

**GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE
MINUTES 1-26-01**

ABSENT: Maraffa

Oral communication intensive requirement – Jenkins indicated that the committee had wanted to discuss whether to reduce the requirement of two oral intensive courses. He introduced Dan O’Neill of Communications and Theater, who had worked with faculty and departments on the development of such courses. O’Neill remarked that many efforts had been made to encourage faculty to develop such courses, but that the time required for presentations and the recent swelling of class size had made it difficult to convince faculty to provide oral intensive courses. He indicated that he would not object if the number were reduced to one.

Phil Munro made a motion to recommend to the Academic Senate that it reduce the oral communication intensive course requirement from two to one; Young seconded. Sherri Lovelace-Cameron raised a question about whether oral intensive courses could have only one credit. Jenkins indicated, with general committee concurrence, that it would be ok if the course provided the same amount of work expected in the criteria. Julia Gergits asked how the other intensives. Jenkins said that the writing intensive courses were numerous enough, but the critical thinking were rather low. He did not think it appropriate to reduce the number of critical thinking intensives, though, because class size was not a problem, nor had he heard many complaints. Hence, he concluded that time was the key factor for faculty in the development of critical thinking intensive courses. Jim Pusch was against the motion. He feared going to the Senate to ask for a reduction, and the potential opening up of other changes. He thought that more time was warranted, and perhaps more contact with departments. Jenkins pointed out that workshops had been held, as well as the initiation of contact with departments. Tess Tessier indicated that she was satisfied with having one introductory course in oral communication and one intensive. Darla Funk pointed out that the original Gened Committee had not recommended the regular course. She believed that the two oral intensive requirements were compensation for that lack. However, once advocates of a course were successful in gaining Senate approval, no one returned to examining how many oral intensives were warranted. The motion passed, 10-1.

990271 – HPES 2698, Survey of Dance. Tessier moved, Castronovo seconded, a motion to certify. Amidst general comments favorable to the course, the motion passed.

990214 – ECON 3712, Macroeconomics. This course had been sent back as a critical thinking intensive course because of general agreement with Shipka’s commentary. The committee did not agree, however, that an extensive infusion of ethical questions was necessary. Mosca moved, Kasuganti seconded, a motion to certify. Motion passed.

Policy regarding student choice of general education requirements – Jenkins pointed out that the meeting last week, which approved of the recommended policy, did not have a quorum, and that action was needed at this meeting. Tessier moved, Pusch seconded, a motion to approve. Motion passed.

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE MINUTES 2-6-01

ABSENT: Lovelace-Cameron, Maraffa, Young

990230 – MECH 3762L, Design of Machine Elements Laboratory. Oral Communication Intensive. Jenkins reported on the concern that had led to the return of this course to the department, no indication of the process involved. There was general agreement that the department had upgraded the proposal. Castronovo moved, Funk seconded, a motion to certify pending submission of a syllabus that included a statement that the course satisfied the oral communication intensive requirement. Motion passed.

990232 – MECH 3762, Design of Machine Elements. Critical Thinking Intensive. Jenkins passed out a copy of Tom Shipka's earlier critique of the proposal. The committee found the changes in the proposal appropriate, but Darla Funk pointed out that the syllabus grading section did not have the value of the CTI portion as 30% of the grade. It was decided to return this course for clarification.

990257 – FNUTR 4858, Food Service Systems Management. Critical Thinking Intensive. Jenkins explained that he had misplaced the proposal, but that it was now with Shipka's review committee. He intended to review the proposal at the next meeting.

990272 – PHIL 3728, Engineering Ethics. Oral Communication Intensive. Dan O'Neill had reviewed the proposal, and found no problems. Mosca moved, Castronovo seconded, a motion to certify. Motion passed.

990274 – ECON 3710, Intermediate Microeconomic Systems. Critical Thinking Intensive. Jenkins noted that this course had not appeared before the committee, although there were some earlier notes. This had apparently happened as a result of the College of Arts and Sciences General Education Committee looking at the proposal first. The committee examined the recent Shipka review of the course proposal. GEC agreed that the syllabus should indicate that the course satisfies the critical thinking intensive requirement, but that should not hold up course approval. There was a debate over whether the statement, "It is difficult to enhance or to evaluate critical thinking skills without requiring a demonstration of reasoning in writing." Overall, the committee felt that there was sufficient material for inclusion as an CTI course. Mosca moved, Munro seconded, a motion to certify. Motion passed.

Options for transfer and re-enrolling credit in general education – Jenkins went over the two options that he intended to present to college advisors in a meeting later in the week. There was widespread acceptance of option two. Option one raised the following concerns: use of word *specific* with equates; problem of giving elective credit for general education courses when a number of degrees do not have electives. Jenkins indicated that these options were simply initial offerings, and that committee members should offer any possible alternatives. This policy will come before the committee again.

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE MEETING 2-16-01

ABSENT: Castronovo, Hannay, Kasuganti, Tessier.

990265 -- PSYCH 3755, Developmental Psychology I: Child. Jeff Coldren, one of the instructors in the course appeared to present his case for acceptance of the course in the general education program as part of the Personal and Social Responsibility domain. He talked about the fact that the course was for anyone, not just for certain majors. He compared this situation to that of Ford Motor Co. manufacturing a Crown Victoria. It was intended for everyone, but only certain people bought it, such as police departments. He also pointed out that the course was not organized chronologically by year, but by topic and school of thought, such as mechanism, organicism, and contextualism. Thus, it provided a broader coverage of psychological theories regarding development in general, something that could be applied to other stages of development.

Tom Maraffa pointed out that many upper division courses in the arts and sciences areas could contend that they were intended for a general audience. If the committee accepted this course, he asked, what could keep it from having to accept a large number of upper division courses, thereby defeating the purpose of general education reform. Coldren answered that the course should be considered on its own merits, and in light of the acceptance of two other psychology courses, Lifetime Development and Intimate Relations. He felt that his course was as broad as the others. Nancy Mosca asked about Development 2 and Development 3. Did the psychology department intend to submit them as well once Development 1 was accepted? Coldren could not speak for the others, but he did not see his course as the advance guard.

Maraffa also asked Coldren why the course would be hurt if it were not part of general education. Wouldn't students still take it, including education students. Coldren explained that many of the students did come from the education program, and that the school of education needed such a course to meet both state and general education standards, and yet not add to the number of courses needed to graduate. Jim Pusch indicated that he wanted to check with some of the faculty in education about this issue.

Jenkins indicated that GEC would discuss this proposal at the next meeting. He thanked Jeff Coldren for appearing.

990257, 990273 and 990274 had not been reviewed yet by the appropriate subcommittees, so their consideration would come at the next meeting.

990137 – MGT 3755, Managing Diversity. Jenkins indicated that this proposal had been sent back because of the lack of a second goal. The original proposal did address Goal 12, the diversity goal, but no other goal. The model, as passed by the Academic Senate, however, required courses that fit within the Societies & Institutions domain to feature Goal 11 as the centerpiece, and one other of Goals 10 or 12. It appeared to him that the course still did not do much with Goal 11, and that it was a course in the business school

designed to address the issue of managing diversity. Mosca wondered about diversity courses in nursing, education, or other majors, and whether we would then have to accept them once approval was given to this course. Both Pusch and Gergits felt that the course might have covered business from a society and institution viewpoint, but that it was not clearly presented. They asked that Anne **McMahon** be asked to come to the next meeting. It was decided to do so, but Jenkins wanted each member to think about Goal 11 and what it required, so that we could indicate to her what direction she would have to take.

The meeting lost a quorum. Jenkins announced that the next meeting would take place on Tuesday, February 27, at 3 PM.

**GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE
MINUTES 2-27-01**

ABSENT: Maraffa, Young

990257 – FNUTR 4848, Food Service Systems Management. Critical Thinking Intensive. Tom Shipka reported that this course fit all of the critical thinking requirements, except for the absence of a sentence in the syllabus indicating that the course was critical thinking intensive. Mosca moved, Funk seconded, a motion to certify pending submission of a syllabus with the designation. Motion passed.

990273 – PHYS 3704L, Modern Physics Laboratory. Writing Intensive. Jim Schramer had reviewed the proposal, and thought it approvable. He did suggest the inclusion in the syllabus of due dates for revisions and final papers. Gergits moved, Mosca seconded, a motion to certify. Motion passed.

990274 – MUSTC 3750, Analytical Techniques. Critical Thinking Intensive. Shipka had submitted a list of seven concerns regarding the proposal. The committee agreed that the syllabus needed to designate the course as critical thinking intensive, that there needed to be a fuller explanation of 5 a) to show that the course covered several critical thinking skills (not just problem solving), that the answer to 6 was unnecessary, that the credit for critical thinking exercises should total at least 30% of the grade, and that the answer to question 8 should be clarified. Also the course syllabus had incorrectly designated the course as writing intensive; it had not been submitted, nor approved as such. It was decided to return the course to the department for revision and resubmission. Darla Funk volunteered to talk with music faculty.

990276 – HMEC 4890, Communication of Contemporary Issues. Capstone. Questions arose about whether the course was indeed a capstone course. There was no indication that a student had to be a senior before taking the course, nor was it clear in the syllabus that the prerequisites or the assignments made this course a capstone. Although a motion was made and seconded, it was withdrawn until Jenkins could get some clarification about the prerequisites and the designation of the course as a capstone.

Jenkins passed out two new course proposals. The next meeting will be on Friday, March 2nd, at 2 pm. The agenda will include the course from the Psychology Department, Development I: the Child, and the Management course, Managing Diversity.

**GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE
MINUTES 2-27-01**

ABSENT: Maraffa, Young

990257 – FNUTR 4848, Food Service Systems Management. Critical Thinking Intensive. Tom Shipka reported that this course fit all of the critical thinking requirements, except for the absence of a sentence in the syllabus indicating that the course was critical thinking intensive. Mosca moved, Funk seconded, a motion to certify pending submission of a syllabus with the designation. Motion passed.

990273 – PHYS 3704L, Modern Physics Laboratory. Writing Intensive. Jim Schrarner had reviewed the proposal, and thought it approvable. He did suggest the inclusion in the syllabus of due dates for revisions and final papers. Gergits moved, Mosca seconded, a motion to certify. Motion passed.

990274 – MUSTC 3750, Analytical Techniques. Critical Thinking Intensive. Shipka had submitted a list of seven concerns regarding the proposal. The committee agreed that the syllabus needed to designate the course as critical thinking intensive, that there needed to be a fuller explanation of 5 a) to show that the course covered several critical thinking skills (not just problem solving), that the answer to 6 was unnecessary, that the credit for critical thinking exercises should total at least 30% of the grade, and that the answer to question 8 should be clarified. Also the course syllabus had incorrectly designated the course as writing intensive; it had not been submitted, nor approved as such. It was decided to return the course to the department for revision and resubmission. Darla Funk volunteered to talk with music faculty.

990276 – HMEC 4890, Communication of Contemporary Issues. Capstone. Questions arose about whether the course was indeed a capstone course. There was no indication that a student had to be a senior before taking the course, nor was it clear in the syllabus that the prerequisites or the assignments made this course a capstone. Although a motion was made and seconded, it was withdrawn until Jenkins could get some clarification about the prerequisites and the designation of the course as a capstone.

Jenkins passed out two new course proposals. The next meeting will be on Friday, March 2nd, at 2 pm. The agenda will include the course from the Psychology Department, Development I: the Child, and the Management course, Managing Diversity.

**GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE
MINUTES 2-27-01**

ABSENT: Maraffa, Young

990257 – FNUTR 4848, Food Service Systems Management. Critical Thinking Intensive. Tom Shipka reported that this course fit all of the critical thinking requirements, except for the absence of a sentence in the syllabus indicating that the course was critical thinking intensive. Mosca moved, Funk seconded, a motion to certify pending submission of a syllabus with the designation. Motion passed.

990273 – PHYS 3704L, Modern Physics Laboratory. Writing Intensive. Jim Schramer had reviewed the proposal, and thought it approvable. He did suggest the inclusion in the syllabus of due dates for revisions and final papers. Gergits moved, Mosca seconded, a motion to certify. Motion passed.

990274 – MUSTC 3750, Analytical Techniques. Critical Thinking Intensive. Shipka had submitted a list of seven concerns regarding the proposal. The committee agreed that the syllabus needed to designate the course as critical thinking intensive, that there needed to be a fuller explanation of 5 a) to show that the course covered several critical thinking skills (not just problem solving), that the answer to 6 was unnecessary, that the credit for critical thinking exercises should total at least 30% of the grade, and that the answer to question 8 should be clarified. Also the course syllabus had incorrectly designated the course as writing intensive; it had not been submitted, nor approved as such. It was decided to return the course to the department for revision and resubmission. Darla Funk volunteered to talk with music faculty.

990276 – HMEC 4890, Communication of Contemporary Issues. Capstone. Questions arose about whether the course was indeed a capstone course. There was no indication that a student had to be a senior before taking the course, nor was it clear in the syllabus that the prerequisites or the assignments made this course a capstone. Although a motion was made and seconded, it was withdrawn until Jenkins could get some clarification about the prerequisites and the designation of the course as a capstone.

Jenkins passed out two new course proposals. The next meeting will be on Friday, March 9, at 2 pm. The agenda will include the course from the Psychology Department, Development I: the Child, and the Management course, Managing Diversity.

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE MINUTES FOR 3-9-01

ABSENT: Castronovo, Gergits, Hannay, Kasuganti, Lovelace-Cameron, Young

Jenkins began the meeting with an announcement that this meeting would be the last for Thomas Maraffa. He congratulated Maraffa for his lengthy service (8 years), and for his many contributions to the development of the current general education program.

There was an extended discussion of when to hold meetings because of problems for so many with the present schedule. Jenkins suggested Thursdays at 3 pm; only Phil Munro would be absent. Phil indicated that he would be able to make some of the meetings. Darla Funk indicated that she would have some meetings with the School of Education. It was decided to proceed with the first Thursday after the break, March 22, at 3 pm.

990278 – CSCI 4890, Computer Projects. Capstone. Jenkins reported that this course had been submitted earlier as 990249, but the committee wanted a syllabus before giving approval. Although GEC recognized that this course was given on an individualized basis, it wanted to see guidelines that were common to all capstones offered under this title. Tessier moved, Pusch seconded, a motion to certify. Motion passed.

990279 – CIS 4840, Business System Analysis & Design. Capstone. Committee members did not think that the syllabus was reflective of what a capstone should be. They also wondered how the course fit into the CIS program. It was decided to return the course.

GEC discussed the guidelines for advising transfer and re-enrolled students. They favored most of the guidelines except for the provision that a department chair could reduce the intensive requirements and replace them with alternative assignments. A number of members spoke against requiring any replacement. They thought that at most such a replacement could only be encouraged. The result of the discussion was agreement with wording that "the department chair may adjust the number of intensives required."

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE MINUTES 3-22-01

ABSENT: Gergits, Tessier, and Young

990265 – Jenkins opened discussion on PSYCH 3755, Developmental Psychology I: Child. Jeff Coldren had appeared at the 2-16-01 meeting to argue that this course did fit under the Personal & Social Responsibility category. Castronovo commented that he had read the proposal and listened to Coldren, but he was not convinced that this course did provide a broad background in psychology. Kasuganti argued that a course on children was broad enough in the sense that everyone came into contact with children, and should know about their development. Mosca responded that the psychology course, Lifespan Development, did provide a broad coverage of human development, and included children; it was sufficiently broad, but not the course on child's development. Funk talked about Nancy Sweeney and her contention that a course on children was something that everyone should take. After much additional discussion, Castronovo moved, Kasuganti seconded, a motion to deny certification. Motion passed unanimously.

990137 – MGT 3755, Managing Diversity. Jenkins introduced Anne McMahon from Management, who was there to respond to committee concerns about this course. She responded to the concern that goal 12, the diversity goal, was covered, but not goal 11. Jenkins explained that the Academic Senate had made this goal the required focus of each course in that domain, just as goal 13 was the focus of natural science and goal 8 the focus of artistic and literary perspectives. McMahon noted that business was an institution, and that, as an institution, it played a major role in the creation of individual identity. To avoid being simply a business course, she presented materials from the census and from articles on racial identity. If it were merely a business course, it would emphasize the filling out of forms and other actions that business might undertake to deal with government regulation. Rather, the course used scholarly articles and material from other disciplines so that students might understand the theories, laws, and other social constructions underlying the focus on diversity.

Nancy Mosca asked about the course title, Managing Diversity, and cited it as a stumbling block. McMahon was willing to change it to Diversity in the Workplace if that would help. Funk wondered whether this course would look the same if it were a sociology course. Noting that she was a sociologist by training, McMahon indicated that it would be different, but that she had to tailor it to fit within the business curriculum, although it was not a required course. She wanted the course to achieve the goals of the college.

Jenkins indicated that the course was a very good one, but that it did not sufficiently develop goal 11. It only covered diversity within the business; hence, it was not sufficiently broad enough. He also suggested that it was a course to be taken for professional development in the school of business. North Central guidelines made it clear that students should not be taking courses in general education that prepared them specifically for a profession. He did think that the course should be taken by every

business major. There was also concern expressed that each professional school could handle diversity by identifying an institution associated with that profession, and developing a similar diversity course. The College of Health and Human Services could, for instance, develop a course on diversity in healthcare institutions. Jenkins argued that such courses should be required in the major, and not substitute for general education.

Sherri Lovelace-Cameron believed that the coverage was wider and even covered other institutions. McMahan had pointed out a particular exercise in which students examined their personal histories and the role of other institutions in the creation of their identity. Kasuganti spoke in favor of the course, contending that business was an institution and that the coverage was broad enough to warrant certification. He pointed out that all students should take such a course, because they would have to manage diverse populations. He considered such topics to be part of general education.

Jenkins thanked McMahan for appearing, and indicated that the final discussion and vote would occur at the next meeting. Problems of finding a date for the next meeting caused Jenkins to promise to find a convenient date when most of the committee members could be there. The meeting for Thursday, March 29th, was cancelled.

Subject: Next Meeting

Date: Tue, 06 Mar 2001 14:15:25 -0500

From: Bill Jenkins <wdjenkin@cc.ysu.edu>

Organization: Youngstown State University

To: Nancy Mosca <nwmosca@cc.ysu.edu>, Ram Kasuganti <rrkasuga@cc.ysu.edu>, Frank Castronovo <facastro@cc.ysu.edu>, James Pusch <jdpusch@cc.ysu.edu>, Philip Munro <pcmunro@cc.ysu.edu>, Tom Maraffa <f0029916@cc.ysu.edu>, Tess Tessier <ltessier@cc.ysu.edu>, Darla Funk <fr069001@ysub.ysu.edu>, Gergits Julia <jmgergit@cc.ysu.edu>, Warren Young <amphys02@ysub.ysu.edu>, Sherri Lovelace-Cameron <srlovela@cc.ysu.edu>, Brynn Hannay <Berte48@AOL.com>

Our next meeting will be this Friday, March 9th (please correct the minutes which mistakenly listed the meeting as being on March 2nd).

Agenda: 1) 990230, MECH 3762L, writing intensive.
990232, MECH 3762, critical thinking.
990277, HMEC 3780, critical thinking
990278 CSIS 4890, capstone
990279, CSIS 4840, capstone

2) Discussion of 990265, PSYCH 3755, Developmental Psychology: the Child, and Jeff Coldren's response to our concerns.

3) Anne McMahon will come to discuss the Managing Diversity course as part of societies & institutions.

4) discussion of the guidelines for transfer and re-enrolling students. See below, which is a result of talking with Deans Council.

GENERAL EDUCATION ADVISEMENT
FOR TRANSFER AND RE-ENROLLING STUDENTS

The twin objectives are 1) to give as much gened credit to these students as possible and 2) to have guidelines that will cover all colleges except for program and major requirements that a student has to take even though they may also be general education courses.

GUIDELINES --

Each college dean will designate one or more advisors responsible for approving general education credits for transfer or re-enrolling students. The advisor's approval will constitute the official record for the transfer or re-enrolling student regarding general education credit. Such advisors will check the student transcript for all courses that would have counted under the general education requirements in existence prior to the fall of 2000. The advisor will then take the following steps: 1) Give credit for courses that equate to courses under the new model implemented in the fall of 2000. 2) Give credit for the remaining courses when they fit into an appropriate domain even though there is no specific equate. The advisor should check to see where courses from a department fit under the new model. Psychology, for example, is now under personal and social responsibility. Only give credit up to the limits imposed on each domain. 3) Give elective credits for as many of the remaining courses as possible.

The advisor will then examine what remains as unfinished under the new model, and advise the student to fill in any gaps in the following order:

- 1) Finish all basic skill courses.
- 2) Finish the minimum number of courses required in each domain.

selected elements

3) Finish the total number of courses required overall.

Transfer and re-enrolling students will also be expected to complete the intensive requirements. Dependent upon the hours a student has already completed and the availability of intensive courses, the department chair may ~~adjust~~ ^{adjust} the number of intensives required and replace them with alternative writing, speaking, or critical thinking assignments that can be completed in the hours (courses) remaining. Each student must complete the capstone course at Youngstown State University.

courses
for
for

Problems that we need to deal with include: 1) what happens if a student enters through an advisor outside Arts and Science, and then transfers into a college which has added to the general education requirements provisions that a student must take two departments in each domain, and that the student may not count general education courses from the major as part of a domain?; 2) should the chair be the only decision maker in regard to intensives?; 3) should we indicate that deans can grant exceptions?

See you on Friday. If you can not make it, have a restful spring break.

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE MEETING 4-26-01

ABSENT: Funk, Kasuganti, Young

The meeting consisted of the consideration of course applications.

990280 – ECEGR 2611, Instrumentation and Computation Lab. Shipka approved of the course as critical thinking intensive. Tessier moved, Pusch seconded, certification. Motion passed.

990281 – NURS 4852, Senior Capstone Seminar. Gergits moved, Mosca seconded, a motion to certify. Motion passed.

990282 – NURS 4842, Mental Health Nursing. Schramer approved except for the inclusion of the designation of writing intensive in the syllabus. Mosca moved, Castronovo seconded, a motion to certify. Motion passed.

990283 – CHFAM 3731, Individual & Family Development. Schramer approved. Mosca moved, Pusch seconded, a motion to certify. Motion passed. Needs to include designation as writing intensive on syllabus.

990284 – PSYCH 3761L, Cognition Laboratory. Schramer approved. Gergits moved, Tessier seconded, a motion to certify. Motion passed. Needs to include designation as writing intensive on syllabus.

990285 – ACCTG 4808, Auditing. Dan O'Neill approved. Gergits moved, Riley seconded, a motion to certify. Motion passed. Needs to include designation as oral communication intensive on syllabus.

990286 – ACCTG 3702, Intermediate Accounting II. Schramer approved. Tessier moved, Gergits seconded, a motion to certify. Motion passed. Needs to include designation as writing intensive on syllabus.

990287 – ACCTG 4814, Federal Taxation II. Schramer approved. Pusch moved, Gergits seconded, a motion to certify. Motion passed. Needs to include designation as writing intensive on syllabus.

990288 – FIN 4836, Financial Markets. Schramer approved. Munro moved, Riley seconded, a motion to certify. Motion passed. Needs to include designation as writing intensive on syllabus.

990289 – FIN 4853, Financial Analysis. Mosca noted that there was little on the syllabus to substantiate what was in the answers to the application questions. Course will be returned to department for action on syllabus.

990290 – ACCTG 4801, Advanced Accounting. Shipka approved. Munro moved, Tessier seconded, a motion to certify. Motion passed. Needs to include designation as critical thinking intensive on syllabus.

990291 – ACCTG 4813, Federal Taxation I. Shipka approved. Tessier moved, Castronovo seconded, a motion to certify. Motion passed. Needs to include designation as critical thinking intensive on syllabus.

990292 – Fin 3721, Financial Management. Castronovo moved, Tessier seconded, a motion to certify. Motion passed. Needs to include designation as critical thinking intensive on syllabus.

990293 – Fin 4835, Advanced Business Finance. Shipka approved. Riley moved, Lovelace-Cameron seconded, a motion to certify. Motion passed. Needs to include designation as critical thinking intensive on syllabus.

990294 – NURS 3749, Nursing Research. Schrarner approved as writing intensive, but noted that the syllabus included a spring presentation at Quest. Mosca indicated that she thought the syllabus would change in the fall. Pusch moved, Mosca seconded, a motion to certify. Motion passed. Needs to include designation as writing intensive on syllabus.

990232 – MECH 3762, Design of Machine Elements. Jenkins indicated that the syllabus had been corrected to reflect the fact that critical thinking assignments constituted more than 30% of the overall grade. Funk moved, Munro seconded, a motion to certify. Motion passed.

This page is a corrected page from the 4/26/01 meeting.

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE MINUTES 5-10-01

ABSENT: Hannay, Mosca, Pusch, Tessier, Young

- 1) 990115 -- CHFAM 3751, Individual and Family Development. Jenkins explained that this course was on the 3700 level; it had not been looked at earlier because the committee had decided to deal with regular general education courses and intensive applications first. He noted that the application did not explain how the course met the goals listed for societies and institutions. Moreover, it designated PSYCH 1560 as a prerequisite, which suggested that it was more of a Personal and Social Responsibility course. Jenkins also pointed out that the PSR domain was in need of courses. Committee members then questioned the listing of faculty available to teach the course. Neither Nissen, nor Pavia, would be available, and the instructor listed on the submitted syllabus was a limited service instructor, Dr. Janice Chebra. Jenkins was to discuss these matters with the chair of Human Ecology, Jean Hassell.
- 2) 990295 -- ITALN 3720, Advanced Grammar & Composition WI. Jim Schramer approved of this course. Castronovo moved, Gergits seconded, a motion to certify. Motion passed.
- 3) 990296 -- ITALN 4840, Literature of 20th Century WI. Schramer approved. Gergits moved, Lovelace-Cameron seconded, a motion to certify. Motion passed.
- 4) 990297 -- ITALN 3730, Conversation OCI. Dan O'Neill was concerned about the oral presentation in this course; he believed that there was not enough evidence of the oral presentation being more than conversational. Gergits and Lovelace-Cameron, however, pointed out parts of the syllabus that might indeed fulfill the criteria for the oral communication intensive area. The committee decided to have Jenkins discuss the matter with Dan O'Neill. There was also a need to obtain the 3rd and 4th pages of the syllabus from Foreign Languages.
- 5) 990298 -- HIST 3790, English History I WI. Schramer approved. Kasuganti moved, Riley seconded, a motion to certify. Motion passed.
- 6) 990299 -- HIST 3791, English History II WI. Schramer approved. Gergits moved, Lovelace-Cameron seconded, a motion to certify. Motion passed.
- 7) 990300 -- HIST 3726, History of Women in the US WI. Schramer approved. Gergits moved, Castronovo seconded, a motion to certify. Motion passed.
- 8) 990274 -- MUSTC 3750, Analytical Techniques (returned application). Darla Funk talked about the new syllabus, and how it had been redesigned to satisfy Tom Shipka's concerns. Gergits moved, Funk seconded, a motion to certify. Motion passed.

The committee discussed the next meeting. A particular problem was getting enough members to vote on the ~~Managing~~ Diversity course. Jenkins had postponed consideration of the course earlier in the meeting because there were only 8 people present. There was some discussion of having a ballot for those who could not be present, but the committee decided to have a meeting the first Monday or Tuesday of the summer session, and to have those who were there vote regardless of the number. **Our next meeting will be on Monday, May 21, 2001, in the Provost's Conference Room at 1 pm. There will be lunch at the Inner Circle around noon.**

**GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE
MEETING 6-4-01**

ABSENT: Hannay

990137 – MGT 3755, Managing Diversity. Jenkins proposed that he discuss the problems with accepting the course as part of the societies and institutions domain, Ram Kasuganti discuss the arguments in favor of the proposal, and then follow up with a general discussion. Jenkins began by pointing out that when the Academic Senate accepted the model, it had made one goal the center of each of the domains. In the case of societies and institutions, that goal was goal 11, which he then quoted. Goal 11 required a broader coverage of the relations of societies and institutions than the simple coverage of a diversity topic. He compared it to the science area, where goal 13 was the centerpiece. There had been a course earlier called Women in Science, which had been placed in the special topics domain rather than natural science because it did not provide a broader coverage of science as asked for in goal 13. Jenkins then went through the course syllabus to demonstrate that there were only goals, texts, and topics that spoke of diversity, and not of a broader coverage of business as an institutional part of society(s). Finally, Jenkins noted the title of the course, Managing Diversity, as an indication that it was more of a course for business majors. He recommended that the Business School make it a requirement for its majors, especially since, as demonstrated in the section on the section of the syllabus entitled Relation to Department Goals and College Competencies, the course was meant to fulfill many of the goals of the business school in terms of its curriculum. This constituted a clear violation of the definition of the North Central Association that a general education course "is a part of every student's course of study, regardless of his or her area of emphasis, and it is intended to impart common knowledge, intellectual concepts, and attitudes that every educated person should possess." This kind of course is not a course for the music major, the HPES major, the teacher, or a variety of other majors.

Ram Kasuganti began with his sense that the course was being excluded just because of the department that it came from. He contended that business was an institution and that fact made it a part of the societies and institutions domain. As a matter of fact, it was the preponderant institution within society, an institution to which most people were connected. He believed that the course would be of assistance to any student who took it. Moreover, managing was not a word associated only with business; he argued that it had a broader meaning, that it was a generic word. He then read from a variety of topic descriptions in the syllabus, and contended that these topics covered diversity but within an institutional context, and not just the institution of business. The topics could be related to a variety of institutional settings. Finally, he noted that the course was not a requirement in the business school, but an elective. Hence, it was not necessarily for business majors. As a matter of fact, in the two sections offered per semester, there were more students from areas than business in the course.

Kasuganti moved and Tessier seconded a motion to certify the course as part of the societies and institutions domain. Tessier asserted that the course did cover goal 11.

There was no doubt in her mind. She compared the situation for the course to a Catch 22. Nancy Mosca observed that the course, in her mind, was similar to the Child Development Course, that it was too narrow, and therefore that it was not a gened course. Frank Castronovo felt that the course did cover goal 11, that it covered an institution, and that it would benefit every student if he or she were to take it. Teri Riley spoke against the course. She did not feel that it covered goal #11, and that it was narrowly focused on diversity, albeit in a business context. Tessier tried to find courses certified earlier as similar to the Managing Diversity course, but could not do so.

Jenkins asked for a show of hands, and the course passed by a 7-5 vote. It was decided to ask Anne McMahon if she wanted to rename the course.

990289 – FIN 4853, Financial Analysis. This course syllabus was returned because it did not refer sufficiently either to the requirement or to the writing process. The committee was satisfied with the new syllabus. Castronovo moved, Riley seconded, a motion to certify. Motion passed.

990301 – HPES 4820, Research Design and Statistics. Critical Thinking. Jenkins reported that Shipka had reviewed the course and commented that section 5A needed a more complete answer to reflect the types of critical thinking. This comment had been shared with Rick Walker, chair of HPES, who had submitted a changed section 5A from the instructor. Gergits moved, Munro seconded, a motion to certify. Motion passed.

990302 – HPES 3767, Teaching Behavior P-12 Curriculum. Writing Intensive. Course needs to have a statement about meeting writing intensive requirement. It also lacks material in the syllabus about the writing process.

990303 and 99305 – HPES 4810, Clinical Exercise Practicum. Writing Intensive and Oral Communication Intensive. Jenkins indicated that the committee should make preliminary comments only since the course was attempting to satisfy two categories. It would be the first course to do so. He asked that they review the courses for the next meeting. The committee had questions about the fact that exams were cited as examples of oral presentations, and about the Fit 5's as well. Also there was a question about whether either the writing or the oral communication constituted 30% of the grade.

990304 – HPES 2625, Pedagogical Aspects of Exercise Science. Oral Communication Intensive. Course needs statement about meeting the oral communication intensive requirement. Tessier moved, Mosca seconded, a motion to certify. Motion passed.

990306 – HPES 4876, Teaching of Pre-K Elementary Education. Oral Communication Intensive. Course needs statement about meeting the oral communication intensive requirement. Tessier moved, Mosca seconded, a motion to certify. Motion passed.

990307 – HPES 3710L, Physiology of Exercise Laboratory. Writing Intensive. Jim Schramer reported positively on this course, but wanted a statement of how many lab reports were required, and the minimum number of words. Munro objected saying that

lab reports usually went over minimums. His concern was that the statement of a minimum would encourage students to meet the minimum only. Committee members were not as concerned about the number of words and reports. Gergits moved, Munro seconded, a motion to certify. Motion passed with an addendum that the course must state that it is a writing intensive course.

Gergits, Tess, Hamray, Pusch, Funk

990277--HMEC 3780, Consumer Economics, critical thinking Hassell's letter - ok

ok 990297--ITALN 3730, Conversation, oral communication intensive
Dan O'mull NM¹ PM² Motion Passes.

990303 and 305, HPES 4810, Clinical Exercise Practicum, as both writing and oral communication intensive. Need corrections

ok Calla 990308--ISEGR 3720, Statistical Quality Control, critical thinking
PM¹ FC² Motion Passes

ok Calla 990309--ISEGR 5820, Advanced Quality for Engineers, critical thinking
PM¹ FC² Motion Passes

✓ 990310--THTR 4891, History of Theater, writing intensive
NM¹ WY² - Motion Passes

✓ 990311--THTR 4860, Dramatic Texts, writing in
LT¹ NM² - Motion Passes

3 990312--PHYS 3705L, Thermodynamics & Classified Statistical Mechanics, writing intensive
NM¹ LT² 1 bad suggestion 2, 3
Motion Passes

N^o 990313--CHEM 3739&3740, Physical Chemistry I&II, writing intensive

OC 1 11
W 1 11111
CT 111

Each student in each course.

No 990314--CHEM 3739&3740, Physical Chemistry I&II, critical thinking

Student getting 1 credit instead of two

990315--PHYS 3742, Electromagnetic Field Theory II, critical thinking

LT² Critical thinking. Motion passes ^{Jeff on} 30/10

990316--FNLG 1500, Introduction to Foreign Languages, Special Topics

Outzone

990317--COMM 3756, Interviewing, oral communication intensive

FCI NM² Motion passes

990318--COMM 4855, Interpersonal Communication Theory & Practice, writing intensive

JG1 RE Motion passes

990319--COMM 4859, Organizational Communication Theory & Practice, writing intensive

LT¹ JG² Motion passes

990320--COMM 5852, Group Communication Theory & Practice, writing intensive

JG¹ TR² Motion passes

990321--COMM 3754, Argumentation, critical thinking

990322--ANTHRO 4801, Anthropological Thought, critical thinking

ITALN 4840, Literature of the 20th C.
now 3750

YOUNGSTOWN STATE UNIVERSITY

Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures

To: Dr. William Jenkins, Coordinator
General Education Requirements

From: Allen Viehrmeyer *AV*
Chair, Foreign Languages and Literatures

Date: July 30, 2001

Subject: Change in Course Number

Please be advised that ITALN 4840, *Literature of the 20th Century*, has been officially renumbered as ITALN 3750. No content was changed.

Since ITALN 4840 was approved as a writing intensive course (990296), I assume that ITALN 3750 will retain that status without being resubmitted.

**GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE
MEETING 8-15-01**

ABSENT: Funk, Hannay

Jenkins welcomed the committee members back, and began discussion of recently submitted course proposals.

990277--HMEC 3780, Consumer Economics, critical thinking. Jenkins explained that Human Ecology had submitted the name of a part-time instructor (now a temporary instructor, who had taught for the department for ten years), Barbara Snyder. They had no full-time faculty member to teach this already approved course. Jenkins indicated that she would meet with Jim Schramer to discuss the requirements of a writing intensive course. It was pointed out that Human Ecology was asking this permission for a different course, 990283 – CHFAM 3731, Individual and Family Development. Jenkins noted the error, and has since checked the records, and found that 990283 was indeed the course. Since it had already passed with certification, the committee agreed that it would be appropriate to permit Snyder to teach it as writing intensive given the lack of full-time faculty in the department.

990297--ITALN 3730, Conversation, oral communication intensive. Jenkins noted that Dan O'Neill had submitted a number of objections to this course, but had withdrawn his objections upon further reading of the proposal, and after some questions had been raised by the committee. Mosca moved and Munro seconded a motion to certify. Motion passed.

990303 and 305, HPES 4810, Clinical Exercise Practicum, as both writing and oral communication intensive. Jenkins pointed out that we had looked at these courses at the previous meeting, and had postponed consideration because the same course was seeking double intensive certification. Mosca pointed out that there were also a number of questions raised. Jenkins noted that Jennifer Pintar had changed her proposal to answer committee questions, and the new proposal forms had been circulated. Because some members did not have the resubmitted proposal, it was decided to postpone consideration until the next meeting.

990308--ISEGR 3720, Statistical Quality Control, critical thinking. Jenkins explained that Marty Cala had resubmitted his proposals that day, and passed out copies. Cala had decided to eliminate any other goals in response to question 4, and had provided a lengthy answer to question 5a). Jenkins had talked extensively with Cala about the proposals, and recommended approval. Munro moved and Castronovo seconded a motion to certify. Motion passed.

990309--ISEGR 5820, Advanced Quality for Engineers, critical thinking. Munro moved and Castronovo seconded a motion to certify. Motion passed.

990310--THTR 4891, History of Theater, writing intensive. Jim Schramer praised the proposal and recommended approval. Mosca moved and Young seconded a motion to certify. Motion passed.

990311--THTR 4860, Dramatic Texts, writing intensive. Schramer was equally in favor of this proposal. Tessier moved and Mosca seconded a motion to certify. Motion passed.

990312--PHYS 3705L, Thermodynamics & Classified Statistical Mechanics, writing intensive. Schramer recommended approval, but requested that the instructor include a statement that the course satisfies the writing intensive requirement, and that the syllabus include an assigned number of words for each lab report, and due dates on the course calendar for lab reports. Mosca made and Tessier seconded a motion to certify with the requirement to add the writing intensive statement included, but changing items two and three (number of words and due dates) to suggestions. Motion passed.

990313--CHEM 3739&3740, Physical Chemistry I&II, writing intensive
990314--CHEM 3739&3740, Physical Chemistry I&II, critical thinking. Jenkins explained that the reports on these courses raised some major concerns, and so he had forwarded them to Steve Schildcrout. Since there had not been enough time for Chemistry to respond, the committee would not consider these proposals today. There was some confusion about whether Chemistry was seeking credit for one writing intensive course spread over two courses, or whether it was for two writing intensive courses. The same question applied to the critical thinking intensive proposals. Jenkins said he would check with Schildcrout about Chemistry/s intent.

990315--PHYS 3742, Electromagnetic Field Theory II, critical thinking. Shipka endorsed the course proposal. Gergits moved and Tessier seconded a motion to certify. It was pointed out that the syllabus did not indicate that 30% of the grade was related to critical thinking exercises. Munro said it would be hard to accomplish that task in engineering. Jenkins suggested that they approve the course, and that he have Jeff Carroll submit the course syllabus with the grading distribution as a follow-up. Motion passed.

990316--FNLG 1500, Introduction to Foreign Languages, Special Topics. Since members had not seen this course prior to the meeting, Jenkins suggested, because it was for the Special Topics domain, that consideration be postponed until the next meeting. The committee agreed.

990317--COMM 3756, Interviewing, oral communication intensive. Castronovo moved and Mosca seconded a motion to certify. Jenkins pointed out that there was no review from Dan O'Neill because his department was directly involved. Teri Riley raised a question about the number of minutes spent on oral presentations. Sherri Lovelace-Cameron responded with the observation that tests normally did not take up that much time in a course. It was also observed that practice occurred prior to the formal presentation. Motion passed.

990318—COMM 4855, Interpersonal Communication Theory & Practice, writing intensive. Schamer recommended approval subject to the inclusion of a sentence indicating that the course satisfied the writing intensive requirement in the syllabus, and the expected number of words for each assignment. Gergits moved and Kasuganti seconded a motion to certify. It was understood that the inclusion of the number of words was a suggestion only. Motion passed.

990319—COMM 4859, Organizational Communication Theory & Practice, writing intensive. Schramer approved except for the same two recommendations applied to the previous course. Tessier moved and Gergits seconded a motion to certify with the same understanding as in the previous motion. Motion passed.

990320—COMM 5852, Group Communication Theory & Practice, writing intensive. Schramer approved subject to the instructor adding a sentence about meeting the writing intensive requirement, the number of words for each assignment, and the due dates on the course calendar. Gergits moved and Riley seconded a motion to certify with only the first Schramer suggestion being required, and the others remaining as suggestions.

990321—COMM 3754, Argumentation, critical thinking.

990322—ANTHRO 4801, Anthropological Thought, critical thinking. Jenkins said that these courses would not be covered today because the first course was still being examined by the department in light of comments from Tom Shipka. The second proposals had not been reviewed yet.

Jenkins announced that the new provost would be meeting with the committee in the early fall. Jenkins will be sending out time sheets, and asks that everyone return them quickly.

**GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE
MINUTES 9-7-01**

ABSENT: Castronovo, Mosca, Tessier, Young

Jenkins opened the meeting with a discussion of the AGLS conference in Pittsburgh on October 11, 12, and 13. He encouraged everyone to go, especially those who had not been to a convention before. The General Education budget will pay for travel, meals, registration, the hotel, or for whatever the traveler needs to do. The hotel reservation has to be in by Monday, September 10, and the registration by Wednesday, September 19th.

Course Proposals:

1) 990277 – HMEC 3780, Consumer Economics, applying for critical thinking intensive. This course was not considered earlier because it did not have a syllabus. We have finally received a copy of the syllabus from the Human Ecology Department. Jenkins passed out the syllabus and indicated that the course would be reviewed at the meeting after the hearing on Managing Diversity.

2) 990303 and 990305 – HPES 4810, Clinical Exercise Practicum, applying for writing and oral intensive. Jenkins pointed out that this was the first time that we were considering the same course for two designations in the intensive category. We had sent a signal that we would examine that possibility dependent on the ability of the instructor to cover both areas per the requirements. Gergits raised a question about the drafting process. The instructor, Jennifer Pinter, had a paragraph that talked about a session on the drafting process, but there did not appear to be a follow through on actual employment of the drafting process. It was decided that Jenkins would ask Pinter about the inclusion of an actual drafting process. Gergits moved and Kasuganti seconded, a motion to certify the courses as oral communication intensive. Jenkins explained that earlier questions about the exam and the Fit 5's had been cleared up in the resubmitted proposal, and that the syllabus clearly indicated that the oral communication counted as 30% of the course grade. Motion passed.

3) 990313 – CHEM 3739 & 3740, Physical Chemistry I and II, applying for writing intensive. 990314 – CHEM 3730 & 3740, Physical Chemistry I and II, applying for critical thinking intensive. See Shipka remarks.

This department may have a problem with amount of credit for writing and so will consider having one credit for two courses. Lovelace-Cameron asked about the granting of writing intensive credit to labs that stand alone. She noted that it would be difficult for Chemistry to separate the course and the lab, but, if it were done, the department would have something comparable to lab courses already passed by the committee. Lovelace-Cameron also asked why it was not appropriate to have students get correction on one paper, and then be expected to write better on a second, third or later paper. Gergits explained that students often submitted a first **draft** as their effort in many classes. The drafting process was intended to demonstrate the value of drafting and editing each paper prior to handing it in. She also felt that it was not necessary to have every assignment

linked to a draft. The instructor could employ both drafting and some expectation that the student would show improvement on a later paper.

Jenkins talked about the response of Chemistry to the reports from Schramer and Shipka. They had changed the proposal regarding critical thinking, but had not submitted a new syllabus for Physical Chemistry II. In regard to the drafting process, they had agreed with Schramer that they could have drafts for some of the reports, but had not submitted the second syllabus yet. In addition, they were talking about the fact that the lab counted as only 1/6th of the total grade, and hence did not meet the guideline of 30%. They were to get back to him regarding whether they would increase the percentage or ask for credit for one WI credit only over the two courses. It is also possible to consider the relationship of lab courses that stand alone to what Chemistry is doing. Munro asked whether the courses could each count as .5. It was indicated that we would have to discuss this question when the new package was submitted.

- 4) 990316 – FNLG 1500, Introduction to Foreign Language Study, applying for special topics domain. Concerns were expressed about the level of the course, an intro course to foreign language study, about whether the course actually met multiple goals, and about the interdisciplinary nature of the course. Jenkins explained that the domain was originally designed to promote interdisciplinary courses, but had lost its direction when there was a demand for more electives to allow programs or majors that needed extra courses in other domains to have them. A student could choose either a course that satisfied the selected topics standards or another course from a selected group of other domains. He also pointed out that the combining of goals required in the special topics area applied to goals 4 through 13, and not goals 1 through 3, which all gened courses should try to incorporate. It was decided to invite the foreign language department to come to a general education meeting.
- 5) 990321 – COMM 3754, Argumentation, applying for critical thinking. See Shipka comments. The Communication & Theater department had not resubmitted this course yet.
- 6) 990322 – ANTHRO 4801, Anthropological Thought, applying for critical thinking intensive. See Shipka comments. The department had not resubmitted yet, so there was no consideration of this proposal.
- 7) 990323 – HMEC 4890, Communication of Contemporary Issues, applying for oral communication intensive. Enthusiastically approved by D. O'Neill. Pusch moved, and Munro seconded, a motion to certify. Motion passed.
- 8) 990324 – MUSTC 2632, Theory 2, applying for critical thinking intensive.
990325 – THTR 3762, Directing 1, applying for critical thinking intensive.
990326 – THTR 5864, Directing 2, applying for critical thinking intensive. There was no feedback yet from the intensive evaluators, so these courses were not considered.

Next week's meeting at 9 am will be a hearing on the Managing Diversity course.

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE MEETING 9/14/01

PRESENT: Castronovo, DeVico, Funk, Gergits, Jenkins, Kasuganti, Lovelace-Cameron, Mosca, Munro, Pusch, Riley, Tessier, Young

ABSENT: Fleming

Jenkins opened the meeting, and welcomed Deena DeVico as a student government appointed representative to the General Education Committee. There was another appointee, Katie Flemming, who had class at this time. Since no representative from Artistic and Literary Perspectives had been found, Darla Funk was sitting in since she was also familiar with the issues of the hearing.

Jenkins laid out the procedures of a hearing as passed by the Academic Senate this past year. He then introduced Anne McMahon, who was the designer of the course proposal, Qi Jiang from Sociology & Anthropology, Martha Pallante from History, and Tom Maraffa from Geography. Each of the objectors, Jiang, Pallante, and Maraffa, spoke first. They cited the need for general education to have courses aimed at a general audience rather than upper division courses, North Central's definition of general education, the fact that the Senate model calls for goal 11 to be the central goal of each course in the societies and institutions domain, the highly specialized content of the course, and the labeling of business as more of an organization than an institution.

Anne McMahon and Ram Kasuganti spoke on behalf of the proposals. Their arguments included: the fact that gened did have upper division courses already, the emphasis of the course on how business and organization created constructs of diversity rather than simply diversity, the usage of theories of diversity, the use of data and numbers and the lack of firm specific applications, the need to permit a course that is credible and informed into general education, explanations of how the North Central definition fits this course, its general student body (beyond business students), the common knowledge that it would provide for all students, its application to many organizations, the number of sections (3 which is more than some offerings already approved), the sense that this course on the 3700 level would be very appropriate for students who had matured through the taking of other course work and could apply its principles more readily, and the emphasis of the course on political, economic, and social processes in an institutional context.

During their rebuttal time the objectors made the following points. They argued that goal 11 was central to the fulfillment of the societies & institutions domain, not goal 12, and that the proposal placed goal 12 as the central goal. Moreover, goal 11 was much broader and intended more coverage than the examination of a particular social process within an institutional context. Martha Pallante pointed out that, as a member of the NCATE team, she was particularly concerned about their definition of general education and that fact that they looked for breadth not narrow coverage. She believed that the course belonged in Special Topics, Domain E, particularly because of the dearth of offerings in that area. She had advised many students and found that they took two SI courses quickly in their

freshmen year, and needed more assistance in the Artistic and Literary Perspectives area and in Special Topics. Qi Jiang observed that this course was more a course at the professional level. She was not comfortable with a course that examined social processes in an institutional context. That was not consistent with what Goal 11 asked for. She felt that courses should not simply find a way to fit within a domain; rather, they should follow the criteria fully.

McMahon rebutted that her course had not been designed for the special topics domain. It was built to be part of the societies & institutions domain. She labeled her course a study of the construction of institutionalized identities. She noted that all courses in each of the domains did not satisfy the entire goal. They took a focus point around which they could organize the material, and covered many things, but not the goal in a comprehensive way. Her focal point was diversity, and hence was narrow in a way that many gened courses were narrow. Ram Kasuganti declined to comment further.

During the questioning period, Nancy Mosca asked what the number of upper division courses was in the SI domain (answer was none), how many times the course had been offered (3 times in 2000-2001, and 3 times this academic year), and what the diversity initiatives were? McMahon explained that the diversity committee was putting together a freshmen-sophomore level course on diversity to submit for general education certification, and that it intended to submit it in the special topics domain. It was also noted at this time that the course was an oral intensive course, yet had more than 25 students per section. McMahon stated that there were only 28 students in the course presently. Julia Gergits asked for a further explanation of the institution versus organization argument. Jiang commented that institutions, at least in sociological theory, were broader than business and that goal 11 called for this type of broadness. McMahon pointed out that business people considered business an institution within American society, and that she did not deal with a single firm, but the broader institutional impact of the business world. Tess Tessier asked if the central disagreement revolved around whether the course should apply diversity to institutions, or whether it should examine the development of institutions with an application to diversity. Jiang concurred.

The committee took a five-minute break. Upon returning, Jenkins raised the question of whether there would be sufficient time to debate and vote. Several people had to leave for class or other responsibilities. It was decided to meet next Wednesday, September 19th, at 1:30 or 2 PM. Jenkins would send an e-mail regarding the exact starting time.

Committee:	Senators:
Academic Programs (1)	Tenika Holden
University Curriculum (1)	Joe Long
Academic Planning (2)	Bob Shuttleworth (Vacancy)
Integrated Technologies (2)	Jon Zacharias Bob Shuttleworth
University Outreach (2)	Zach Myers Lisa Torrence
Library (2)	Viola Missos Lisa Torrence
Academic Research (1)	Michelle Hettinga
Student Academic Affairs (6)	Christa Natoli Brice Litshaw Katie Flemming Lisa Torrence (Vacancy) (Vacancy)
Student Academic Grievance (6)	Brice Litshaw Joe Long Rachel Peteritis Zach Myers (Vacancy) (Vacancy)
Honors (2)	Deena DeVico Christa Natoli
Academic Standards (2)	Viola Missos Jon Zacharias
Academic Events (2)	Michelle Hettinga Rachel Peteritis
General Education (2)	Deena DeVico Katie Flemming
Senate Executive Committee (1)	Tenika Holden

**GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE
MEETING 9/14/01**

PRESENT: Castronovo, DeVico, Funk, Gergits, Jenkins, Kasuganti, Lovelace-Cameron, Mosca, Munro, Pusch, Riley, Tessier, Young

ABSENT: Fleming

Jenkins opened the meeting, and welcomed Deena DeVico as a student government appointed representative to the General Education Committee. There was another appointee, Katie Flemming, who had class at this time. Since no representative from Artistic and Literary Perspectives had been found, Darla Funk was sitting in since she was also familiar with the issues of the hearing.

Jenkins laid out the procedures of a hearing as passed by the Academic Senate this past year. He then introduced Anne McMahon, who was the designer of the course proposal, Qi Jiang from Sociology & Anthropology, Martha Pallante from History, and Tom Maraffa from Geography. Each of the objectors, Jiang, Pallante, and Maraffa, spoke first. They cited the need for general education to have courses aimed at a general audience rather than upper division courses, North Central's definition of general education, the fact that the Senate model calls for goal 11 to be the central goal of each course in the societies and institutions domain, the highly specialized content of the course, and the labeling of business as more of an organization than an institution.

Anne McMahon and Ram Kasuganti spoke on behalf of the proposals. Their arguments included: the fact that gened did have upper division courses already, the emphasis of the course on how business and organization created constructs of diversity rather than simply diversity, the usage of theories of diversity, the use of data and numbers and the lack of firm specific applications, the need to permit a course that is credible and informed into general education, explanations of how the North Central definition fits this course, its general student body (beyond business students), the common knowledge that it would provide for all students, its application to many organizations, the number of sections (3 which is more than some offerings already approved), the sense that this course on the 3700 level would be very appropriate for students who had matured through the taking of other course work and could apply its principles more readily, and the emphasis of the course on political, economic, and social processes in an institutional context.

During their rebuttal time the objectors made the following points. They argued that goal 11 was central to the fulfillment of the societies & institutions domain, not goal 12, and that the proposal placed goal 12 as the central goal. Moreover, goal 11 was much broader and intended more coverage than the examination of a particular social process within an institutional context. Martha Pallante pointed out that, as a member of the NCATE team, she was particularly concerned about their definition of general education and that fact that they looked for breadth not narrow coverage. She believed that the course belonged in Special Topics, Domain E, particularly because of the dearth of offerings in that area. She had advised many students and found that they took two SI courses quickly in their

freshmen year, and needed more assistance in the Artistic and Literary Perspectives area and in Special Topics. Qi Jiang observed that this course was more a course at the professional level. She was not comfortable with a course that examined social processes in an institutional context. That was not consistent with what Goal 11 asked for. She felt that courses should not simply find a way to fit within a domain; rather, they should follow the criteria fully.

McMahon rebutted that her course had not been designed for the special topics domain. It was built to be part of the societies & institutions domain. She labeled her course a study of the construction of institutionalized identities. She noted that all courses in each of the domains did not satisfy the entire goal. They took a focus point around which they could organize the material, and covered many things, but not the goal in a comprehensive way. Her focal point was diversity, and hence was narrow in a way that many gened courses were narrow. Ram Kasuganti declined to comment further.

During the questioning period, Nancy Mosca asked what the number of upper division courses was in the SI domain (answer was none), how many times the course had been offered (3 times in 2000-2001, and 3 times this academic year), and what the diversity initiatives were? McMahon explained that the diversity committee was putting together a freshmen-sophomore level course on diversity to submit for general education certification, and that it intended to submit it in the special topics domain. It was also noted at this time that the course was an oral intensive course, yet had more than 25 students per section. McMahon stated that there were only 28 students in the course presently. Julia Gergits asked for a further explanation of the institution versus organization argument. Jiang commented that institutions, at least in sociological theory, were broader than business and that goal 11 called for this type of broadness. McMahon pointed out that business people considered business an institution within American society, and that she did not deal with a single firm, but the broader institutional impact of the business world. Tess Tessier asked if the central disagreement revolved around whether the course should apply diversity to institutions, or whether it should examine the development of institutions with an application to diversity. Jiang concurred.

The committee took a five-minute break. Upon returning, Jenkins raised the question of whether there would be sufficient time to debate and vote. Several people had to leave for class or other responsibilities. It was decided to meet next Wednesday, September 19th, at 1:30 or 2 PM. Jenkins would send an e-mail regarding the exact starting time.

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE MINUTES 9/28/01

ABSENT: Kasuganti, Lovelace-Cameron, Mosca, Young

The first portion of the meeting was spent discussing Tessier's concerns about the need for a stronger diversity requirement and whether she could remain on the committee. She pointed out that the requirement of a central goal in each domain meant that diversity was a goal subordinate to others. She felt that the present Gened Model marginalized diversity, and that there was a need to investigate other possibilities. One suggestion was to create a list of strong diversity courses from among those courses dealing with goal 12, and then require a student to take at least one course from the list. It was agreed by all that the committee would continue this discussion after meeting with the Provost.

Jenkins announced that the October Senate meeting had been cancelled; hence, Senate consideration of the Managing Diversity proposal, if the objection were not withdrawn, would occur in November. The Provost will come to the next meeting to meet committee members and to discuss general education.

990241-POLSC 3712, Political Behavior, critical thinking. Jenkins indicated that the course had been returned with changes. After some discussion, Tessier moved, Castronovo seconded, a motion to certify. Motion passed.

990277-HMEC 3780, Consumer Economics, critical thinking. The committee had not previously considered this course because it did not have a syllabus. Questions were raised about whether the syllabus indicated that critical thinking assignments totaled 30% of the overall grade, and what the assignments were.

990303-HPES 4810, Clinical Exercise Practicum, writing intensive. Jenkins pointed out that Pintar had returned a syllabus that dealt with the issues previously raised by the committee. Gergits raised a question about the drafting process, but a statement was found that explained when the drafting process would occur with each paper. Castronovo moved, Gergits seconded, a motion to certify. Motion passed.

990313-CHEM 3739 & 3740, Physical Chemistry I & II, writing intensive. Jenkins passed out updated copies of the syllabus for each course and for each lab. He noted that the Chemistry department was asking for credit based on what was done in the lab, just as in the engineering lab courses. The difference lay in the fact that science departments attached the lab to a regular course, and the engineering college did not. The General Education Committee had accepted the engineering proposals because there was sufficient work in the labs to justify certification. Gergits expressed concern, though, about the fact that Chemistry did not require students to engage in the drafting process; they had a choice not to. She was also concerned about the teaching assistants, who were

in charge of the lab, and whether they or the faculty member directed the writing. It was decided to return the proposal.

990324-MUSTC 2632, Theory 2, critical thinking. Shipka approved of the course while expressing some minor concerns. Committee members noted the lack of indication on the syllabus of critical thinking assignments and their total value. The course was to be returned.

990325 & 990326-THR 3762 & 5864, critical thinking. Shipka approved of both courses. Gergits pointed out that the syllabus did not elaborate on critical thinking as a goal, nor designate the assignments. Munro questioned whether such material was needed in the syllabus since the department had provided sufficient justification in the narrative. Tessier responded that there was a need to demonstrate follow through in the syllabus, and that the instructor need to make a connection for the student with critical thinking. Jenkins explained that there was a need, because of assessment, to inform students as much as possible of what they were doing in regard to crucial thinking in the course. Castronovo agreed that some information could be included.

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE MINUTES 10-5-01

Absent: Young

990327 – NURS 3710, Nursing in the Community, oral communication intensive. Although no report had been received, Jenkins pointed out that the syllabus needed to indicate that the course was an oral intensive course, and that the goals or some similar segment of the syllabus needed to contain some indication that the course sought to improve the speaking abilities of the students. Mosca agreed that some statements could be included, but noted that some of the goal statements were related to accreditation requirements.

The new provost, Dr. Tony Atwater, came to introduce himself to the committee, and to comment on general education. He indicated his concern about the approval of the intensive courses and the need to push faculty to finish developing such courses before the end of the fall semester. In light of the NCA guidelines, he was committed to working through the deans and the department chairs to achieve that goal. Atwater was complimentary about the committee's work and the inclusion of diversity in the model, but indicated that he would like to see some further development, perhaps along the line of requiring that each student to take 1 diversity course with an emphasis on the United States and 1 with an emphasis on the non-western world. Both he and the president were interested in this possibility, although he stated firmly that it was the faculty that should provide the leadership on such matters. There was to be no mandate from the president or provost.

Tessier talked about her desire that the model have a requirement in diversity. She felt that the present diversity goals were subordinate to other goals and that perhaps the special topics area could be turned into a required diversity course, or students could be required to take within the existing domains at least one strong diversity course with the General Education Committee choosing which courses were strong enough. Jenkins was willing to discuss those possibilities but pointed out that the present system did require students to be exposed to goal 10 or goal 12 within the societies and institutions domain, and that it was the job of the committee to guarantee that goals 10 or 12 were dealt with strongly enough.

Dr. Atwater and the committee also talked about other areas of diversity, particularly in hiring. He had talked with the president about the offering of incentives to increase the hiring of minorities, or the adoption of a homegrown program emphasizing the development of part-time minority faculty. There was discussion about some of the factors affecting the hiring of minorities: our starting salaries, the limited pool, the attractiveness of other schools with lighter teaching loads, and our role as an entry-level university.

Melissa Smith, Foreign Languages and Literature, came to discuss course proposal 990316, Foreign Language 1500, Introduction to Foreign Languages. It was being

proposed as a special topics course. Smith explained that the course was originally designed for those who had no language in high school at all, but that it would be open to those who had. As designed, the course was no a grammar course, but a course to foster understanding about the commonalities among languages and the impact that a language has on culture or vice versa. It was more of a course that answered the question, why study language? The number of sections was two per semester, offered by her, because the other faculty member was on sabbatical.

After much discussion, Tessier moved, Gergits seconded, a motion to **certify**. However, concerns were expressed about the fulfillment of all of the goals listed, and about the fact that the criteria response did not answer the questions asked on the form. Further questions arose about original intent behind the design of the course, the relationship of the placement test to the assignment of a student to the course, and the type of student actually taking the course. Gergits moved, and Riley seconded, a motion to table the motion of certification until Jenkins had obtained answers to the questions.

**THERE WILL BE NO MEETING ON OCTOBER 12TH BECAUSE OF THE
AGLS CONFERENCE IN PITTSBURGH.**

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE MINUTES 10-19-01

Absent: DeVico, Gergits, Kasuganti, Young

Jenkins, Lovelace-Cameron, and Pusch discussed the AGLS convention in Pittsburgh, and some of the sessions that they attended. Some of the topics included critical thinking, paired courses, service learning.

Jenkins explained what had happened to the following courses:

990316 – FNLG 1500. Viehmeyer said that the course was designed for those with little exposure to foreign language, and that those were the types of students in the course presently. Melissa Smith also needed to resubmit the section on the criteria. Jenkins had e-mailed her the list so that she could respond accordingly. Some committee members expressed the notion that the course looked like it might be tailored for a broader audience; others wanted to know how remedial it was.

990313 and 990314 – CHEM 3739 & 3740. Jenkins explained that the department had accepted the need to require some drafts, but that the issue of whether graduate students would be in charge of the writing assignments remained. Jim Schramer was to meet with Chemistry representatives to discuss whether some training might be the answer.

990277, 990321, 990322, 990325, 990326, 990327 – had been returned but no response was forthcoming.

The committee then considered the following courses:

990324 – MUSTC 2632. Darla Funk had returned a new syllabus with changes regarding the designation of this course as a critical thinking intensive course. Tessier moved, Munro seconded a motion to certify. Motion passed.

990329 – COMM 2670. Since this course came from the Communications and Theater Department, it was not sent to Dan O'Neill for review because he had signed off on the course as chair of the department. This course needs a statement designating as satisfying the university's oral communication intensive requirement. Pending reception of that change, Mosca moved, Tessier seconded, a motion to certify. Motion passed.

990330 – CEEGR 3716L. Jenkins told the committee that O'Neill had no problems with the course. Riley raised a question about the course being only for one credit. It was pointed out that the GEC had approved similar lab courses because they did meet three hours per week, and because they did require as much work as a standard three-credit course would. The syllabus did not have a statement that the course satisfied the oral communication intensive requirement. An additional question was raised about the videotaping of students and whether there should be some reference to this procedure in

the syllabus. Munro was concerned about what he saw as recent efforts to demand more explanation in the syllabus about the intensive area. Mosca explained the need to inform the students about why this was an intensive course. Jenkins also noted that the more information given the student, the more likely it was that they would acknowledge coverage in any future assessment. He did not see, however, a need for extensive explanation. Given departmental action on the concerns raised above, Munro moved, Pusch seconded, a motion to certify. Motion passed.

990328 – COMM 2610, Intercultural Communication, societies and institutions. It was noted that the application lacked a statement under the Narrative section concerning how the course met goal 11 and either goal 10 or 12. That section addressed goals 1, 2, and 3 only. Jenkins raised a question about the course as one that meets goal 1, the communication goal, as its primary goal. Thus, it would not fit under the societies and institutions domain, but under Special Topics. There was also a question raised about whether the course as described in the syllabus, and in the departmental description, deviated from the course title and Bulletin description. Tessier moved, Lovelace-Cameron seconded, a motion to return the course proposal, and to ask for a completed Narrative. Motion passed. Much discussion ensued about the proper interpretation of what constituted a societies and institutions course.

For the remainder of the meeting the committee discussed the reasons why objections to recent course proposals in the societies and institutions domain were arising. Tessier led the discussion and directed questions to clarify why the objections were occurring.

GENERAL EDUCATION MEETING MINUTES 11-9-01

Absent: DeVico

Jenkins introduced and welcomed Dr. Michael Crist, Music Department, who has been appointed as the new representative of the Artistic & Literary Perspectives domain.

Jenkins commented on the defeat by the Academic Senate of the GER committee's motion to certify Managing Diversity as a societies and institutions course. He noted that no one won because the issue of how to deal with diversity as a part of the curriculum remained. He then asked Tess to discuss her concerns as expressed in a memo that she had sent to committee members. Tess spoke about the fact that goals 10 or 12 were not listed as the "central" goals in any of the domains; she believed that their subordination to these other goals marginalized their strength as diversity goals. In searching for a solution, she had come up with the possibility of asking students to take one course from a list of strong diversity courses. She mentioned in particular the problem of selecting such courses and of being designated as the diversity police.

After some discussion, Jenkins suggested that the committee brainstorm about the possible ways that the committee might recommend to deal with this issue. After brainstorming, the committee would list the positive and negative qualities of each solution. He did not want the committee to act on this proposal today. It is important, he noted, not to rush to the Academic Senate without a well-thought out proposal that is vetted among various constituencies prior to submitting a recommendation to Senate.

The options were: 1) a required diversity course, 2) student choice of one strong diversity course from a provided list, 3) staying with the present model, 4) creation of diversity intensive courses (possibly reducing other intensive requirements such as critical thinking), 5) creation of a diversity domain and reduction of the requirement in another domain, such as societies and institutions, 6) requiring that the core courses in either English or Communication teach diversity, 7) a required five week, one credit course on diversity similar to what the University of Vermont offers.

The strengths and weaknesses were: 1) Required course. Strengths – universal experience for all students, a strong course. Weaknesses – additional 3 credits added to GER requirements, resources to staff course not available, necessity of having central administrator handle logistics. 2) Strong diversity course. Strengths – a good compromise, no additional hours required, students get a stronger course. Weaknesses – not as strong and clear as single course; designation of courses as strong (diversity police); an added requirement to administer. 3) Stay. Strengths – no change required. Weaknesses – many courses not strong enough, assessment may show that students have not really learned about diversity. 4) Diversity intensive. Strengths – no increase in requirements, possibility of a wider number of courses being accepted, still required GER committee oversight. Weaknesses – some departments, such as ECEGR, might not have

the background, more extensive revamping required, such as reduction of other intensives or the addition of a new category. 5) New Domain. Strengths – places diversity in its own category, does not add on the total number of hours because hours are taken from another domain, such as societies and institutions. Weaknesses – potential battle over redistributing hours, lack of definition of what diversity is. 6) Core Course. Strengths – already existing courses, examples of such an approach at other colleges, all students take these courses. Weaknesses – willingness of all teachers in those courses to teach diversity, capability of all such teachers to teach diversity, already full content goals in communication course. 7) Mini-course. Strengths – small expansion of number of hours, covers all students. Weaknesses – resources, availability of interested teacher with background in the area, logistics of a five-week course.

Tessier **finished** the discussion with an observation that there were two key issues floating beneath the surface in the comments made today. They were: 1) whether the committee could **function** as experts in the area, 2) the status of upper division courses **within** the general education model. She expressed a hope that these issues would be dealt with as well.

990313 and 990314 – CHEM 3739 & 3740, Physical Chemistry I & II, for writing and critically thinking intensive. Jenkins explained that the only remaining issues for these courses were the need to include a required drafting process and the **training/monitoring** of the graduate assistants who taught the laboratory sections. Jenkins reminded the committee that each course would count for one section in both the writing and critical thinking areas. He passed out **an** amended syllabus with a statement requiring some **drafting** in the lab reports. He also noted that Steven Schildcrout and Howard **Mettee**, the instructors, had agreed that the graduate assistants would receive training, and that they would monitor their grading practices. Nancy Mosca suggested that we should have some record of their agreeing to the training and monitoring. It was decided to have them answer question thirteen on the proposal form and thereby indicate their commitment. Jenkins was to include the changed proposal in the circulation of the course. Pusch moved, Castronovo seconded, a motion to certify both courses in both areas. The motion passed.

990325 – THTR 3762, Directing 1, critical thinking. Jenkins pointed out that he had circulated a changed syllabus that included a statement about the meeting the gened requirement in this area, about critical thinking in general, and about the percentage of the grade. Mosca moved, Tessier seconded, a motion to certify. Motion passed.

990326 – THTR 5864, Directing II, critical thinking. A new syllabus made the same changes as with proposal 990325. Mosca moved, Riley seconded, a motion to certify. Motion passed.

Jenkins reminded members that we would meet next Friday. The first half-hour would deal with new course proposals; the next hour with diversity options. He asked members to come prepared to whittle down the list of seven options, and to discuss the process by which we gather information about viable options and also vet those options throughout the university.

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE MINUTES 11-16-01

Absent: DeVico, Kasuganti, Young

990322 – ANTHRO 4801, Anthropological Thought, CT. Jenkins pointed out that John White had secured a new instructor for the course, which was originally taught by Mark Shutes. The new syllabus did have a statement about the critical thinking requirement, but it lacked any other indication or description of what would be done in the course.

990331 – ART 3782, pre-Columbian **Art**, writing intensive. Jim Schramer approved of the course except for the need to add a statement about meeting the writing intensive requirement. Tessier moved, Gergits, seconded, a motion to certify. Motion passed.

990332 – ART 3746, American *Art*, writing intensive. Schramer was concerned about the fact that the writing assignments totaled only 45%, rather than the suggested 60%, of the total course grade. It did meet the minimum of 30%. Jenkins would ask them to take note of that disparity in future syllabi. There was also a need to add a statement to the syllabus about meeting the writing requirement. Gergits raised the issue that the course had only one revision of one paper. She thought there should be more revisions. The committee agreed; it was decided to ask them to consider having more drafts and revisions, but to leave it up to them as to how to do it.

990333 – TCOM 2682, Scriptwriting for the Electronic Media, writing intensive. Schramer felt that the course syllabus had to be updated, and that it needed a requirement statement and a draft and revision process. Also Riley pointed out that questions 12, 13, and 14 on the proposal form were not answered.

990330 – CEEGR 3716L, oral communication intensive given to Scott Martin, who returned a syllabus which included a requirement statement and a line about the possible use of videotaping to evaluate student performance. Tessier moved, Castronovo seconded, a motion to certify. Motion passed.

990334 – CEEGR 37161, Fluid Mechanics Lab, writing intensive. Jenkins pointed out that this course was seeking both oral and writing intensive approval. Schramer asked for a syllabus that indicated a draft and revision process. The committee agreed to return the proposal to Scott Martin for a revision of the syllabus. Jenkins noted that he would not circulate the oral proposal until the writing proposal had been certified.

Diversity requirement – Jenkins began the discussion of the 7 possible options for a diversity requirements by noting that he had talked with the Provost about the requirement, and the Provost had indicated a desire to talk with the committee. However, he could not make it today, but he would try to be there on November 30th. Given his schedule, though, Jenkins was not sure that we would see him then, and suggested that we should proceed with our discussion. Tessier spoke first. She wanted to examine the

point made at the Senate meeting about the review of courses by representatives from the domain. In particular, Tom Maraffa spoke about the fact that the GEC turned to advisors from writing, critical thinking, and oral communication to comment on the intensive proposals. Maraffa suggested that perhaps a similar arrangement could occur in regard to societies and institutions (or other domains) because the General Education Committee had not listened to the objections of departments that taught courses in that domain. Tessier was concerned about this possibility because no one department or departments was to have a lock on any domain. She also felt that each domain did have one representative appointed by the Provost. Jenkins pointed out that the present system did not rely on domain reviewers, but further discussion was left to future meetings when all committee members could be present.

Jenkins then asked the committee to discuss the seven possible diversity initiatives proposed at last week's meeting, and to evaluate them.

1) single course required of all students – most committee members felt that it would face too many problems, including political reactions to one course, the difficulty of adding on a requirement to the number of hours presently required, the problem of having enough faculty to teach the course, and the lack of administrative structure to handle the scheduling.

2) students to select one course from a list of general education courses with a strong emphasis on diversity – there was a consensus that this option was viable depending on the ability of the committee to define strong. Tessier recommended that the Diversity Committee be invited in to comment on the definition, and on the other options as well.

3) no change – committee members considered this option the weakest since it was obvious that we were examining the possibility of changing. Munro wanted to keep the option, though, as a possibility.

4) diversity intensive – Castronovo suggested that 2 and 4 could be combined, and that upper division courses, such as Anne McMahon's Managing Diversity, could count toward satisfying the requirement. It was general agreed that we would look at 2 and 4 together, but no decisions were made on details.

5) creation of a diversity domain with reduction of number of courses required in societies and institutions – Mosca believed that this option would work well for her school and department. Riley pointed out, however, that

6) use of core courses in oral communication or writing to teach diversity – Gergits had talked with some of the English faculty. She was concerned about the problem of motivating faculty to teach diversity, as well as the need to teach writing and use of computers. Castronovo stated very firmly that the oral communication course did not have the room for also teaching diversity.

7) a one-credit course required of all students similar to that of the University of Vermont -- committee members compared this course to the first option, and found the same problems in its adoption.

Generally speaking, the GEC considered options 1, 3, and 7 to be the weakest. Options 2, 4, and 5 remained under consideration and 6 as well but with little support. Jenkins concluded that options 2 and 4 were the most supported. No final decisions were made. Discussion will continue at the next meeting on Friday, November 30th.

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE

MINUTES 11-16-01 rev. 12/14/01

Absent: DeVico, Kasuganti, Young

990322 – ANTHRO 4801, Anthropological Thought, CT. Jenkins pointed out that John White had secured a new instructor for the course, which was originally taught by Mark Shutes. The new syllabus did have a statement about the critical thinking requirement, but it lacked any other indication or description of what would be done in the course.

990331 – ART 3782, pre-Columbian **Art**, writing intensive. Jim Schramer approved of the course except for the need to add a statement about meeting the writing intensive requirement. Tessier moved, Gergits, seconded, a motion to certify. Motion passed.

990332 – ART 3746, American **Art**, writing intensive. Schramer was concerned about the fact that the writing assignments totaled only 45%, rather than the suggested 60%, of the total course grade. It did meet the minimum of 30%. Jenkins would ask them to take note of that disparity in future syllabi. There was also a need to add a statement to the syllabus about meeting the writing requirement. Gergits raised the issue that the course had only one revision of one paper. She thought there should be more revisions. The committee agreed; it was decided to ask them to consider having more drafts and revisions, but to leave it up to them as to how to do it.

990333 – TCOM 2682, Scriptwriting for the Electronic Media, writing intensive. Schramer felt that the course syllabus had to be updated, and that it needed a requirement statement and a draft and revision process. Also Riley pointed out that questions 12, 13, and 14 on the proposal form were not answered.

990330 – CEEGR 3716L, oral communication intensive given to Scott Martin, who returned a syllabus which included a requirement statement and a line about the possible use of videotaping to evaluate student performance. Tessier moved, Castronovo seconded, a motion to certify. Motion passed.

990334 – CEEGR 37161, Fluid Mechanics Lab, writing intensive. Jenkins pointed out that this course was seeking both oral and writing intensive approval. Schramer asked for a syllabus that indicated a draft and revision process. The committee agreed to return the proposal to Scott Martin for a revision of the syllabus. Jenkins noted that he would not circulate the oral proposal until the writing proposal had been certified.

Diversity requirement – Jenkins began the discussion of the 7 possible options for a diversity requirements by noting that he had talked with the Provost about the requirement, and the Provost had indicated a desire to talk with the committee. However, he could not make it today, but he would try to be there on November 30th. Given his schedule, though, Jenkins was not sure that we would see him then, and suggested that we should proceed with our discussion. Tessier spoke first. She wanted to examine the

point made at the Senate meeting about the review of courses by representatives from the domain. In particular, Tom Maraffa spoke about the fact that the GEC turned to advisors from writing, critical thinking, and oral communication to comment on the intensive proposals. Maraffa suggested that perhaps a similar arrangement could occur in regard to societies and institutions (or other domains) because the General Education Committee had not listened to the objections of departments that taught courses in that domain. Tessier was concerned about this possibility because no one department or departments was to have a lock on any domain. She also felt that each domain did have one representative appointed by the Provost. Jenkins pointed out that the present system did not rely on domain reviewers, but further discussion was left to future meetings when all committee members could be present.

Jenkins then asked the committee to discuss the seven possible diversity initiatives proposed at last week's meeting, and to evaluate them.

1) single course required of all students – most committee members felt that it would face too many problems, including political reactions to one course, the difficulty of adding on a requirement to the number of hours presently required, the problem of having enough faculty to teach the course, and the lack of administrative structure to handle the scheduling.

2) students to select one course from a list of general education courses with a strong emphasis on diversity – there was a consensus that this option was viable depending on the ability of the committee to define strong. Tessier recommended that the Diversity Committee be invited in to comment on the definition, and on the other options as well.

3) no change – committee members considered this option the weakest since it was obvious that we were examining the possibility of changing.

4) diversity intensive – Castronovo suggested that 2 and 4 could be combined, and that upper division courses, such as Anne McMahon's Managing Diversity, could count toward satisfying the requirement. It was general agreed that we would look at 2 and 4 together, but no decisions were made on details.

5) creation of a diversity domain with reduction of number of courses required in another domain – Mosca believed that this option would work well for her school and department. Riley pointed out, however, that the number of courses could not be easily reduced without movement of courses into the new domain. Would already accepted courses have to reapply? There was also the issue of the term, "floater." Riley felt that, while a third course could be taken in two of the three domains, there was a need to respect the number of hours assigned, and to consider the balance among the domains. She pointed out that other departments or programs had already set up certain requirements for their students in some of the domains, which could create a potential conflict for this change.

6) use of core courses in oral communication or writing to teach diversity – Gergits had talked with some of the English faculty. She was concerned about the problem of

motivating faculty to teach diversity, as well as the need to teach writing and use of computers. Castronovo stated very firmly that the oral communication course did not have the room for also teaching diversity.

7) a one-credit course required of all students similar to that of the University of Vermont -- committee members compared this course to the first option, and found the same problems in its adoption.

Generally speaking, the GEC considered options 1, 3, and 7 to be the weakest. Options 2, 4, and 5 remained under consideration and 6 as well but with little support. Jenkins concluded that options 2 and 4 were the most supported. No final decisions were made. Discussion will continue at the next meeting on Friday, November 30th.

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE MINUTES 11/30/01 rev. 1/5/02

ABSENT: Castronovo, DeVico

Jenkins welcomed the Provost, Tony Atwater, who was there to talk about the diversity discussions the committee had been holding. Jenkins had provided him with information about the seven possible recommendations. Atwater praised the committee for its work. He personally considered diversity to be an important component of curriculum development, and noted that President Sweet had made diversity one of his priorities. It is important, he stated, for students to achieve cultural literacy, an awareness of the many different peoples in the world, and the best way to assure their exposure would be a required portion of the curriculum. Atwater believed that Youngstown was a diverse community and that a diversity curriculum would indicate a positive link between Youngstown State and that community.

Gergits posed several problems for the committee: 1) how to function as intelligent gatekeepers in the selection of diversity courses, and 2) what training to provide for the faculty. Atwater responded that he considered professional development to be an important part of curricular reform, and that CATALYST would cooperate in providing such training. He then noted that a single course required of all students would probably present problems. He is committed, though, to the solution that the committee decides upon as long as it promotes cultural diversity/literacy. He encouraged the committee to test its possible solutions with various constituencies, including the Deans Council.

Crist said that he favors working on diversity, but raised a question about making it an add-on. Music school curriculums, he noted, are tight and may have difficulty in fitting in any additions. Tess reported that there had been work on a single diversity course, but there was lack of certainty about whether it could pass the Academic Senate. She did want, however, to make student's exposure to diversity a stronger part of the gened model given the recent defeat of the Managing Diversity course. Her concerns generated from the fact that a course that was strong in diversity had to meet goal 11 in the societies and institutions domain. Tess considered herself an advocate of Walter Rauschenbusch, early twentieth century minister and social gospeller, who believed that institutions could propagate evil. There was a need, she asserted, for the institution to use the language of diversity, just as language had been used in regard to women. The use of "he or she" caused people to reflect on the fact that a woman could also be the actor or doer.

The Provost responded with a suggestion that the committee list all of the courses university-wide that deal with diversity. At Northern Kentucky they had encouraged a diversity curriculum across departments. Once students became aware of these courses, they became more popular. Lovelace-Cameron felt, though, that the Senate criteria did not really provide a place for diversity, that indeed there was no requirement. She wanted a diversity domain that would take its credits from elsewhere. Pusch stated that he was pro-intensive and even wanted such courses in each school, but he also wanted a

diversity requirement among the general education courses. The Provost cautioned the committee that such a requirement must be manageable for the students. The lack of manageability would provoke an unfavorable sentiment toward diversity, and should be avoided.

Mosca explained that she leaned toward a separate domain with one of the eight courses presently assigned to the natural science, artistic and literary perspectives, and societies and institutions domains being transferred. She thought that it was better than having diversity intensive courses in the major; nursing spread its diversity content throughout the nursing curriculum. Tessier then raised the possibility of beginning the decision-making process by compiling a list of what we want from diversity reform. These principles could then guide the discussion; she preferred that kind of discussion to one in which we went round pointing out the strengths and weaknesses of the options. Kasuganti suggested that the solution might lie in letting each college decide on the diversity initiative it would take.

The Provost declared himself in favor of a required domain, perhaps supplemented by an intensive requirement also. Pusch was concerned that the university, unlike others, often had problems in working together toward a common goal. Jenkins pointed out that he did not consider the present general education system as being optional in regard to learning about diversity. Each student had to take at least two courses in the societies and institutions domain, and every one of those courses had to fulfill goal 10 or goal 12 (no exception permitted). He agreed that how strong some courses were was open to discussion, but the fact remained that there was a diversity requirement. Many previous committee members had worked to make it so. Jenkins observed also that taking one course from the 3 domains would create a reaction. The distribution was a result of compromise worked out within a previous committee and by passage through the Academic Senate. Mosca reasserted her commitment to the diversity domain, and suggested that we might invite the University Diversity Initiative to a meeting.

After the Provost had to leave, discussion continued with no decisions being made. It was agreed that the first step would be to gather, as the Provost suggested, a list of the diversity courses in every college, major, or program. Jenkins indicated that the next Friday's meeting would have to deal with course approval, and that there would probably be a need to hold one other morning-long or afternoon-long meeting. He then passed out various course proposals, and a timesheet.

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE MINUTES 11/30/01 rev. 1/5/02

ABSENT: Castronovo, DeVico

Jenkins welcomed the Provost, Tony Atwater, who was there to talk about the diversity discussions the committee had been holding. Jenkins had provided him with information about the seven possible recommendations. Atwater praised the committee for its work. He personally considered diversity to be an important component of curriculum development, and noted that President Sweet had made diversity one of his priorities. It is important, he stated, for students to achieve cultural literacy, an awareness of the many different peoples in the world, and the best way to assure their exposure would be a required portion of the curriculum. Atwater believed that Youngstown was a diverse community and that a diversity curriculum would indicate a positive link between Youngstown State and that community.

Gergits posed several problems for the committee: 1) how to function as intelligent gatekeepers in the selection of diversity courses, and 2) what training to provide for the faculty. Atwater responded that he considered professional development to be an important part of curricular reform, and that CATALYST would cooperate in providing such training. He then noted that a single course required of all students would probably present problems. He is committed, though, to the solution that the committee decides upon as long as it promotes cultural diversity/literacy. He encouraged the committee to test its possible solutions with various constituencies, including the Deans Council.

Crist said that he favors working on diversity, but raised a question about making it an add-on. Music school curriculums, he noted, are tight and may have difficulty in fitting in any additions. Tess reported that there had been work on a single diversity course, but there was lack of certainty about whether it could pass the Academic Senate. She did want, however, to make student's exposure to diversity a stronger part of the gened model given the recent defeat of the Managing Diversity course. Her concerns generated from the fact that a course that was strong in diversity had to meet goal 11 in the societies and institutions domain. Tess considered herself an advocate of Walter Rauschenbusch, early twentieth century minister and social gospeller, who believed that institutions could propagate evil. There was a need, she asserted, for the institution to use the language of diversity, just as language had been used in regard to women. The use of "he or she" caused people to reflect on the fact that a woman could also be the actor or doer.

The Provost responded with a suggestion that the committee list all of the courses university-wide that deal with diversity. At Northern Kentucky they had encouraged a diversity curriculum across departments. Once students became aware of these courses, they became more popular. Lovelace-Cameron felt, though, that the Senate criteria did not really provide a place for diversity, that indeed there was no requirement. She wanted a diversity domain that would take its credits from elsewhere. Pusch stated that he was pro-intensive and even wanted such courses in each school, but he also wanted a

diversity requirement among the general education courses. The Provost cautioned the committee that such a requirement must be manageable for the students. The lack of manageability would provoke an unfavorable sentiment toward diversity, and should be avoided.

Mosca explained that she leaned toward a separate domain with one of the eight courses presently assigned to the natural science, artistic and literary perspectives, and societies and institutions domains being transferred. She thought that it was better than having diversity intensive courses in the major; nursing spread its diversity content throughout the nursing curriculum. Tessier then raised the possibility of beginning the decision-making process by compiling a list of what we want from diversity reform. These principles could then guide the discussion; she preferred that kind of discussion to one in which we went round pointing out the strengths and weaknesses of the options. Kasuganti suggested that the solution might lie in letting each college decide on the diversity initiative it would take.

The Provost declared himself in favor of a required domain, perhaps supplemented by an intensive requirement also. Pusch was concerned that the university, unlike others, often had problems in working together toward a common goal. Jenkins pointed out that he did not consider the present general education system as being optional in regard to learning about diversity. Each student had to take at least two courses in the societies and institutions domain, and every one of those courses had to fulfill goal 10 or goal 12 (no exception permitted). He agreed that how strong some courses were was open to discussion, but the fact remained that there was a diversity requirement. Many previous committee members had worked to make it so. Jenkins observed also that taking one course from the 3 domains would create a reaction. The distribution was a result of compromise worked out within a previous committee and by passage through the Academic Senate. Mosca reasserted her commitment to the diversity domain, and suggested that we might invite the University Diversity Initiative to a meeting.

After the Provost had to leave, discussion continued with no decisions being made. It was agreed that the first step would be to gather, as the Provost suggested, a list of the diversity courses in every college, major, or program. Jenkins indicated that the next Friday's meeting would have to deal with course approval, and that there would probably be a need to hold one other morning-long or afternoon-long meeting. He then passed out various course proposals, and a timesheet.

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE MINUTES 12/7/01

Absent: Crist, DeVico, Mosca, Munro

990328 – COMM 2610, Intercultural Communication, societies and institutions. Jenkins began the discussion by pointing out that the course description emphasized communication across cultural boundaries and the development of communication skills, whereas the department course description highlighted "understanding the nature of cultural development, cultural maintenance, and cultural change using oral communication as a backdrop." Thus, there was a discrepancy between the two, which would require that the course be submitted to the University Curriculum Committee with a changed description befitting what was actually being taught in the course. Jenkins also pointed to the tentative course calendar as a further indication of the discrepancy between the course description and what was being taught. There was only one mention of communication (during week seven). Riley asked why the tentative course calendar did not correspond with the text, the only reading mentioned. Tessier asserted that the course, in her opinion, fulfilled the goals of societies and institutions, but she questioned whether the course would be accepted, even if it secured approval from the University Curriculum Committee. Kasuganti noted that the departmental description and the proposal provided plenty of information on how this course met the appropriate goals. He believed that the course should be approved. There was, he admitted, some discrepancy between the university and departmental description, but he would allow for some evolution in what was taught. He suggested that the department might have not have gotten a chance to resubmit. Gergits suggested that we invite Hugenberg to the next meeting; a consensus was reached that Hugenberg's appearance before the committee would be the next step. Kasuganti then advocated that previous courses certified for the societies and institutions domain be revisited and scrutinized as much as recent courses were. He felt that some of them would pass muster; they were only accepted because they were from certain departments. Tessier responded that she did not think it necessary to do so, and that some courses would receive more scrutiny than others.

990335 – CEEGR 3717, Hydraulic Design, critical thinking. Tom Shipka approved of the course, but made a suggestion that Dr. Khan incorporate a book by Henry Petroski for an oral or written report. The committee viewed the suggestion as a suggestion only. The course was returned, however, so that a description of critical thinking as a goal and some development of the assignments could be included in the syllabus.

990336 – MGT 3735, Communications for Management and Business, OCI. Dan O'Neill approved of this course, but it was also seeking approval as writing intensive. Gergits moved, Tessier seconded, a motion to certify. Motion passed.

990337 – MGT 3735, Communications for Management and Business, writing intensive. Jenkins had provided a syllabus to Jim Schramer this past week. They had agreed that there was not sufficient indication on the syllabus of the use of a drafting process. Also there was only one assignment, and no indication of how each student engaged in writing in the group projects. The course was returned for review.

990338 -- MGT 3789, Operations Management, critical thinking. There was general acceptance of the course, but the syllabus needed to include a statement about the critical thinking requirement, and about the goals and assignments of critical thinking.

990339 – ART 4889, Seminar in Art History, capstone. The committee agreed that this course met the capstone requirements. Tessier moved, Young seconded, a motion to certify. Motion passed.

990340 – MUSCO 3715, Choral and Instrumental Conducting, OCI. Dan O'Neill approved of the course. It was unclear, however, how the grading occurred for the oral component of the grade. There were quizzes, but no one was sure whether the quizzes were written or oral. Also it was not clear whether the oral component constituted 30% of the overall grade. The course was returned for revision.

990341 – MUSHL 3772, Music History & Literature II, writing intensive. The course was returned to examine the following: 1) lack of more than one written assignment; 2) the failure of the writing to count as 30% of the grade. The committee has generally not counted exams as part of the writing requirement.

The committee discussed how it would proceed on the diversity options. It was agreed that the time would be spent between now and the start of the new semester compiling a list of courses that focus on diversity whether they are general education courses or a part of the major. Each person would examine his or her college and forward a list (e-mail?) to Bill Jenkins for compilation.

Jenkins indicated the need for another meeting prior to Christmas. It was decided that the morning of December 17th would be a good one. Jenkins announced that there would be a lunch for those in attendance. At the December 17th meeting the committee will discuss the number of courses submitted for intensive credit, and whether any other meetings prior to the new semester were needed or possible.