup>if</sup> that course also satisfies the goals for that domain.

Page 5, bullet 4, second sentence part on second line to read:

Examples of these skills include .... [continue with list as in original]

Oral Communication criteria, page 2, bullet 9

Delete Have the introductory oral communication course as a prerequisite.

Phil Munro continues to have a problem with bullet 5 under mathematics course. He believes that this should be deleted. He would support a more general statement regarding the limitations of all disciplines at the beginning of the document.

Munro has also raised a question about writing intensive courses having to be on the 700 or 800 level. He believes that it should be possible to do it on the 600 level, which would take the pressure off the major.

Finally, Munro has asked whether a calculus 2 course could satisfy the Selective Topics and Electives Domain. He thinks that it counts as a substitute.

## GENERAL EDUCATION APPLICATION FORM

**First page** – Titled "Domain" Course Application Form.

General instructions: 1) read the attached goals and criteria for the domain, 2) make an inquiry if doubtful to Bill Jenkins, 3) distinguish between substantially meeting the goals, and reaching other goals, 4) attach a syllabus, which includes the assignments and any other information demonstrating how the goals will be reached.

Put the statement about the responsibility of the Gened Committee and departments recently read to the Senate on the first page.

**Second page** – List of goals and criteria for that domain.

**Third page** – Short-answer questions tied to the numbering of the criteria. Basically, we will ask for a short, but illustrative, example of how the department intends to fulfill the criteria.

**Fourth page** – Request that they write a narrative indicating how and to what extent they will meet the goals of the domain in the particular course under consideration. Encourage them to attach additional sheets, but no more than three.

*Faculty*

*Rule must submit 15 copies.*

*sample  
university  
format*

*To go - name of course, dept chair contact person date of submission  
indication of decision*

## GENED AMENDMENTS

Page 1, bullet 5, insert at end:

It is understood that the requirements of general education in a given domain may be met by substitution of a more advanced course that has not been designed for the general student body if that course also satisfies the goals for that domain.

Page 5, bullet 4, second sentence part on second line to read:

Examples of these skills include .... [continue with list as in original]

Oral Communication criteria, page 2, bullet 9

Delete Have the introductory oral communication course as a prerequisite.

Phil Munro continues to have a problem with bullet 5 under mathematics course. He believes that this should be deleted. He would support a more general statement regarding the limitations of all disciplines at the beginning of the document.

Munro has also raised a question about writing intensive courses having to be on the 700 or 800 level. He believes that it should be possible to do it on the 600 level, which would take the pressure off the major.

Finally, Munro has asked whether a calculus 2 course could satisfy the Selective Topics and Electives Domain. He thinks that it counts as a substitute.

**GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE  
MINUTES 2-26-99**

Absent: Harvey, Hunter, Mauch, Moneyhun

The meeting was primarily concerned about the design of the course proposal forms for general education. There was much discussion of what Jenkins had put together, and many suggestions for change. Jenkins indicated that he would submit the changed forms to members of the committee for feedback prior to next week's meeting.

The committee discussed the March 3<sup>rd</sup> Senate meeting. There appeared to be very few objections. Jim Andrews has agreed to omit the one section of his amendment, as requested by the GEC. Therefore, we will support, as agreed at the previous meeting, both of his amendments. It was also noted that Charles Singler would be making his amendment to delete the provision in the oral communication course criteria that there be a prerequisite course before taking any intensive components. The committee agreed to support this amendment so that a better statement/practice could be worked out.

Jenkins passed out Clyde Moneyhun's application for the WAC position. He is the only candidate so far.

# Memo

**To:** GEC members

**From:** Bill Jenkins

**Date:** 03/05/99

**Re:** Meeting on Friday, February 26, 1999, at 12:20

---

**AGENDA:** 1) March Senate meeting – Andrews and Singler

2) Course proposal forms

3) Applications for WAC position

4) Assessment

# Memo

**To:** General Education Committee

**From:** Bill Jenkins

**Date:** 03/05/99

**Re:** meeting 3-5-99

---

## AGENDA:

- ✓ 1) COURSE APPLICATION FORMS
- ✓ 2) APPLICATIONS FOR WAC POSITION
- ✓ 3) <sup>HEALTH PROFESSIONS</sup> NURSING/BIOLOGY AND COURSE PROPOSALS
- 4) ASSESSMENT
- 5) WORKSHOPS -
- 6) BWL 1505, 1506

**GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE  
MINUTES 3-5-99**

ABSENT: Garr, Harvey, Maraffa, Mauch, Ritchey  
*S ZUPANIC sitting in*

The committee spent much of its time discussing the course proposal forms. Changes were suggested, discussed, and adopted when there was strong support. Robert Rando showed committee members how the forms could be filled out through a software program. The committee was enthusiastic about the possibility of using the software. It was noted, however, that some faculty may have difficulty. Hence, it was agreed that GEC would offer 3 ways of filling out a proposal form. Each department would receive a printed copy of the form, the forms on a disc, and a file enabling them to use the software recommended by Rando.

Allen Hunter raised an issue regarding whether or not a sequence of courses might count as one course toward the general education requirements. He believed that the science requirements were so extensive that the substitute courses being developed, particularly in biology, might require a two-course sequence to cover both the science material and the broader goals. Nancy Mosca objected on the basis that such a system, while only counting as one course toward general education, would add two courses to programs, such as nursing. Hunter moved and Moneyhun seconded a motion that a two-course sequence could count toward the general education requirements. After much discussion Mosca moved and Antenucci seconded a motion to table until next Friday's meeting. The motion passed. Additional information would be sought in the meantime.

As of March 3<sup>rd</sup>, there was only one applicant for the WAC position, Clyde Moneyhun. He, however, announced that he is leaving YSU to take a writing position at the University of Delaware. Jenkins indicated that there might be other candidates, and that he was extending the deadline.

Mosca presented her concerns regarding the possibility of biology's general education offering including the type of courses needed by nursing and allied health. Paul Peterson had written to her that Biology would have only Biology 505 and AS 600. Hunter responded that he believed that they would also offer substitute courses meeting the needs of the health professions. Jenkins asked Hunter to discuss the issue with Peterson, and to report back to the committee at next Friday's meeting.

**GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE  
MINUTES 3-5-99**

ABSENT: Garr, Harvey, Maraffa, Mauch, Ritchey

The committee spent much of its time discussing the course proposal forms. Changes were suggested, discussed, and adopted when there was strong support. Robert **Rando** showed committee members how the forms could be filled out through a software program. The committee was enthusiastic about the possibility of using the software. It was noted, however, that some faculty may have difficulty. Hence, it was agreed that GEC would offer **3** ways of filling out a proposal form. Each department would receive a printed copy of the form, the forms on a disc, and a file enabling them to use the software recommended by **Rando**.

Allen Hunter raised an issue regarding whether or not a sequence of courses might count as one course toward the general education requirements. He believed that the science requirements were so extensive that the substitute courses being developed, particularly in biology, might require a two-course sequence to cover both the science material and the broader goals. Nancy Mosca objected on the basis that such a system, while only counting as one course toward general education, would add two courses to programs, such as nursing. Hunter moved and Moneyhun seconded a motion that a two-course sequence could count toward the general education requirements. After much discussion Mosca moved and **Antenucci** seconded a motion to table until next Friday's meeting. The motion passed. Additional information would be sought in the meantime.

As of March 3<sup>rd</sup>, there was only one applicant for the WAC position, Clyde Moneyhun. He, however, announced that he is leaving YSU to take a writing position at the University of Delaware. Jenkins indicated that there might be other candidates, and that he was extending the deadline.

Mosca presented her concerns regarding the possibility of biology's general education offering including the type of courses needed by nursing and allied health. Paul Peterson had written to her that Biology would have only Biology 505 and AS 600. Hunter responded that he believed that they would also offer substitute courses meeting the needs of the health professions. Jenkins asked Hunter to discuss the issue with Peterson, and to report back to the committee at next Friday's meeting.



**GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE**  
**AGENDA**  
**3-12-99**

- 1) Examination of course proposal forms – intensive components
- 2) Allen Hunter report on science courses for health programs
- 3) Tabled motion regarding courses offered sequentially to fulfill goals
- 4) Assessment
- 5) Applications for WAC position
- 6) Schedules for spring quarter
- 7) Workshops

## **GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE MINUTES 3-12-99**

ABSENT: Mauch, Moneyhun

Bob Rando told the committee that he had to contact Rob Levin about the spring quarter, and whether he would continue to represent Education.

Jenkins presented the forms for writing, oral communication and critical thinking intensive components. Committee members accepted the writing intensive form, but wanted a question format for each of the other two forms. They suggested that Dan O'Neill and Tom Shipka be contacted to see if they would provide a list of questions to be addressed for the oral communication intensive and critical thinking intensive forms respectively. Jenkins indicated he would do so, and that he would need assistance in reviewing the forms without bringing them back to committee. The urgency of getting the forms out to department chairs precluded another meeting. Funk, Castronovo, Mosca, Antenucci, Garr, and Tessier agreed to review the changed forms.

Jenkins then began a discussion over whether to include a dean's signature on the course proposal forms. It was noted that a dean did need to be aware of such proposals, that a dean needed to assess the availability of resources within the college, and that a dean might have other administrative considerations. On the other hand, there was concern that the signature not be viewed as a means by which a dean might turn down the course for curricular reasons. Members of the committee asserted the prerogative of the General Education Committee to certify courses for general education. After much discussion, it was decided that language changes might cover the need to address both issues. Hunter moved and Mosca seconded a motion that the signatures for the forms include "Submitted by (department or program chair's signature)," "Reviewed by (dean's signature)," and "Certified by (Coordinator, GEC, signature) and (Chair, Academic Senate, signature)." The motion was passed.

Jenkins explained that he would be sending out discs instead of paper forms in order to save trees. He also would put the forms on the Website, so that chairs could download the forms. Finally, Bob Rando would put the forms on Access programs. Nancy Mosca suggested that each member of the committee have a copy of the disc as another resource for departments. It was decided to provide each member with a disc.

Sequence science courses -- Allen Hunter reported on his discussions with the science chairs regarding the offering of substitute courses for the health profession students. He presented a case for the science sequence courses -- that the science departments could reach the goals in the sequence rather than in a single course. It was argued that students majoring in the health professions would have to take the sequence. Jenkins asked what would happen to a student who took only one course, and then switched majors. Hunter responded that few students did so, and that those who did would not miss that much if they took other general education science courses. It was decided to have Hunter come back with more detail on the possible sequence. Jenkins indicated that it would not be an

official proposal, but something that would enable the committee to decide whether it wanted to consider such a possibility. Committee members agreed to proceed. There was no need to bring back the tabled motion from last week.

WAC Director -- Jenkins announced that only Bob Hogue (CSIS) and Karen Becker of the Reading and Study Skills Center had applied. There were several other possibilities, and he would wait until next week to see if those applications were forthcoming. Meanwhile, because of the lateness of the process of application, Jenkins suggested that he might ask Moneyhun to prepare some workshops for the spring. Thus, the WAC director would begin in the fall. The committee concurred.

Workshops – there will be workshops on the proposal forms, and for the intensive components during the spring quarter. Antenucci, Funk, Garr, Mosca, Tessier, and White indicated an interest in assisting at the workshops.

Assessment – Jenkins explained that ETS and ACT had tests on general education that could be administered to some incoming freshmen, and then when they were in their junior year. Last fall the GEC had looked at the ACT test, but had to return it within a week. Jenkins has copies of the ETS test, and was going to see if ACT would send us another copy. The testing would begin next fall.

**GENERAL EDUCATION MEETING**  
**4-2-99**

AGENDA:

- 1) Pre-interview with Bob Hogue
- 2) Interview with Bob Hogue
- 3) Porter suggestion on intensive components
- 4) Major as a substitute for GER domain – Ritchey
- 5) Workshops
- 6) Assessment
- 7) Next week's meeting

**GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE  
MINUTES OF MEETING 4-2-99**

Absent: Antenucci, Harvey, Mauch, Moneyhun, Rando

GEC met to go over the questions to be asked of Bob Hogue, the candidate for the WAC position. Jenkins passed out a list that he had formulated to which committee members added.

After finalizing the questions, the GEC interviewed Hogue. There was much discussion of his candidacy. Ritchey moved, Castronovo seconded, a motion to recommend to the Provost the appointment of Bob Hogue as the WAC Director. The motion passed unanimously.

There was also discussion of the need for Bob Hogue to begin work over the summer. Hunter moved and Tessier seconded a motion that Jenkins request some summer compensation for Hogue from the Provost. The motion passed.

Tod Porter sent a letter to the committee asking that it consider the creation of a choice of models for the intensive components. He believes that the present form is overly long, and that faculty might not recall their commitment several years down the road. His proposal would allow the department to submit a list of courses that might include the component. When a faculty member actually teaches the course, he or she would submit a form indicating which model would be followed. There was concern expressed, though, that the department might not take the time to think through the implementation of the component, which the present form would require. Jenkins asked the committee if it was all right to postpone the submission of intensive component forms until the fall so that course proposals could be finished in the spring, and that workshops be held on each component with possible models being suggested. It was agreed that there would be a delay, and that Jenkins would report back to the committee on the progress of the workshops.

Nate Ritchey indicated that the science departments would be sending a letter to the committee regarding the possibility of permitting its majors to use the entire major as the science requirement for general education. He suggested that we wait to see the letter before discussing the issue.

Jenkins announced that he had to attend a history conference in Dayton, Ohio, next week, and so the Friday meeting would be canceled. Because of the need to decide on whether to use ACT or ETS for assessment, he would place each of their booklets on the table in the GEC meeting room by next Tuesday afternoon. These booklets would be used to test a sample of incoming freshman, and to follow up when they are juniors. Each committee member should review the booklets by next Friday, April 9. There would be a decision made at the April 16<sup>th</sup> meeting.

**GENERAL EDUCATION MEETING  
MINUTES 4-16-99**

Absent: Funk, Garr, Harvey, Mauch, Moneyhun, Rando, Ritchey, Tessier

Marie Cullen, the Director of Assessment for YSU, attended the meeting to discuss the tests available from ACT and ETS. Those present did not like the length of the ACT test. Although there was no quorum present, there was unanimity that the ETS test was better. The choice of a test will come up at next Friday's meeting.

There was much discussion about the value of using either the one-hour or two and one-half hour ETS test. Some felt that students would be more motivated to take a one-hour test, but others questioned whether the shorter test would tell us much about our program. Jenkins indicated that he would provide more information to the committee about the two tests.

The committee discussed the memo from Jeanette Garr regarding the tests. Cullen stated that it would be very expensive to undertake a full-scale evaluation as suggested by Garr. She favored sampling and a more general approach to scoring. Some committee members were concerned about how the results might look to the public, but others felt that our scores would only be compared to similar institutions, and that we would fare as well as they did. Cullen believed that the results would be favorable. This discussion will continue next Friday.

**GENERAL EDUCATION MEETING  
AGENDA 4-23-99**

1) Discussion on whether to use ACT or ETS test. If ETS, then long or short form.

2) Oral Communication proposal forms. *- possible to do one form for multiple sections.*

3) Writing Intensive workshops

4) Critical thinking intensive workshops

## **GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE MINUTES 4-23-99**

ABSENT: Funk, Harvey, Mauch, Tessier, White

The meeting began with a discussion of the science departments and their desire to submit the entire major for their majors to meet the general education requirement in natural science. Bill Jenkins and Nate Ritchey met with the chairs this past Monday, and indicated to them that it was necessary for them to submit the introductory courses offered at an advanced level for the students in engineering, health programs, etc., so that they could meet the goals of general education in the natural science domain. In doing so, they were providing courses also for their majors since science majors have to take introductory courses in other sciences. They seemed to agree with this approach at that meeting. However, Ritchey has since received an e-mail message with a cc to Bill Jenkins from the Dean of Arts and Sciences that this approach was the wrong one, and a waste of time and trees. Ritchey and Jenkins will be meeting with the Dean on Monday morning to discuss the matter. The General Education Committee agreed that the approach suggested by Jenkins and Ritchey to the science chairs was the correct one. It was also agreed that the committee would consider a course proposal with multiple numbers if those courses were very similar in design as a means of saving paperwork.

The GEC discussed whether to use the ACT or the ETS test. Hunter moved and Garr seconded a motion to use the ETS test. The motion passed with little discussion. Ritchey did raise the issue of whether the test would prove undesirable in the math area because the test covered traditional math concepts rather than the more practical math offered in the Gened Math course. It was decided that the committee would look into using the additional fifty questions to beef up the math section and make it more compatible with what we will be teaching. The GEC then discussed whether to use the long or short form. Jenkins pointed out that the only advantage of the long form (apart from somewhat greater reliability) was the possibility of having the company report on subgroups. However, Marie Cullen had queried Linda Hays of ETS and found out that they would provide a disc for the university with the short form results, and, with the purchase of **SampleSelect**, she could create a report on subgroups herself. There was also much discussion of who would be sampled and when. Garr was interested in having all engineering majors tested. Jenkins pointed out that we could discuss the sampling procedures later, and that it was possible, even with adoption of the short form for the general testing, to consider the long form for specific groups. Mosca moved and Antenucci seconded a motion that we adopt the short form for general use. The motion passed with the understanding that possible alternative uses of both long and short form would occur when we discussed sampling.

Clyde Moneyhun reported on the writing intensive workshop that he and Bob Hogue had planned. Bill Jenkins will move forward with getting out information on the meetings. Jenkins also reported on the critical thinking intensive components. He had met with a committee of critical thinkers that had worked with Tom Shipka. Shipka recommended, and they agreed, that faculty from similar departments should come prepared with their



proposals to a consultation session with this committee. Since most faculty contended that they already engaged in the use of critical thinking and that it was related to their discipline, Shipka was more comfortable with advising them about their proposals rather than suggesting something new or different. The committee could also help with filling out the forms, or with gathering verifying sources from the critical thinking literature.

GEC began a discussion of the oral communication proposals (990001,990002,990003). It was decided to delay discussion of these proposals because most people had not had an opportunity to read them. However, a question was raised as to whether GEC would interrogate a department about whether it had enough faculty to teach the course. It was noted that the Dean should have handled this matter. Jenkins pointed out that, if the issue was not addressed, that the GEC could inquire as to whether faculty met the North Central test regarding number of courses taken in a field. It was decided that the oral communication proposal did address the issue of quality properly.

## **GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE MINUTES 4-23-99**

ABSENT: Funk, Harvey, Mauch, Tessier, White

The meeting began with a discussion of the science departments and their desire to submit the entire major for their majors to meet the general education requirement in natural science. Bill Jenkins and Nate Ritchey met with the chairs this past Monday, and indicated to them that it was necessary for them to submit the introductory courses offered at an advanced level for the students in engineering, health programs, etc., so that they could meet the goals of general education in the natural science domain. In doing so, they were providing courses also for their majors since science majors have to take introductory courses in other sciences. They seemed to agree with this approach at that meeting. However, Ritchey has since received an e-mail message with a cc to Bill Jenkins from the Dean of Arts and Sciences that this approach was the wrong one, and a waste of time and trees. Ritchey and Jenkins will be meeting with the Dean on Monday morning to discuss the matter. The General Education Committee agreed that the approach suggested by Jenkins and Ritchey to the science chairs was the correct one. It was also agreed that the committee would consider a course proposal with multiple numbers if those courses were very similar in design as a means of saving paperwork.

The GEC discussed whether to use the ACT or the ETS test. Hunter moved and Garr seconded a motion to use the ETS test. The motion passed with little discussion. Ritchey did raise the issue of whether the test would prove undesirable in the math area because the test covered traditional math concepts rather than the more practical math offered in the Gened Math course. It was decided that the committee would look into using the additional fifty questions to beef up the math section and make it more compatible with what we will be teaching. The GEC then discussed whether to use the long or short form. Jenkins pointed out that the only advantage of the long form (apart from somewhat greater reliability) was the possibility of having the company report on subgroups. However, Marie Cullen had queried Linda Hays of ETS and found out that they would provide a disc for the university with the short form results, and, with the purchase of SampleSelect, she could create a report on subgroups herself. There was also much discussion of who would be sampled and when. Garr was interested in having all engineering majors tested. Jenkins pointed out that we could discuss the sampling procedures later, and that it was possible, even with adoption of the short form for the general testing, to consider the long form for specific groups. Mosca moved and Antenucci seconded a motion that we adopt the short form for general use. The motion passed with the understanding that possible alternative uses of both long and short form would occur when we discussed sampling.

Clyde Moneyhun reported on the writing intensive workshop that he and Bob Hogue had planned. Bill Jenkins will move forward with getting out information on the meetings. Jenkins also reported on the critical thinking intensive components. He had met with a committee of critical thinkers that had worked with Tom Shipka. Shipka recommended, and they agreed, that faculty from similar departments should come prepared with their

proposals to a consultation session with this committee. Since most faculty contended that they already engaged in the use of critical thinking and that it was related to their discipline, Shipka was more comfortable with advising them about their proposals rather than suggesting something new or different. The committee could also help with filling out the forms, or with gathering verifying sources from the critical thinking literature.

GEC began a discussion of the oral communication proposals (990001, 990002, 990003). It was decided to delay discussion of these proposals because most people had not had an opportunity to read them. However, a question was raised as to whether GEC would interrogate a department about whether it had enough faculty to teach the course. It was noted that the Dean should have handled this matter. Jenkins pointed out that, if the issue was not addressed, that the GEC could inquire as to whether faculty met the North Central test regarding number of courses taken in a field. It was decided that the oral communication proposal did address the issue of quality properly.

**GENERAL EDUCATION MEETING**  
**4-30-99**

AGENDA:

- 1) Oral Communication courses considered for approval as general education courses – COMM 1545 (990001), COMM 1545H (990002), COMM 2645 (990003).
- 2) Oral Communication courses submitted too late for distribution – COMM 2610 (990004), COMM 4899 (990005)
- 3) Psychology course just received – PSYCH 1560 (990006)
- 4) ETS assessment test
- 5) Workshops – see attached for time and place of various workshops.
- 6) Assessment Conference in Denver, June 13-16. Anyone want to go?

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE  
MINUTES 4-30-99

ABSENT: Harvey, Maraffa, Mauch, White

Jenkins noted that the GEC had received six course proposals, five from the Department of Communication and Theater and one from Psychology. Three of the courses, COMM 2610 (990004), COMM 4899 (990005), and PSYCH 1560 (990006), were distributed too late for consideration at today's meeting. Allen Hunter raised the following questions about courses 990004 and 990005. 1) Was the capstone course required for all majors? 2) did the 990004 course belong in the Societies and Institutions domain since it was primarily about communication and only secondarily about diversity? Jenkins suggested that it might be considered under the Selected Topics and Electives domain. 3) shouldn't the department indicate how much lecture and how much small group discussion would occur in all communication courses? Jenkins will talk with the department about these questions, but consideration of these three courses was left to next Friday's meeting.

5/10/99  
Societies  
&  
Institutions

Ritchey raised the question of whether GEC would permit courses to receive gened approval if they were offered infrequently. He commented that some people were concerned about the number of courses that might receive approval and whether North Central would look favorably on too many courses. Mosca argued that as long as the course met the goals it should receive approval regardless of how often it was offered. Committee members agreed.

in the 5/10/99

GEC began to discuss the approval of course proposals COMM 1545 (990001), COMM 1545H (990002), and COMM 2645 (990003). Hunter raised his objection again to the lack of specificity regarding the number of hours spent in lecture versus those spent in small groups or in laboratory. He noted that the sciences traditionally gave one hour of credit for two hours of laboratory, and wondered whether the same should be true for the communication courses. Castronovo and Rando spoke against requiring them to provide such information and also against judging them on a basis of this issue. They contended that the job of GEC was to judge the course proposals on a basis of the goals and the criteria only; they believed that the information Hunter wanted was not relevant to making that judgment. After much discussion, Hunter offered a motion to request information from the Department of Communications and Theater regarding the distribution of hours spent on lecturing and discussion or laboratory. The motion failed for lack of a second.

Castronovo moved and Tessier seconded a motion to adopt COMM 1545 and COMM 1545H together. Moneyhun praised the proposals, commenting that they should serve as a model for other proposals. He did raise a concern, however, about the fact that syllabus included a definite assignment on selecting an audience under the informative presentation, but not under the persuasive presentation. Mosca noted that the fifth bullet under the persuasive presentation did call on the student to "select examples that are both logically and psychologically appealing to the listeners." Others commented that they

felt that there was sufficient indication of concern about the audience. The motion to approve the courses passed with Hunter abstaining.

GEC then considered course proposal 990003, an oral communication intensive proposal for the Presentational Speaking Course. Ritchey expressed some concern about the fact that the intensive component was attached to an oral communication course; obviously, it was more than oral communication intensive. It was noted, however, that the general education model was encouraging departments to have writing, oral communication, and critical thinking intensive components in the major as a followup on skill development. Moneyhun observed that the English department was going to seek writing intensive status for courses on its upper division level that were writing courses. Castronovo moved and Antenucci seconded a motion to approve proposal 990003. Motion passed unanimously. Jenkins congratulated the committee for approving the first courses under the new general education program.

Jenkins reported on the ETS test. Truman University, formerly Northeast Missouri State University, had experienced difficulty with the math section (declining scores) because their Contemporary Math course did not use any calculation. After 18 months they had adopted a return to requiring algebra and geometry, plus a course called Liberal Arts Calculus. A committee within the Math Department was meeting that afternoon to examine the ETS test. The proposed math course did include calculation, but the committee might recommend adding some other elements to the course as a result of examining the test. Ritchey noted that there had been much discussion in the Math Department. He had told faculty that there was not much of a problem as far as he was concerned. Jenkins said that he would bring their report to the GEC next week.

Jenkins announced that all workshops had been organized with the writing and oral communication ones already scheduled. He passed out a sheet with the times after the meeting. Finally, Jenkins asked if anyone wished to go to the Assessment Conference held in Denver on June 13-16. Darla Funk said that she was interested.

#### NEXT FRIDAY'S AGENDA

- 1) COMM 2610 (990004)
- 2) COMM 4899 (990005)
- 3) PYSCH 1560 (990006)
- 4) Other course proposals received during the week
- 5) ETS test
- 6) Reduction of paperwork in science substitute proposals

## **GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE MINUTES 5-7-99**

ABSENT: Harvey, Mauch, Ritchey

Allen Hunter noted several mistakes in the minutes from the 4/30 meeting. Changes under his comments included replacement of Diversity with Societies and Institutions in the first paragraph, line 7, and to substitute "two or three hours of laboratory," for "two hours of laboratory" in paragraph three, line 5. GEC accepted the changes. Jenkins reminded committee members that they should offer any corrections to the past meeting's minutes at the start of the next meeting.

The General Education Committee discussed the proposal of Student Government to change the General Education preface to include citizenship of the United States, to add Goal 14 – *Understand the basic structure and theories of American government at the federal, state, and local level* – and to require that one of the courses taken by students under Personal and Social Responsibility meet this goal. Many questions were raised about the merit of the proposal, including its lack of timeliness, its effect on Goals 4 and 9, the remedial nature of the course, and the fact that it could be offered under the new system without being required. Since the representatives from Student Government were not present, the committee decided to invite them to next week's meeting.

GEC examined Proposal 990004, Intercultural Communication, from the Department of Communication and Theater. Moneyhun questioned whether this course fit under the category of Societies and Institutions just because it met the diversity goal. Hunter added that diversity was not a primary goal for this course. Jenkins commented that the Model required a course in this domain to satisfy Goal 11, along with either 10 or 12. Garr noted that we were asking all courses to do something on diversity, but that did not mean that all courses fit into Societies and Institutions. Castronovo commented that many members of the Communication and Theater had degrees in other subject areas, and that they were trained to teach a course that met these goals. He also felt that the course did teach about cultures, and that communication within and across cultures was a part of examining Societies and Institutions. Tessier asked whether we might examine the textbook used in the course. Moneyhun moved and Maraffa seconded a motion to refer the course back to the department for clarification on how Goal 11 is central to the course, and for delineation of how the subsidiary goal is achieved. The text should be included with the proposal. Motion passed.

GEC examined Proposal 990005, Senior Project, from the Department of Communication and Theater. Castronovo noted that it was required of all majors. Hunter moved and Tessier seconded a motion to accept the course proposal. Motion passed.

GEC examined Proposal 990006, General Psychology, from the Department of Psychology. Discussion centered on the course syllabus. It was felt that the course fit under the Personal and Social Responsibility domain, and that the Criteria and Narrative sections were complete. But many expressed concern that the syllabus did not

## GENERAL EDUCATION AND CITIZENSHIP

Under the Preface "the purpose of the general education requirements is to foster: .... "Recognition of the importance of acting as informed, responsible, democratically-minded citizens of the world...."

Under Goal 4: *Understand the personal and social importance of ethical reflection and moral reasoning*, there is an explanatory statement. "Students develop their capacity for ethical sensitivities and insight and understand important social issues that confront our society and those values necessary for a democratic nation to prosper."

Under Goal 7: *Realize the evolving interrelationships among science, technology and society*, there is an explanatory statement. "Students understand the impact and changes in society that take place as scientific principles are discovered and new technology developed. Students understand that societal conditions and needs influence and shape progress in science in science and technology."

Under Goal 9: *Understand the relationships between physical, mental, and emotional well-being and the quality of life of the individual, the family and the community*, there is an explanatory statement. "Students recognize the interdependent nature of the individual, family, and society in shaping human behavior and determining quality of life. They understand that mental, physical and emotional well-being are interconnected, make informed decisions about life-style choice, and apply this knowledge to their own well-being and that of others."

Under Goal 11: *Evaluate the impact of theories, events and institutions of the social, economic, legal and political aspects of society*, there is an explanatory statement. "Students develop knowledge about the markets, social organizations, legal systems, and levels of government that comprise society. They understand, through study of theories, how these institutions function, interact with each other, and evolve in our society and others."

Under Goal 12: *Comprehend and appreciate the development of diversity in America in all its forms*, there is an explanatory statement. "Students comprehend the historical development of the United States as a democratic political system and the ideals, rights and institutions associated with that system. Students appreciate the diverse characteristics of the populations that comprised American society over time, the ways devised to cope with these differences, and the impact of conflicts over differences on politics and society in general. Diversity includes but is not limited to the characteristics of race, social and economic class, religion, gender, ethnicity, age, disability, lifestyle and political identity."

Under Goal 13: *Understand and appreciate the natural environment and the process that shape it*, there is an explanatory statement. "Students demonstrate knowledge of the characteristic, processes, and laws that define natural environments. They evaluate the impact of events and changing conditions within these environments."



The General Education Committee has met to consider the resolution of Student Government presented to the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate. At its meeting on May 14, GEC provided time for the student representatives to present arguments on behalf of the resolution. We applaud their concern about the lack of interest of the American people in participating in governmental activities. However, after much discussion, GEC has decided not to recommend any changes in the present goals or model for the following reasons:

- 1) Students already take a required government course in high school, as well as a proficiency test on citizenship. Yet neither this course nor the proficiency test has led to a higher level of voter participation in the past thirty years. In fact, the total percentage voting in presidential elections has declined from 69.3% in 1964 to 54.2% in 1996.
- 2) There is much public concern about the number of remedial courses taught on the college level to compensate for what was not taken or not learned in high school. The recommended goal 14 calls for students to "Understand the basic structure and theories of American government at the federal, state, and local level" This narrowly-defined goal, which is included the State Social Studies Curriculum for K-12, appears to be a remedy for a high school deficiency. We believe that colleges should not repeat that material; rather they should build upon what was taken in high school.
- 3) The present goals do provide an opportunity for students to take courses relating to citizenship. GEC believes that the thrust of the new goals is to engage the students in examining how various types of subject matter relate to the society at large and to ponder how they might participate in that society. Please see the attached list of references in the goals to citizenship or social impact.
- 4) The core courses under the new model all belong under the skill area, whereas the domains have no core courses. Approving one core course would open the door to requiring other courses in which students can be proven to have a deficiency of knowledge. History, psychology, geography, economics – all of these areas in recent years have had surveys showing the paucity of factual knowledge stored in the memory of the average citizen. Should they also be core courses?
- 5) An American government course fits within the Societies and Institutions category. It does have a place. Students can choose to take this course, but it is not required.
- 6) Placement of a course on American government in the Personal and Social Responsibilities category would take away significantly from achievement of either the ethics or the personal well-being goal.
- 7) The present model is a result of 5 years of deliberation and compromise. We should proceed with its implementation prior to making further changes.

sufficiently address how it was relating the course objectives to the overall goals. Tessier was satisfied with how the syllabus addressed the goals, and worried that we might cause people to repeat our wording just to satisfy the committee. Castronovo also believed that the section on course objectives did explain the relationship to overall goals. Hunter moved to refer the course proposal back to the department to work on the syllabus. There was no second. Castronovo moved and Tessier seconded a motion to accept the course. Rando made a suggestion that we create a category for course proposals that accepted the proposal with conditions. His motion was ruled out of order. Mosca stated that her experience in nursing was that syllabi needed to state more strongly the tie to the overall goals of the program; she was reluctant to approve the proposal. When the vote occurred, only three people voted; Jenkins declared the vote insufficient. The committee decided by consensus to refer the proposal back to the department through Nancy White.

Jenkins announced that he had no official correspondence from the math committee regarding the ETS test, but that he had talked informally with Bernadette Mullins. She said that the math committee was favorable to the test, but that it had some work to do. Richard Goldthwait was going to send us a letter.

**Next Friday's meeting at 12:30. Agenda includes 1) proposal 990007, 2) any resubmission from proposals sent back, 3) any new course proposals, 4) citizenship requirement, 5) assessment.**

## GENERAL EDUCATION MINUTES 5-14-99

Absent: Hunter, Maraffa, Mauch (Anthony Jesko as proxy), Tessier

Jenkins began the meeting by noting that the first part would be a hearing on the resolution from Student Government regarding a citizenship course. Anyone was permitted to speak during the hearing. After conclusion of the hearing, the GEC would ask any non-members to leave, while the committee deliberated upon the issue. He then introduced Robert Harvey (member of the GEC), Anthony Jesko (a proxy for Tara Mauch), and Brandon Schneider, a student representative to the Academic Senate. Jesko spoke in favor of the resolution. He noted that he had seen some surveys by national organizations that revealed extreme ignorance on the part of Americans regarding their government. These surveys had caused him to seek some appropriate method of encouraging a higher level of participation in our government on all levels. Citing the fact that a number of states (Texas being one) had passed such a requirement for state universities, he argued that this course would begin to solve the political corruption of the Mahoning Valley. The Ohio State legislature, he commented, might pass such legislation if we did not.

Questions from the committee members revolved around application of this course to our non-American students, and the coverage that might occur in a course on morals. Clyde Moneyhun cited the presence of citizenship components in the goals (in particular goals 4, 11, and 12), and contended that students would have to take aspects of citizenship under the present goal system. Indeed, they could not avoid it. He also believed that it was not the prerogative of GEC to require a course from any department. Overall, general education did not have core courses in any domain; instead, it encouraged a variety of departments to submit courses meeting the goals. He gave assurances that no student could avoid taking a course or courses relating to these goals.

In regard to a question about the remedial nature of the course, Jesko and Harvey pointed to other courses presently taken that they felt were remedial in nature. Harvey did not want a remedial course on government, though, but a course that would build on what had been learned in high school.

Discussion then revolved around the fact that the course might only be taught by the political science department. Jesko commented that Tammy King of the Criminal Justice department was in favor of offering such a course. Jenkins noted, however, that the history department would have to change its basic history course if it were to reach the goal as stated – *Understand the basic structure and theories of American government at the federal, state, and local level.* Ritchey encouraged the students to consider getting departments together to offer a course on citizenship as an alternative. The hearing ended with a break of two minutes.

When the meeting re-convened, Ritchey suggested that GEC consider the three parts of the resolution separately. After discussion of part one recommending a change in the

preface from "Recognition of the importance of acting as informed, responsible, democratically-minded citizens of the world," to "Recognition of the importance of acting as informed, responsible, democratically-minded citizens of the United States and members of the global community," Harvey moved and Moneyhun seconded a motion to replace "citizens of the world," with "citizens and members of the global community." The motion passed without dissent.

GEC then considered the second part of the resolution calling for Goal 14, "Understand the basic structure and theories of American government at the federal, state, and local level." Moneyhun moved and Antenucci seconded a motion to reject the recommendation. Discussion ensued. The motion passed 7-1.

Jenkins pointed out to the committee that the third part of the resolution was now moot because it depended upon passage of goal 14. All committee members agreed. Jenkins passed out copies of course proposal #990007 and a letter from Richard Goldthwait of the mathematics department. A quorum being noted as lacking, no further action was taken.

**Next Friday's meeting at 12:30 – agenda: 1) course proposal 990007, 2) any resubmitted course proposals, 3) new course proposals, 4) ETS test, 5) assessment.**

## GENERAL EDUCATION MINUTES MEETING 5-28-99

ABSENT: Harvey, Maraffa, Mauch, Rando, White

Jenkins asked committee members to fill out a schedule for the summer. He indicated that there would be a need to meet over the summer, and that he would try to schedule some afternoon meetings (perhaps in the morning) so that the work would be concentrated.

Jenkins also announced that there would be a luncheon for committee members next Friday, June 4<sup>th</sup>, at 12:30 in Bresnahan III. The committee decided by consensus to order the Chinese buffet.

The committee examined the following courses:

- 1) 990007 – Oral Interpretation (COMM 2670). Committee members commented very favorably on this course. Mosca moved and Hunter seconded a motion to approve. The motion passed unanimously.
- 2) 990008 – The Art of Motion Pictures (THTR 2690). The prerequisite to this course is THTR 1590. The committee noted that the syllabus should have the prerequisite noted. Mosca moved and Moneyhun seconded a motion to approve. Motion passed.
- 3) 990009 – History of Motion Pictures (THTR 1590). After a brief favorable discussion, Hunter moved and Castronovo seconded a motion to approve. Motion passed.
- 4) 990010 – Understanding Theater (THTR 1560). Hunter moved and Tessier seconded a motion to approve. Motion passed.
- 5) 990011 – Survey of Mass Communication (TCOM 1595). The committee reached a consensus that the proposal depended too much on the present course. There should be an updated description, a beefed-up response to the criteria, and a syllabus prepared for the new course reflecting the general education goals. Moneyhun moved and Antenucci seconded a motion to send the course back. Motion passed.
- 6) 990004 – Intercultural Communication (COMM 2610). This course had previously been sent back to indicate how it satisfied the societies and institutions goals. Committee members commented that they believed that the new proposal did satisfy the goals. Hunter moved and Mosca seconded a motion to approve. Motion passed.

*Everyone present*

**AGENDA  
GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE  
6-4-99**

*Record in Senate meeting*

- 1) **CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSAL 990014**
  
- 2) **CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSAL 990015**
  
- 3) **CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSAL 990016**
  
- 4) **CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSAL 990017**
  
- 5) **RE-EXAMINATION OF PROPOSAL 990004, INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION**
  
- ✓ 6) **ENGINEERING USE OF LABORATORIES AS WRITING AND ORAL COMMUNICATION INTENSIVE COMPONENTS**
  
- 7) **SUBSTITUTE COURSES – A CHALLENGE OF SEMANTICS**
  
- 8) **COURSES REQUIRED OF MAJORS – AMERICAN HISTORY**

*Meeting dates*

## GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE MEETING 6-4-99

ABSENT: Harvey, Mauch

GEC discussed the possibility of meeting next week. It was decided to meet on Wednesday, June 9<sup>th</sup>, from 2 to 5 PM in the GEC office. Jenkins passed out course proposals 990018 through 990033. He will send the syllabus for the resubmitted Psychology course proposal, 990006, to members for Wednesday's meeting.

Jenkins reported on the Academic Senate meeting and the issue of requiring a course on citizenship. Student government President David Myhal and Dr. Paul Sracic, student government Advisor, were upset with our recommendations, and raised a number of questions at the meeting. With a motion on the floor to change the language in the preface as recommended by GEC, Myhal noted the absence of a quorum. Thus, the Academic Senate took no action. The motion will be the first item on the agenda of the fall meeting.

Jenkins took item six on the agenda first because he wanted to report back to Jack Bakos in engineering. Bakos was requesting that the GEC consider approval of writing and oral communication components in the required lab courses in the engineering program. Students in these labs already had to present both oral and written reports on their experiments. The oral presentations were often in PowerPoint. The problem, Jenkins noted, was that these courses were only 1 credit. Could they be compared to courses with 3 credit hours of work? Bakos had argued that the students did do the same work, and that engineering would use the standard minimums of the criteria for both areas. Jeanette Garr informed the committee that there were 4 required labs for engineering majors, and each of these would require the minimums. It was decided to encourage engineering to submit the laboratories for intensive approval, but that they should be submitted as a group application.

990014 – THTR 4860, Dramatic Texts. Although the committee agreed that the course did have material that fit within the Arts and Literary Perspectives domain, they were concerned about the fact that this course was on the senior level in the major, and that it had prerequisites within the major, not in general education. Some members expressed concern that the course was not for the general student body, as promised in the Senate criteria. Allen Hunter suggested that it be considered a substitute course. Jenkins defined a substitute course as one providing more advanced consideration of material being taught in a general education course offered for the general student body, such as the general education science courses, and the science sequences for engineering, science, or health majors. Students with a greater skill level and a desire to major in the area would, therefore, take a substitute course, but that course had to meet the goals of general education. It was noted that COMM 4860 was not a substitute for any other course. Much discussion ensued over the definition, and the use of the word, substitute. Maraffa noted that he had raised that issue before, and was in favor of designating all accepted courses as part of general education. There was also much discussion over whether a

course on the upper division level specifically designed for majors could be a general education course. **Ritchey** moved and **Tessier** seconded a motion to postpone consideration of this proposal and proposal 990015 – THTR 4891, History of Theater (for the same reasons) until next Wednesday's meeting. **Jenkins** argued for the postponement on a basis that the issues involved were very important in defining the general education program, and that we should not settle issues in which there was much disagreement in one meeting.

990016 – GEOG 2640, Human Geography. **Jenkins** reported that the Dean of Arts and Sciences considered this proposal a model of what should be submitted. The committee agreed. **Tessier** moved and **Hunter** seconded a motion to approve this proposal. The motion passed.

990017 – A&S 2600, Exploration in the Sciences. Concern was raised about the 4 credit hours required. Most general education courses will be at the 3 SH level. An addition of one credit hour will add to the hours required for general education. **Rando** moved and **Garr** seconded a motion to postpone consideration of this course until the second meeting after the present one because of the absence of concerned members next week. The motion passed. It was decided to invite **John Usis** and **Charles Singler** to that meeting to answer questions about the extra credit hour.

**Jenkins** postponed the other items until the next meeting. He commented that he wished to bring up the domain under which 990004, Intercultural Communication, was located. Perhaps Selected Topics was better since this course involved a melding of goals.

**Jenkins** thanked everyone on behalf of the Provost for their work this year.



## **GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE MEETING 6-9-99**

ABSENT: Harvey, Mauch, Mosca, Rando, White

Jenkins discussed future meetings. It was decided to meet on Thursday, June 17, from 2 to 5 PM.

The first item of business was a discussion of the meaning of the substitute category. Maraffa pointed out that the term was confusing, and suggested that all that was necessary was approval of a course based on whether it met the criteria. He advocated the listing under a particular category of all courses which had received GEC approval. Tessier added, however, that those more advanced courses needed a star or an asterisk next to them to indicate the higher degree of difficulty for such courses as the science sequence courses taken by majors. Moneyhun read the criteria passed by the Academic Senate, which called for general education courses to be intended for the general student and not for the major, except for substitute courses. Jenkins argued that the rule that gened courses must be taught for the general student held except for courses that were of a higher level and yet similar to a general education course. We should not, therefore, approve a course designed for the major only even though it met the criteria. He pointed out that all history courses could be submitted for approval in the societies and institutions category.

Tessier moved and Hunter seconded a motion that "Substitute courses are courses on a more advanced level taken by students in a specific program or who have a special interest in and capability for that level." After much discussion about the wording and agreement on editorial changes, the motion was withdrawn. Hunter moved and Castronovo seconded that "Substitute courses replace a previously approved general education course, and are designed for students in a specific program or who have a special interest in the subject matter."

The GEC turned its attention to course proposals, in particular 990014 and 990015. Frank Castronovo commented that these courses were substitute courses for theater majors. Although they were on the senior level, their majors would take these courses in place of the introductory general education courses on theater. Many committee members expressed satisfaction that these courses, although on the senior level, did fit the definition of substitute course. Tessier moved and Hunter seconded a motion to approve these courses as substitute courses. The motion passed.

Jenkins returned to the earlier discussion. He wanted to have a motion regarding the inclusion of substitute courses on the list of each domain with a designating asterisk and a definition at the bottom of the page. Hunter moved and Moneyhun seconded a motion that an asterisk be placed next to each substitute course included in the list under each domain, and that an explanatory sentence be placed below. The motion passed.

The GEC then considered the returned Psychology proposal, 990004. Members approved of the syllabus changes. Ritchey moved and Antenucci seconded a motion to approve the proposal. The motion passed.

Hunter asked whether we were going to consider the 990017 course, A&S 2600, the science lab. Jenkins indicated that Mosca had asked that consideration of the course be delayed until she returned next week. Jenkins had asked Charles Singler to come to that meeting, and he would contact John Usis also.

GEC looked at the world history courses, 990018,990020,990022, and 990024. Castronovo commented very favorably on how well these courses fit the domain, especially for his students. Ritchey moved and Tessier seconded a motion to approve all of the above courses. The motion passed.

GEC examined the critical thinking intensive proposals attached to the world history courses, 990019,990021,990023, and 990025. Hunter moved and Garr seconded a motion to approve the proposals. Moneyhun commented that he believed there should be more specific description of the critical thinking exercises in the syllabi. Committee members commented that inclusion of assignments, exercises, and even definition of critical thinking as related to the discipline would be appropriate. The motion failed 2 to 5. The courses will be returned to the history department for reconsideration.

Next week's meeting will begin with course proposal 990026 from American Studies.

## **GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE MEETING 6-17-99**

ABSENT: Funk, Harvey, Hunter, Mauch, Rando, Tessier, White

Jenkins began the meeting by welcoming Mary Jo Reiff, who will serve out Clyde Moneyhun's unexpired term as the Provost's appointee in the basic skills domain through September 15.

The rest of the meeting was devoted to consideration of the following course proposals:

990026 – American Identity. Ritchey moved and Castronovo seconded a motion to approve. With little discussion, the motion passed.

990027 – Mathematics and Statistics. Castronovo moved and Antenucci seconded a motion to approve. Concerns were expressed about the syllabus and its lack of clarity regarding the goals. Reiff moved and Ritchey seconded a motion to postpone consideration until the math department examined the syllabus. The motion passed.

990028 – Economics. Garr moved and Mosca seconded a motion to return the proposal for a more developed syllabus. The committee agreed that the criteria and narrative statements were good, but that the syllabus did not reflect those statements.

990029 – Political Science. Castronovo moved and Antenucci seconded a motion to approve the proposal. There was some discussion of the relationship of the American government part to the rest of the world. It appeared that the coverage would be of interactions between the United States and these areas rather than on the development of other parts of the world. The motion passed.

990030 and 990031 – History. Ritchey moved and Castronovo seconded a motion to approve these courses together. The motion passed.

990032 – History. As a critical thinking proposal, these courses and all other critical thinking intensive courses will be submitted to the CT subcommittee for review.

990033 – American Studies. Lacks a syllabus. Will be referred back to Sherri Linkon.

990012 – Telecommunications. As a critical thinking intensive proposal, it will be submitted to the CT subcommittee for review.

990013 – Telecommunications. There was much discussion of what a capstone was. Some argued that the capstone experience should involve new activities on the part of the student to demonstrate the capabilities required by goals 1, 2, and 3. Others felt that the work of assembling a portfolio could constitute a capstone experience. Maraffa moved and Antenucci seconded a motion to refer the proposal back to the department for better explanation of how the course met goals 1, 2 and 3.

990034 – Theater. Castronovo moved and Ritchey seconded a motion to approve this proposal. The committee felt that this was a strong oral communication proposal coming from within the communication department. The motion passed.

990035 – Theater. Reiff moved and Antenucci seconded a proposal to approve this proposal. Castronovo noted that Acting II was about voice and diction and not about communication, so they were not seeking an oral communication intensive designation for Acting II. The motion passed.

990036 – THTR. Mosca moved and Antenucci seconded a motion to approve this proposal. There was some discussion about the adequacy of the syllabus with some asking for more description and others satisfied with the description. Castronovo pointed out that the Portfolio/Review requirement related to all project areas, and was not itself the content of the course. He was asked about the CR/NC grading for the course. His response was that with four graders it would be difficult, given the subjectivity involved in such presentations, to decide what grade to assign. Standards, he suggested, would certainly be applied, and the department would be making an assessment of student progress. The motion passed.

**GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE  
MEETING 6-29-99**

Absent: Castronovo, Funk, Harvey, Mauch, Reiff, Tessier

Bill Jenkins welcomed John Usis from Biological Sciences to the meeting. He explained that the committee has some concern about the 4 sh required for the A&S 2600 course instead of 3. Usis explained that the course had been taught this past spring as a 4qh course, but with only two-thirds of the material. Also the course would have lecture blended in, probably at the 2 hours per week level. He believed that the course merited 4 sh, and that students would be happy about getting that number of credits for the amount of work required in the course.

Jeanette Garr raised a question about the amount of actual science material that a student would learn in such a course. It was explained that each science department would also have a more traditional content course as an introductory survey general education course. Students would have to take one of the intro courses and A&S 2600. She was still concerned about the amount of science that the average student would have prior to graduation.

Nancy Mosca asked why the course proposal did not have any reflection of the extra material. She also expressed concern for the music program, based on her conversation with Darla Funk. As an intensive program, it would not be easy for music to absorb the extra hour.

Allen Hunter argued that the course was fairly typical around the country in terms of science offerings and the credit, and that it did merit 4 sh. He also explained that there would be a challenging level of science material for the non-science student.

The committee did not consider any motion regarding the course. Some of the committee members were going to check with programs in their colleges regarding the impact on their programs. It was pointed out that this course would not affect any program related to science.

## GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE MINUTES 7-21-99

Absent: Funk, Garr, Harvey, Hunter, Mauch, Mosca

Charles Singler, assistant to the Dean of A&S and professor of Geology, was present to discuss the proposals for A&S 2600 and for science substitute courses. Joe Edwards, chair of the Music Department, was also there to discuss the A&S 2600 proposal. Singler began with the science substitute courses. He indicated that he had prepared a criteria statement and narrative that combined all of the substitute courses in the departments of biological sciences, chemistry, geology, and physics. For each department he had included a list of the courses being submitted for approval as substitutes, and sheets sent to the University Curriculum Committee and the Academic Programs Committee to show that these courses had been approved. For some courses there was a syllabus, primarily from biological sciences. When asked why he had not included syllabi for each course, he suggested that such could be provided, but they would be for the present quarter courses. The science departments had to spend time getting their programs ready, and negotiating with other departments. Hence, they could not provide the course syllabi at this time, especially since many faculty were away. Tessier pointed out that the committee had utilized the syllabi from all other course proposals as a means of determining whether the proposal met the goals of the domain. The present proposal did not provide enough information for her to determine what she considered to be her job on this committee. Maraffa indicated that his department, which had some science offerings, was preparing a complete package. He queried as to why his department should have to go to such lengths, and not the science departments. Singler felt that there was sufficient information there, and that we would not be able to get a finished proposal until the fall because of the absence of faculty. Jenkins asked Singler to provide what syllabi he could, but indicated that the committee would decide what needed to be included. Singler asked to be included at the time of discussion of this matter, but Jenkins said no. Singler requested that the committee allow him to be present. It was decided to proceed with the 2600 proposal first.

Jenkins then began a discussion of the A&S 2600 proposal. He noted that John Usis had made a presentation at a previous meeting. His basic arguments were that other science department at other universities had 4 S.H. courses, and that, considering the need to present content through lecture, the course required that many hours. There were a number of comments from committee members that no one had a problem with the content of the course, but with the extra credit hour. Joe Edwards commented that it was a particular problem for the music education program, but not for the performance area. Joe Antenucci had talked with the chairs of the business school, and they were opposed to the extra hour because it would raise the number of overall hours. He asked if it were possible to have a 2-credit lecture course, but Singler did not think so. Maraffa pointed out that the programs could also consider a 1-credit reduction in their offerings. Rando asked if it were possible to have an A and a B lab course each worth 3 S.H. Singler did not think that was appropriate, but he would discuss it with the science chairs. After much discussion, the meeting was adjourned because of the lack of a quorum. Jenkins indicated that at the next meeting the first order of business would be these issues and Singler's request to be present.

## **GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE MEETING 7-27-99**

Absent: Harvey, Mauch, Mosca, Rando

Jenkins began the meeting by noting that Allen Viehmeyer of the Foreign Languages and Literature department had raised an objection to some of the Communication and Theater course proposals. He explained to committee members that the handling of objections would follow the process in place for the University Curriculum Committee. In **STAGE ONE** the objector would meet informally with the proposing department. Such a discussion could lead to an agreement over changes in the proposal and/or to the withdrawal of the objection. GEC would review the changes if any for approval and appending to the Academic Senate agenda. In cases where no changes were made, the GEC would simply append. In **STAGE TWO** agreement has not been reached, and GEC holds a hearing with both parties. Each will have an opportunity to present its case, and to rebut arguments. If the two parties agree to changes in the proposal, the objection will be withdrawn, and the revised proposal appended to the Senate agenda. If agreement is not reached, the GEC will vote to certify or not to certify the proposal. In **STAGE THREE** an uncertified proposal will be returned to the department with comments on why it was not certified. A certified proposal will be taken to the Senate floor, and a motion made to certify. An objecting party may present its arguments at that time.

GEC then began to discuss the request of Charles Singler that he be present for our discussion and vote regarding the science proposals. Jenkins noted that Roberts' Rules of Order did permit a committee to set rules for attendance. There were many comments that fuller and frank discussion would occur if the GEC did not permit attendance, while others suggested that openness was a better policy. Maraffa made a motion and Tessier seconded that GEC deny Singler's request. The motion passed.

A&S 2600 – there was much discussion about the need for 4 credits. Those opposed to the 4 credits cited program needs in regard to hours, the lack of a choice for students who want only six hours, the fact that most general education courses are only 3 credits, a laboratory course that was taught for 4 credits under the quarter system but was not reduced under semesters, staffing, and internal disputes within the science departments as reasons for their opposition. Those in favor cited the validity of the content and process in the course, the fact that similar science courses at other semester institutions are 4 credits, and a grant as reasons for acceptance of the course proposal. GEC decided to return the course because it did not have a semester syllabus. GEC also wanted to know about the staffing problems, and whether it were possible to have alternative 3 credit hour laboratory courses. Finally, GEC is asking the science departments to re-examine the course as a 3-credit course. It does not appear that it will be certified without that change.

Science substitute courses – GEC discussed the proposal, and decided that it did not meet the needs of the committee. The committee referred it back to the proposing departments with directions that they include semester syllabi for each course, that the proposals come

from individual departments and for single courses or sequences only, that chairs sign in the appropriate place, and that more explanation be offered tailored to individual courses or sequences, particularly for the more advanced courses.

990027 – Jenkins commented that Bernie Mullin had created a new semester syllabus for the course, and that John Buoni had revised the number of sections needed. Tessier moved, Castronovo seconded, certification of the proposal. It passed.

990028 – Jenkins had talked about the syllabus to Tod Porter, chair of the Economics Department, who responded that he thought that it did provide sufficient information. Jenkins explained Porter's position. GEC, however, decided to return the proposal. Economics should focus upon how the syllabus indicates that it is meeting the criteria, what actually occurs in the Internet assignments, and more indication of how critical thinking is achieved in the assignments.

990033 – Jenkins explained that Sherry Linkon had not included a syllabus in the original proposal because of the individual nature of the course. She did agree, however, to guidelines, and ultimately converted them into a syllabus. The committee commented favorably on the capstone course. Tessier moved, Ritchey seconded, certification of the proposal. The motion passed.

990037 – GEOG 2626, a new proposal. The committee commented very favorably on the course. Ritchey moved, Tessier seconded, certification of the course. The motion passed.

Jenkins discussed when the next meeting would occur. It was decided to meet on Thursday, August 5<sup>th</sup>, at 2 PM. The meeting will begin with item #6 on the agenda of 7-14.

9900