

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE MINUTES 8-12-99

Absent: Antenucci, ~~Garr~~, Harvey, Mauch, Rando

Jenkins reported that the objections that had been filed were still in the first stage, a meeting of the proposing department and of the objector. He was going to talk with Dan O'Neill about expediting the process.

The committee examined the following course proposals:

990011— Survey of American Mass Communication. It was pointed out that the narrative section of the proposal did not discuss the goals of the domain, only goals 1, 2 and 3.

990012—Ritchey moved the certification of Telecommunication's Capstone course, and Castronovo seconded it. Jenkins explained that we had returned it because it did not seem to have any projects within the course itself, only the gathering of a portfolio. The revised version addressed this issue. Motion passed.

990046—Introduction to Film Study. A question was raised as to whether the course was entitled Introduction to Film Study, or Studies. It was decided that Study was the word of choice. Mary Jo Reiff was to check on this point. Tessier moved and Reiff seconded a motion to certify this course. Motion passed.

990047—American Literature and Diversity raised few questions except for one about writing for self-expression and not for "the mastery of a particular kind of academic writing." Reiff explained that this sentence referred to specific types of writing rather than writing that was graded. She pointed out that the types of assignment were listed in the syllabus and that writing assignments were graded. Ritchey moved and Mosca seconded a motion that this course be certified. Motion passed.

990048—World Literature. The committee wondered about the coverage of the world since 80 to 90% of the course was European. It was decided to ask the English department to comment on this discrepancy.

990049—Introduction to Anthropology. The committee was impressed with the course proposal. Ritchey moved and Castronovo seconded a motion to certify. Motion passed.

990050—Introduction to Sociology. The committee was generally favorable. Ritchey moved and Tess seconded a motion to certify. Motion passed.

Tess asked for a few moments to discuss the issue of substitute courses. She was no longer sure of our definition and its ability to cover all situations. Castronovo pointed out that substitute courses arose because of the coexistence of a liberal arts program with

professional schools, and that some compromise was in order. The committee agreed to stick with its present definition, which Jenkins read for the committee.

Jenkins asked whether people would be going on vacation shortly. There is only one week left in the summer quarter. He would see what was happening with the objections, and try to plan a meeting when all could attend.

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE MINUTES 9-7-99

ABSENT: Funk, Harvey, Mauch

Jenkins passed out a copy of what he has prepared so far for the Transfer Module. He explained that he had consulted with Gordon Mapley and Dick Arndt (OBOR), and, as a result of those conferences, had changed the Module. Since OBOR required that the requirements fit their model (which includes writing, math, natural science, humanities, social studies, and interdisciplinary), he had eliminated the oral communication course, and the personal and social responsibility domain. Also he had required 9 credit hours in the natural science, humanities, and social studies areas. It should be noted that OBOR allows interdisciplinary courses to substitute for any of those three areas; such courses do not count separately. Hunter suggested that Jenkins look into whether the natural science category should carry nine credits. Jenkins noted that the policy was a work in progress.

Charles Singler was in attendance to explain the resubmission of the A&S Science Laboratory Course (2600) as a four-credit course. Jenkins explained that he had met with Singler **after** the July 27th meeting to explain the following concerns: 1) lack of a semester syllabus, 2) sufficient consideration of whether this course could be staffed, and 3) the possibility of having some alternative three credit courses. Singler pointed out that he had submitted a semester syllabus with two of the three modules present. There would be more modules depending upon who was teaching the course. For point two he commented that each chair in the science area was behind this proposal and was committed to providing the staff. The dean had also promised to assist in the provision of an adequate number of sections. On point three Singler explained that he had investigated what was being done at Kent State, Akron, and Toledo. He found that each had 4 credit laboratory courses under the semester system. There was also no faculty interest at this time in developing additional courses. Hunter supported Singler by indicating that he, although interested, did not have the time to develop another course. Finally, he noted that each faculty member that would teach this course favored having four credits, particularly since it would be part lecture (2-3 hours) and part laboratory.

Garr pointed out that the courses at Kent, Akron, and Toledo were 3 credit content courses with 1 hour of additional lab, and so were not the same as this course, which to her seemed to focus more on process than on content. She was concerned that students obtain more breadth of knowledge than seemed to be offered in this particular course. It was also pointed out that faculty would earn four credit hours each of workload for teaching one of these sections since there would be at least 75 students. Garr suggested that this workload deviated from that available to other faculty.

Antenucci talked about a letter that Singler had given him regarding the request from WSBA for a laboratory course. He pointed out that the letter indicated that, if the course had an additional credit hour, WSBA would not be interested.

Mosca asked three questions. 1) Could non-science students take this course more than once? After much discussion it was agreed that any student should take this course only once for credit, but that the option to retake for a higher grade or because of failing would also be there. 2) Shouldn't this syllabus have a full fifteen weeks of modules? It appeared to her that this syllabus was not a semester syllabus. Some members commented that this was a generic syllabus for a multi-sectional course, and that more modules would be provided when available. Writing I and Writing II were generic syllabi, which faculty members would adjust to fit their topics of study. 3) Didn't the model preclude the consideration of this course as a four-credit course? She argued that the model at least tacitly recognized the three-hour limit, and that such changes could only be exceptional. Garr observed that other departments might make similar arguments and that general education would expand to the detriment of the professional curriculum.

Maraffa explained that there were some people that felt that there should be alternatives available, such as three credit content/laboratory courses. This science course appears to put all of the eggs in one basket, rather than offering a variety of options. Antenucci elaborated on a conversation he had with Anne McMahon, a former member of the gened committee. She believed that there was a commitment to offering a variety of courses. He believed that there should be more options. Ritchey asked if it were not possible to have a three-credit laboratory course with two modules that might have a beginning and advanced component. Hunter commented that it could happen, but Jenkins pointed out that the proposal offered more breadth to the student. Hunter pointed out, though, that no faculty member in the science area was willing at this time to propose an alternative course.

Tessier moved and Antenucci seconded a motion to certify this proposal. The motion passed by voice vote. Antenucci asked for a show of hands. The motion passed 6-3.

Hunter moved and Garr seconded a motion to approve course proposal 990045, a capstone course for electrical engineering. The motion passed.

Jenkins presented a letter from Dean Barbara Brothers to the committee. She was asking for clarification of General Education guidelines. Under part 1 she was asking the committee to provide the criteria by which it determines whether a class is for the general student population. Jenkins noted that the dean believed that there should be no single section courses, except for those that might fit into an optional list of courses for the students. She wanted students to take courses that provided very general coverage for purposes of breadth. Provost Jim Scanlon was concerned about single-section courses from the standpoint of providing an opportunity for a significant number of students to take it. He was suggesting that such courses must offer a seating of at least sixty students. The committee agreed that the course should 1) be open to the general student body, 2) have only another general education course as a prerequisite, or no prerequisite, and 3) have sufficient coverage to meet the general education goals for that domain. The committee does not believe that it has the power to determine the number of sections, nor the number of students to be accommodated; these are administrative matters, which do not preclude acceptance of the course as a general education course.

Under part 2 the dean was asking for additional criteria that the deans could apply to substitute courses, in particular as students were evaluated for intra or inter university transfer. Jenkins explained that the Dean thought that the Gened Committee had no power to determine which courses were substitutes, but that this decision should be left to the deans, who would use the criteria provided. Committee members agreed that it was the prerogative of the committee, based on the charge placed within the Model passed by the Academic Senate, to examine substitute course proposals to determine whether such courses met the goals of general education. The committee would then provide a list of courses to the deans and advisors for them to make judgements as to whether the student had completed the requirement.

Jenkins asked committee members whether they could meet next week. A tentative meeting was scheduled for Tuesday, September 14, 1999 at 9 AM.

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE MEETING 9-16-99

Absent: Antenucci, Harvey, Mosca, Pusch, Reiff, Ritchey, Schneider

Jenkins passed out an updated table of course proposals, and explained the table. He welcomed Phil Munro to the committee; he is representing the school of engineering *+technology*

Jenkins welcomed Charles Singler and Daniel O'Neill to the committee. The purpose for today was to hear the arguments regarding the objections raised by Charles Singler regarding ^{GEC} course proposals 990001, 990002, and 990008. He has withdrawn his objections to other courses from Communication and Theater, except for 990014 and 990015. Jenkins excluded the last two course proposals because there were other departments also objecting.

Singler commented that his concern originally arose because of the problem of determining whether Communication and Theater could staff all of these courses considering their new commitment to 64 sections of the basic oral communication course. He believed that our committee had the responsibility to ask that question, and that he came seeking assurances regarding such staffing. He noted that Bill Jenkins had discussed the issue with him yesterday, and had talked about discussions with O'Neill, Dean McCloud, and Provost Scanlon.

O'Neill began by pointing out that the oral communication course had passed the Academic Senate last year, and that he, Dean McCloud, Bill Jenkins, and Provost Scanlon had met in the fall to answer staffing questions. O'Neill had made a proposal that was accepted with no expansion of existing resources (unless there were additional faculty approved for replacement of departing faculty in the upcoming year's allocation of positions) except for a marginal amount in the limited service area. He denied that he had talked about the possibility of adding two or more new faculty. He also believed that Dean Barbara Brothers was the key figure in this objection, and that she had not accepted the decision of the Senate and the Provost. Singler took sole responsibility for the objections, and the concern about staffing. Jenkins spoke regarding the issue of staffing. He indicated that he had met with O'Neill, McCloud and Scanlon this summer, and they with each other, and that each of them had assured him that the resources were there. He also noted that O'Neill had withdrawn two ^{GEC} courses proposals (990004 and 990007) in order to allay fears regarding staffing.

A debate ensued about the responsibility of the committee regarding staffing. Jenkins said that the committee could ask for the information from the chair, dean, or provost, but that it could not reject a course. Hunter, Maraffa, and Tessier spoke also to that issue, and asked Singler what more we could do than ask for the assurances of the administrators involved. Maraffa and Castronovo were also concerned that Singler had argued on behalf of the science lab course (990017) that he was not totally sure how staffing would work. However, he requested that the committee give the science

departments the benefit of the doubt; yet he was not applying the same standard to these proposals.

Singler was asked whether he was satisfied. He said that he would withdraw his objections regarding staffing, given the assurances of the Provost, the Dean and O'Neill, and would do so in writing. Singler commented that he also had concerns about single section courses, and Jenkins responded that the committee would deal with that issue at the next meeting. Jenkins noted that, if Singler withdrew his objection, then the courses would stand approved unless there were other objections.

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE
MINUTES September 24,1999

Absent: Tessier

Jenkins welcomed the new student representative, Brandon Schneider, to the committee. Schneider indicated that no one else had been appointed yet.

Jenkins updated the data sheet on general education course proposals. He had received Charles Singler's letter withdrawing his objection to the communication and theater proposals. Some of these courses then, with the objections withdrawn, would simply be appended to the Senate Agenda as an indication that they had achieved certification as a general education course. Also general education course proposals 990046,990047, 990049, and 990050 had weathered the objection stage and would also be appended to the Senate Agenda as certified general education courses.

990051 – the committee discussed this proposal ~~from~~ Special Education. Many questioned whether this was a course intended for the general student body, and cited its content and its syllabus as indications that it was more for the major. Mosca raised a question as to why such a course might not satisfy the selected topics area, and be useful for students to take. Tom Maraffa moved and Allen Hunter seconded that the course proposal be returned to Special Education with a request to consider resubmitting a proposal that 1) better justifies how it is intended for the general student body; 2) addresses the criteria for the Selected Topics and Electives domain (see Senate, 3-5-99); 3) modifies the syllabus to reflect the fact that it is for the general student body, and 4) indicates how many spaces would be available in the six sections for the general student body. The motion passed.

990052 – Frank Castronovo questioned Darla Funk about the justification in the narrative for coverage of the oral communication goal. He felt that classroom discussion was not sufficient to meet that goal, particularly since it was ungraded, and there was no guarantee that all students would participate. She admitted that the wording was simply an indication that oral communication was part of the course. She was willing to withdraw the sentence, but others felt that she did not need to since the model did not require that all of these goals had to be met. Ritchey moved and Reiff seconded a motion that the course proposal be certified. Motion passed.

Jenkins then brought up the issue of coverage of the goals. He noted that it was important that students take as many courses as possible to meet each of the goals. Thus, they would achieve breadth of coverage. He was not suggesting that the GEC impose this rule given program requirements, but that we go on record as encouraging the coverage of goals. Hunter moved and Mosca seconded a motion that the General Education Committee encourage departments and programs to assist their students in meeting as many of the general education goals as possible. Jenkins suggested that we might provide a list of courses and which goals they meet for advisors and students. Ritchey was concerned that the motion was not strong enough, and suggested wording

that would make it the responsibility of each department and program to do so for its students. The motion passed, 8-1, with the original wording.

Meeting times were discussed. Jenkins indicated that Fridays from 1 to 3 PM would be standard. Funk suggested that there be no time limit. Jenkins agreed that hearing dates should have no time limit. He would look into future scheduling.

Mosca told the committee that the Senate Executive Committee had discussed the motion on citizenship, and that it would be the first item on the agenda at the October meeting. Jenkins thanked her for bringing up the issue, and said he would put the motion on the agenda for Friday, October 1st.

NEXT MEETING WILL BE ON FRIDAY, OCTOBER 8ST, AT 1 PM. AGENDA WILL INCLUDE DISCUSSION ON ASSESSMENT AND SUBSTITUTE COURSES, AS WELL AS CONSIDERATION OF ANY NEW GENERAL EDUCATION COURSE PROPOSALS AND ANY OBJECTIONS. THERE WILL BE NO MEETING NEXT FRIDAY.

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE MINUTES 10-8-99

Absent: Maraffa

Jenkins opened the meeting with a discussion of whether the General Education Committee should contact faculty about the circulation of course proposals with a sheet that indicated each title, description, and domain. He indicated that he did send out a general cover sheet with the course proposals that did not identify the courses, but that he also e-mailed department chairs and deans with a note that provided a title, description, department, and domain for each course proposal. Munro suggested that it would be very helpful if chairs were to receive a cover sheet that listed the courses, their descriptions, and domains, and if this list were attached to the packet sent to the deans. After much discussion, it was decided to accept both of these suggestions.

Jenkins announced that Joe Antenucci had resigned from the General Education Committee because of other commitments. There will be an election for someone to fill out the term, but no nominee has been identified yet.

Jim Pusch pointed out that his home phone number on the membership list was incorrect. Mosca asked about the terms of members of the committee, and what the number next to her name meant. Jenkins explained that members served a three-year term, except for the first time around because of the need to rotate membership. By lot, some served only for one, others two, and the rest for three years. The number indicated the number of years remaining on the committee, including this year. Munro asked that Jenkins change the name of his department to electrical and computer engineering. Jenkins said that he would be putting out a new roster shortly.

Jenkins talked about the upcoming dinner at Springfield Grille. Every member of the committee, including the student representative, was invited. The best date was Monday, December 13th. It was agreed to be there at 6 PM. Please set aside that date.

990048 – World Literature (ALP). Jenkins passed out a new syllabus for the course. Hunter argued that the course was more of a western European literature course with maybe 15% of world literature. He opposed the course unless it approached a percentage of 50%. He did believe that the course could be submitted as it is but with a different title. The committee agreed to send the course back with these suggestions.

18 welko
990053 – SOCIO 3751, Social Research (WI). Ritchey moved and Tessier seconded a motion to certify this course as writing intensive. Jenkins explained that he had run this and other writing intensive courses past Bob Hogue as the director of Writing Across the Curriculum. Hogue endorsed this course. Motion passed.

990059 – ANTHR 4890, Advanced Topics in Archaeology: Cultural Resource Management (WI). Castronovo moved and Hunter seconded a more to certify this course

as writing intensive. Ritchey explained that CASGEC had expressed concerns initially about this course, because of the filling out of forms. They had called in Bob Hogue to explain why he saw this course as a "model." Hogue pointed out that the course did involve the process of writing (drafts, feedback, revisions, etc.) and so met his standards. It was also observed that the reports required extensive explanations and not merely the filling out of boxes. Motion passed.

990019,21,23,25 – HIST 1511, 1512, 1511H, 1512H, World Civilization Before and After 1500 (CTI). Hunter moved and Ritchey seconded a motion to certify these courses as critical thinking intensive. Jenkins told the committee that he had sent these courses to a critical thinking intensive committee, composed of Tom Shipka, Bruce Waller, Jonelle Beatrice, Dan O'Neill, and Dave Law, and they felt the courses were acceptable. Motion passed.

990012 – TCOM 4887, Theories and Criticism of Telecommunication (CTI). Hunter argued that the justification and the syllabus were skimpy. He believed that the course probably met the criteria, but there was not enough explanation, particularly on question number 7, and enough description in the syllabus. The committee agreed to send back the course proposal, and to encourage its resubmission.

990032 – HIST 2606,2606, Turning Points in US History I, II (CTI). A number of members of the committee indicated that they had not had time to read this proposal, or did not have a copy. It was agreed to hold consideration of this proposal until the next meeting.

Members did not have enough time to read proposals 990054 through 990058, and some had not received their copies through the mail. These courses will appear on next week's agenda. Jenkins asked committee members how much time each needed between the delivery of the courses and the meeting. The consensus was that the committee should only consider courses received by the Wednesday before the Friday meeting. Funk and Castronovo were concerned about the distance of Bliss Hall from the mail room, and the inability of mail to migrate across Wick Avenue. Jenkins indicated that he would have his student secretary deliver the packets to them.

Substitute courses – a lengthy discussion ensued over the role of this committee in the approval of substitute courses. Jenkins read the statement from page one of the Criteria regarding substitute courses, and noted that these courses must meet the general education goals for the domain that they satisfy. It would appear that the GEC has a role to play in examining whether these substitutes meet Gened goals. Some have been arguing, however, that it should be up to the department or program to determine whether a course is a substitute course. Jenkins pointed out that a problem might arise in the assessment process when a particular goal has not been attained by the student taking a substitute series of courses. Hence, it was important for the committee to exercise some kind of review to assure achievement of the goal. Ritchey asked that there be some consideration of how to shorten the forms for the substitute course proposals. Jenkins

concluded the meeting by asking members to think about this issue, and to come prepared next week to discuss the issue.

NEXT MEETING: FRIDAY, OCTOBER 15TH, 1 PM, TOD HALL. BRING COURSE PROPOSALS 990032,990054,990055,990056,990057,990058,990059, AND ANY OTHER COURSE PROPOSALS THAT ARRIVE BY WEDNESDAY.

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE

Corrected MINUTES 10-8-99

Absent: Maraffa

Jenkins opened the meeting with a discussion of whether the General Education Committee should contact faculty about the circulation of course proposals with a sheet that indicated each title, description, and domain. He indicated that he did send out a general cover sheet with the course proposals that did not identify the courses, but that he also e-mailed department chairs and deans with a note that provided a title, description, department, and domain for each course proposal. Munro suggested that it would be very helpful if chairs were to receive a cover sheet that listed the courses, their descriptions, and domains, and if this list were attached to the packet sent to the deans. After much discussion, it was decided to accept both of these suggestions.

Jenkins announced that Joe Antenucci had resigned from the General Education Committee because of other commitments. There will be an election for someone to fill out the term, but no nominee has been identified yet.

Jim Pusch pointed out that his home phone number on the membership list was incorrect. Mosca asked about the terms of members of the committee, and what the number next to her name meant. Jenkins explained that members served a three-year term, except for the first time around because of the need to rotate membership. By lot, some served only for one, others two, and the rest for three years. The number indicated the number of years remaining on the committee, including this year. Munro asked that Jenkins change the name of his department to electrical and computer engineering. Jenkins said that he would be putting out a new roster shortly.

Jenkins talked about the upcoming dinner at Springfield Grille. Every member of the committee, including the student representative, was invited. The best date was Monday, December 13th. It was agreed to be there at 6 PM. Please set aside that date.

990048 – World Literature (ALP). Jenkins passed out a new syllabus for the course. Hunter argued that the course was more of a western European literature course with maybe 15% of world literature. He opposed the course unless it approached a percentage of 50%. He did believe that the course could be submitted as it is but with a different title. The syllabus also had eighteen weeks rather than fifteen; it should be changed. The committee agreed to send the course back with these suggestions.

990053 – SOCIO 3751, Social Research (WI). Ritchey moved and Tessier seconded a motion to certify this course as writing intensive. Jenkins explained that he had run this and other writing intensive courses past Bob Hogue as the director of Writing Across the Curriculum. Hogue endorsed this course. Motion passed.

990059 – ANTHR 4890, Advanced Topics in Archaeology: Cultural Resource Management (WI). Castronovo moved and Hunter seconded a motion to certify this course as writing intensive. Ritchey explained that CASGEC had expressed concerns initially about this course, because of the filling out of forms. They had called in Bob Hogue to explain why he saw this course as a "model." Hogue pointed out that the course did involve the process of writing (drafts, feedback, revisions, etc.) and so met his standards. It was also observed that the reports required extensive explanations and not merely the filling out of boxes. Motion passed.

990019,21,23,25 – HIST 1511, 1512, 1511H, 1512H, World Civilization Before and After 1500 (CTI). Hunter moved and Ritchey seconded a motion to certify these courses as critical thinking intensive. Jenkins told the committee that he had sent these courses to a critical thinking intensive committee, composed of Tom Shipka, Bruce Waller, Jonelle Beatrice, Dan O'Neill, and Dave Law, and they felt the courses were acceptable. Motion passed.

990012 – TCOM 4887, Theories and Criticism of Telecommunication (CTI). Hunter argued that the justification and the syllabus were skimpy. He believed that the course probably met the criteria, but there was not enough explanation, particularly on question number 7, and enough description in the syllabus. The committee agreed to send back the course proposal, and to encourage its resubmission.

990032 – HIST 2606,2606, Turning Points in US History I, II (CTI). A number of members of the committee indicated that they had not had time to read this proposal, or did not have a copy. It was agreed to hold consideration of this proposal until the next meeting.

Members did not have enough time to read proposals 990054 through 990058, and some had not received their copies through the mail. These courses will appear on next week's agenda. Jenkins asked committee members how much time each needed between the delivery of the courses and the meeting. The consensus was that the committee should only consider courses received by the Wednesday before the Friday meeting. Funk and Castronovo were concerned about the distance of Bliss Hall from the mail room, and the inability of mail to migrate across Wick Avenue. Jenkins indicated that he would have his student secretary deliver the packets to them.

Substitute courses – a lengthy discussion ensued over the role of this committee in the approval of substitute courses. Jenkins read the statement from page one of the Criteria regarding substitute courses, and noted that these courses must meet the general education goals for the domain that they satisfy. It would appear that the GEC has a role to play in examining whether these substitutes meet Gened goals. Some have been arguing, however, that it should be up to the department or program to determine whether a course is a substitute course. Jenkins pointed out that a problem might arise in the assessment process when a particular goal has not been attained by the student taking a substitute series of courses. Hence, it was important for the committee to exercise some kind of review to assure achievement of the goal. Ritchey asked that there be some

consideration of how to shorten the forms for the substitute course proposals. Jenkins concluded the meeting by asking members to think about this issue, and to come prepared next week to discuss the issue.

NEXT MEETING: FRIDAY, OCTOBER 15TH, 1 PM, TOD HALL. BRING COURSE PROPOSALS 990032,990054,990055,990056,990057,990058,990059, AND ANY OTHER COURSE PROPOSALS THAT ARRIVE BY WEDNESDAY.

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE MINUTES 10-15-99

Absent: Ritchey

Brandon Schneider noted that the minutes of the last meeting had left out the committee's request that English rewrite the syllabus for the World Literature course for a fifteen-week duration rather than eighteen weeks. It was agreed that the committee also wanted a larger segment of the material covered to come from non-Western sources if it was to retain the title, World Literature. Jenkins reminded members that it was their duty at the beginning of the meeting to note any errors in the previous meeting's minutes. He also corrected the designation of Munro's department. It should be Electrical (not electronic) and Computer Engineering.

Jenkins opened discussion on the resolution presented by Brandon Schneider at the Academic Senate and referred to the Academic Standards and General Education Committees. Jenkins commented that Academic Standards would only examine whether the motions violated any university academic standards, not present the motions themselves. Schneider explained that these proposals came from the student senators, who believed that there was a need for a stronger inclusion of citizenship in the goals themselves. After some discussion occurred, Jenkins asked the committee to focus on the second amendment to include citizenship in goal four. Tessier objected to its inclusion because she believed that citizenship was a sub-category of ethical reflection and moral reasoning, not an equivalent. Moreover, she was concerned that such positioning would lead to all ethic courses having to include citizenship. Schneider did not feel that it was an impossible task for these courses to have some coverage of citizenship. Tessier moved and Munro seconded a motion to reject the amended goal four. Mosca argued that citizenship could be in there under the present language; no change was needed. Pusch believed that the amendment could create problems because of the different meanings of citizenship. Hunter argued, as a person who came from and has resided in other countries, that citizenship is a peculiarly American concern. He did not witness concerns about citizenship on the minds of the residents of other countries. Motion passed with Schneider abstaining.

The committee proceeded to consider the amended goal 11. Munro argued that the word, *political*, included citizenship as far as he was concerned. Moreover, he felt that citizenship was not parallel to the other nouns in the sequence, "theories, events, institutions, and citizenship." Schneider pointed out the dictionary definition of citizenship offered on the second page of his recommendation. Pusch wondered which definition applied. Mosca thought that the original wording covered citizenship, and was concerned about having to revisit courses already passed in the societies and institutions category. Maraffa moved to reject the amended goal 11, Mosca seconded. The motion passed with Hunter and Schneider abstaining.

In the midst of the previous conversation, a number of members indicated their willingness to consider a better placement of the word, citizenship. Jenkins indicated that the committee could consider such changes next Friday.

990054 Crosslisted 3718 Women, Science and Technology (ST). Jenkins noted that he had checked and all the courses coming before us today were for 3 SH. Tessier pointed out that this was a legitimate interdisciplinary courses requested by Women's Studies. Hunter agreed, but was concerned that science texts are misrepresented; they do include material on women and biographies. Tessier moved, Hunter seconded, a motion to **certify** this course. A point was made and agreed to that the cover letter to the CASGEC committee should be removed. Jenkins commented that the note on the first page did not apply since the GEC had not recognized any subcategories, such as Science and Society. A concern was raised about the vague prerequisites in natural science and philosophy. Any prerequisite should be a general education courses. Tessier amended her motion and Hunter concurred to certify the course contingent upon changes in the prerequisites. Motion passed.

990055 GEOL 1504 The Dynamic Earth (NS). The committee agreed that the narrative and the syllabus had not addressed goals 1, 2, and 3, and that the course should be referred back.

990056 GEOL 2602 Introduction to Oceanography (NS). The committee agreed to refer the course back to the department because of the discrepancy between its discussion of goals 1, 2, and 3 and the fact that the total grade is dependent on three tests.

990057 GEOG 2630 Weather (NS). Hunter moved and Tessier seconded a motion to certify the course. The committee had few questions about the course. Motion passed.

990058 GEOG 1503 Introduction to Physical Geography (NS). Hunter moved and Pusch seconded a motion to certify. With few questions the committee passed the motion.

The committee had time to consider course proposals 990060 through 990065, but at least three members had not received the proposals in a timely fashion. Hence, Hunter moved and Tessier seconded a motion to postpone consideration of these proposals until next week's meeting. Motion passed.

A number of questions were raised informally about the proposals:

- 1) Was applied behavioral analysis too confined to one theory, Skinnerism, for a general education course?
- 2) Didn't the title Selected Topics in Multicultural Studies duplicate too closely the title of a domain, Selected Topics and Electives? Would students be confused by the title? Doesn't Multicultural Studies suggest a much broader area of study than implied in a course offered by the English department?
- 3) Does the foreign drama course have to be offered as part of the World Literature course? Why is it separate?

NEXT MEETING, FRIDAY, OCTOBER 22, 1 PM.

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE MINUTES 10-22-99

ABSENT: Hunter

Jenkins introduced Megan Isaac to the committee. She is the general education chair for English, and was appearing today to provide answers to the committee's concerns about course 990048, World Literature. She provided members with a copy of a new syllabus, narrative and criteria response and noted that English instructors had condensed the course to fifteen weeks. She argued that the department needed to use World Literature as the title because the School of Education needed such a course to enable their students to satisfy the NCATE guidelines. Furthermore, the course would include between 25 and 30% on non-western texts regardless of the instructor, but could range as high as 75-80%. It was difficult, she contended, to find non-western texts for a course that chronologically covered several thousand years. She advocated allowing the instructor to decide the mix within these percentages. Jenkins asked for the definition provided by NCATE. Isaac said that NCATE did not require a single course, but offered broad categories to be satisfied. Those categories were American, British, and World. Thus, the literature of mainland Europe would qualify for the world category. After Isaac left, Castronovo moved and Maraffa seconded a motion to certify this course. Motion passed.

Jenkins presented a report from Tod Porter of Economics that he had grouped four economics proposals for general education certification. These courses were not yet coming to us, but would be coming as sections a,b,c,d of course 1500. The Dean of Arts and Sciences thought that such a structure was needed so that regular sections of the course could be offered. The committee questioned why that was necessary. Mosca wondered what would happen to the student who took one section (could the student take it again?). Maraffa thought that an integrity issue was involved. Jenkins told the committee that he was merely bringing this information to them, not asking for action. He also gave out an updated syllabus from Clyde Morris for Economics 1510, Economics in Action; we had requested a more detailed syllabus. This course would come forward as Section A of 1500.

Tessier raised the issue of how courses were to proceed between the University Curriculum Committee and the General Education Committee, as they seek certification and general approval. Jenkins indicated that the committees were considering the courses concurrently because of the time factor. Tessier asked that Jenkins inform committee members as to whether courses under consideration had passed the University Curriculum Committee. Jenkins responded that he was checking and that he would provide more information for the committee.

Jenkins brought up the issue of citizenship. The committee had defeated both amendments offered by student senators, but had indicated that it might consider alternative wording, particularly for goal 11. No one offered any change. Ritchey asked student senator Brandon Schneider what he thought, or if he had any suggestions.

Schneider said that, while he was disappointed over the failure to approve any changes, he did not want to pursue the issue any further. He did, however, offer a motion **that the General Education Committee include in its report to the Academic Senate a statement encouraging the inclusion of the concept of citizenship with its various definitions into all appropriate general education courses.** Mosca seconded the motion. Tessier spoke in favor of the motion, and congratulated the students for speaking out. Jenkins also favored the motion. He indicated that he would like to make up a brochure on general education that talked about citizenship as a very important component of the general education curriculum. The committee could also circulate a letter to all faculty encouraging the inclusion of citizenship wherever possible. Munro expressed a lack of comfort with an overemphasis on citizenship. The motion passed.

990041 – Writing I Honors, ENGL 1550H. Maraffa moved and Schneider seconded a motion to certify. There was general approval for the resubmitted proposal. Motion passed.

990043 – Writing 2 Honors, ENGL 1551H. Tessier moved and Castronovo seconded a motion to certify. Again there was general approval. Motion passed.

990060 – Applied Behavior Analysis, PSYCH 3734. Jenkins raised the questions of whether the course was broad enough since it apparently covered only the Skinnerian approach to behavior analysis. Reiff noted that there was some mention of alternative theories, but it did not seem to be spelled out thoroughly. The committee agreed to return the course with a request to spell out how alternative theories are considered, and to check on the course number. Maraffa pointed out that this was a higher level course, which is appropriate in general education, and that the course could be more specialized. Jenkins argued that the specialization in this course was too narrow, that it would be better for students to cover more theories.

990061 – Psychology of Intimate Relationships, PSYCH 3707. The committee agreed to return the course to the department for revision of the syllabus. The syllabus should reflect the narrative, especially on goals 1,2,3 in the assignments.

990062 -- Selected Topics in Multicultural Studies, ENGL 3790. There was much concern expressed about the title. Selected Topics might confuse students because of the general education domain of Selected Topics and Electives. Multicultural Studies was believed to be a much broader subject matter than involved in an English course. It was decided to send the course back for 1) a change of title that reflected the topic of multicultural literacy; 2) better coverage in the narrative of why the course fulfills goal 8; 3) better explanation of why the course fulfills goal 10 since that goal emphasizes world societies in connection with western society, not the US with western; and 4) consideration of including the course under Selected Topics and Electives.

990063 – Foreign Drama, FNLG 2605. Jenkins noted that Dean Brothers had attached a note indicating that English and Foreign Language had agreed to submit the course as cross-listed with World Literature. The committee did not understand why that listing

was necessary. It supported a separate listing for the course. Questions were raised about the coverage of the course, that the syllabus appeared to be for Greek and Roman drama primarily. Castronovo believed that Melissa Smith would teach primarily Russian drama if she were to teach the course. He also raised a question about the instructor asking the students to consider how they might stage the plays today. How would they know the elements of production? It was not clear in the narrative or in the syllabus. The committee decided to send the course back for 1) consideration of a title such as Topics in Foreign Drama, which would reflect the fact that the instructors would emphasize a narrow segment of the subject matter; 2) examination of how students would learn the production elements so that they might stage a play today.

990064 – Introduction to Professional Ethics, PHIL 2625. Ritchey moved and Mosca seconded a motion to certify. Motion passed.

Jenkins paused to consider a proposal regarding substitute courses. Allan Hunter had discussed with him the possibility of expediting consideration of substitute course proposals by asking for a list of such courses composed of the title and description only. Individual departments or programs offering such courses would make up the list. Then the committee would be able to certify, to request more information, or to require a complete proposal. Mosca asked about those departments or programs dependent on such courses. It was generally agreed that the committee had no power over departments or programs to require them to offer courses that another department or program needed. Tessier thought that such a list would be too sketchy for her to do her job. She agreed with Ritchey when he offered a suggestion that the syllabus be included. Reiff offered a motion, seconded by Maraffa, that **1) the Committee request an initial list of courses from departments or programs seeking to offer substitute courses with title, description and a syllabus included; and 2) the Committee review the list to determine whether sufficient information was present to certify with the possibility that it might request more information or a complete course proposal.** Motion passed.

990065 – Introduction to Literature, ENGL 1590. Castronovo moved, Pusch seconded, a motion to certify. With little discussion, the motion passed.

990067 – Engineering Economy, ISEGR 3724. Tessier pointed out that the course had a non-general education prerequisite, and thus was not eligible to be a general education course. She also commented that it did not appear to be a general education course because it was not directed toward the general student body, but toward the engineering major. It was also noted that the narrative did not address goals 1,2,3. Munro argued that the course did cover economic principles, but Jenkins questioned the breadth of knowledge about economics that the student would gain from taking this course. Maraffa asked why the course did not have an introductory economics course as a prerequisite. The committee decided to send the course back for consideration of 1) its appeal to the general student body; 2) its prerequisites; and 3) comments on its coverage of goals 1,2,3.

990067 – Healthy Lifestyles, HSC 1566. Tessier moved and Mosca seconded a motion to certify. There was general commendation for the proposal. Motion passed.

990068 – Biology and the Modern World, BIOL 1505. Castronovo moved and Reiff seconded a motion to certify. It was noted positively that the course did directly address the coverage of goals 1,2,3. Jenkins wondered whether biology was justified in not undertaking much activity directed toward these goals. The committee felt that the size of the students taking the course (60 to 200) justified the lack of coverage. Motion passed.

990069 – Lifespan Psychology, PSYCH 3758. Maraffa moved and Mosca seconded a motion to certify. Motion passed.

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE MINUTES 11-5-99

-ABSENT: Kasuganti, Maraffa

Jenkins went over the list of submitted courses and explained the status of courses overall.

990028 – Economics 1510. Clyde Morris submitted a new syllabus, which had been sent back as the committee's main concern. The Committee decided to return the syllabus because of its concern about the absence on the syllabus of a large number of essays assignments referred to in the narrative. Jenkins noted that the economics department was submitting a number of proposals, but that he had not received 1500A and 1500B. It was noted that the ability to group courses in this fashion belonged to the University Curriculum Committee. Jenkins would check with Patricia Hoyson, chair of UCC, regarding the economics' proposals

990032 – History 2605 and 2606 as critical thinking intensive. Tessier moved, Schneider seconded, a motion to certify. Motion passed.

990038 – Music 2618. Jenkins explained that Charles Singler had withdrawn his objection because the course now dealt with goal 12 rather than goal 7. Funk moved, Pusch seconded, a motion to certify. Motion passed.

990055 – Geology 1504. Singler had returned a note detailing additions to the proposal form as requested. The committee was satisfied with the additions. Reiff moved, Hunter, seconded, a motion to certify. Motion passed.

990056 – Geology 1602. Hunter asked whether this might be a substitute course. The committee thought otherwise. Munro moved, Castronovo seconded, a motion to certify. Motion passed.

990062 – English 3790. The English department had agreed to change the title to Topics in Multicultural Literacy, but the resubmitted form had the wrong description. Also it was noted that the narrative talked about having multiple literary forms to study, but that the syllabus attached had primarily historical documents. It was agreed that these could be included, but that the selection should reflect the purpose of enabling students to study different literary forms.

990063 – Foreign Language 2605. John Sarkissian had resubmitted the proposal with a title of Topics in Foreign Drama to reflect the fact that multiple instructors would teach from within their own area of expertise. Sarkissian had also removed the reference to having students reflect on how the production might be mounted in modern times. Castronovo moved, Tessier seconded, a motion to certify. Motion passed.

At this point Allen Hunter requested that the committee consider his form for substitute courses. This form would provide for a way to fast track such courses. There was much concern expressed about the reluctance of the science departments to provide a syllabus. After much discussion, it was agreed that the name of the form should be the Fast Track Substitute Course Form For _____ (domain) to reflect the fact that the form should not be for natural science only. It was also the consensus of the committee that the form should include a definition of substitute courses, and that the wording, "must include this page, a syllabus and (where requested by the GEC committee) the pages on Criteria Response and Narrative" should be changed to "must include this page and a syllabus. The General Education Committee may request a semester syllabus and/or a Criteria Response and Narrative." Munro moved, Mosca seconded, a motion to adopt the form. The motion passed with one abstention.

990070 – Chemistry 1500. Ritchey moved, Munro seconded, a motion to certify. Motion passed.

990071 – English 2617. Tessier moved, Ritchey seconded, a motion to certify. Motion passed.

990072 – English 2631. At first there were questions about the relevance of mythology to literary forms. Tessier explained that mythology was a recurrent component of many literary forms. Mosca moved, Castronovo seconded, a motion to certify. Motion passed.

990073 – Physics 1500. It was not felt that the syllabus reflected the work discussed in the narrative. Also the syllabus was for quarters, not semesters.

990074 – ^{11m}Astrology 1504. Schneider moved, Tessier seconded, a motion to certify. Motion passed.

990075 – Counseling 4887. Jenkins explained that Counseling was primarily a graduate department, which offered swing courses. This course had no prerequisite as a result, which may violate university rules. It was decided to have the University Curriculum Committee determine whether such a course could be included in the course inventory.

Jenkins began a discussion of the fact that Philosophy & Religious Studies had submitted 28 courses for general education certification. He noted that North Central had called for a paring down of courses, and that most departments had submitted no more than four. Also the number of courses in the domain of societies and institutions would increase from 20 to 34; the number in personal and social responsibility from 11 to 19. There were also four courses for Selected Topics and two capstone courses. He pointed out that most departments in Arts and Sciences had been discouraged from sending in so many courses. He believed that, if GEC certified these courses, fairness demanded that we re-open the opportunity for other departments to send in proposals. Obviously, this would present a problem for finishing the certification process in a timely fashion.

Tessier spoke on behalf of the proposals. She argued that these courses should be judged individually as to whether they met the goals within a domain. Moreover, because the department was composed of two programs, each should be judged separately. She presented data gathered by the department on the type of student in each course. The fact that each of these courses appealed to a variety of students demonstrated that these were general education courses for the general student body. It was not the committee's job, she argued, to limit the number of courses. Mosca agreed that the committee should limit itself to certifying the courses only. Jenkins explained that the powers of the committee went beyond certification; it could establish rules and recommend policy. He was still concerned about the large number of courses, North Central's reaction, and the problem that would arise with departments that had not submitted more courses. Mosca commented that some of these courses had a prerequisite, and that the 700 level courses would provide depth. She was satisfied that the Committee's only charge was to certify such courses on a one-by-one basis.

No decision was reached. Jenkins postponed any action until the next meeting.

NEXT MEETING ON FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 12 AT 1 PM. PLEASE COME PREPARED FOR A LONG MEETING. WE WILL BEGIN WITH THE PHILOSOPHY COURSES.

NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION

DEFINING GENERAL EDUCATION

The following statement comes from the Handbook of Accreditation, 2nd ed., published by North Central Association of Colleges and Schools in September 1997.

From Chapter 3: The General Institutional Requirements, pages 23-24.

16. Its undergraduate degree programs include a coherent general education requirement consistent with the institution's mission and designed to ensure breadth of knowledge and to promote intellectual inquiry.

Defining General Education

Throughout its history, the Commission has held to the tenet that higher education involves breadth as well as depth of study. General education refers to that component of a student's study that ensures breadth. In 1983 the Commission approved this Statement on General Education, which still applies:

General education is "general" in several clearly identifiable ways: it is not directly related to a student's formal technical, vocational, or professional preparation; it is a part of every student's course of study, regardless of his or her area emphasis, and it is intended to impart common knowledge, intellectual concepts, and attitudes that every educated person should possess.

Recently, the Commission refined its understanding of general education, emphasizing the need for a general education program to be coherent, ensure breadth of knowledge, and promote intellectual inquiry.

Therefore, regardless of how an institution of higher education defines its goals for general education,

- it will be able to show that it has thoughtfully considered and clearly articulated the purposes and content of the general education it provides to its students;
- it will give evidence of its commitment to the importance of general education by including an appropriate component of general education in all of its programs of substantial length, whether they lead to certificates, diplomas, or degrees; and
- if it offers graduate instruction, it will provide further evidence of this commitment by requiring the student to have completed a general education program for admission to its graduate programs.



Network for Academic Renewal (NAR) working conferences

Each academic year AAC&U's Network for Academic Renewal (NAR) presents a series of working conferences — with the emphasis on "working." The conferences are intended especially for campus teams, with individual participants also welcome. See the [message from the director](#), Jerry Gaff.

Network [Registration Form](#) | [Registration Fees](#)

The schedule of working conferences for the 1999-2000 academic year is:

- Partners in Academic Leadership: Faculty, Chair and Dean Collaboration
September 30-October 2, 1999
Toronto, Canada
Preliminary Program
- Rethinking the Purposes and Practices of Foreign Language Education
In collaboration with the National Foreign Language Center of the Johns Hopkins University and Drake University
October 21-23, 1999
Des Moines, Iowa
Preliminary Program

Winter/Spring Schedule of Meetings

Preliminary Programs for the Winter and Spring 2000 meetings will be available November 15.

- General Education in the New Millennium: Opportunities, Principles, Politics
In collaboration with the Council for the Administration of General and Liberal Studies
February 24-26, 2000
San Antonio, Texas
Hotel Information
- Resolving Conflict and Building Community: Successful Approaches
March 2-4, 2000
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Hotel information
- Integration of Liberal and Professional Studies: From Aspiration to Improved Practice

Des Moines, Iowa

There is a critical need to prepare our graduates to communicate with people of other cultures and to do so in languages other than English. Yet most colleges and universities do not respond effectively. They are constrained and often frustrated by a host of factors. These include: disparate levels of student preparation; disjunction between K-12 and postsecondary language programs; rapidly shifting patterns of language enrollments; the labor-intensiveness of classroom-based language instruction; mismatches between and among program design, institutional needs and student goals; the scarcity of institutional resources; a lack of comprehensive attention at the institutional level to the improvement of foreign language programs; and—frequently compounding all of these problems—pervasive disagreement and confusion as to what, if any, important role language education has to play.

The working conference will be of greatest use to institutions that send a team, including both administrators and faculty representing a range of academic areas. The assumption governing this work is that challenges as numerous, complex and deeply rooted institutionally and societally as those facing language programs cannot be dealt with adequately at the departmental or program level. They require a broader process of analysis, negotiation and consensus-building that recognizes the institution's responsibility to help language programs define appropriate, feasible and compelling goals and then to deliver on them effectively and efficiently.

This working conference will involve selected Language Mission Project participants in addition to the project leadership team. It will provide participants practical assistance in coming to grips with the challenges confronting language education—from framing the issues, to fashioning and conducting a workable self-study and planning process, to exploiting exciting new approaches and technologies for language learning.

[Return to top](#) | [Preliminary Program](#) | [Registration Form](#)

General Education in the New Millennium: Opportunities, Principles, Politics

February 24-26, 2000

San Antonio, Texas

This conference is designed as a major national event for faculty leaders, academic administrators, and others committed to the principle that all undergraduates deserve a rigorous, engaging, and coherent general education in addition to a specialization. It will provide opportunities to analyze achievements and lessons learned by campuses that have taken specific steps to strengthen their general education programs. It will also highlight the unfinished agendas that will claim the attention of curriculum reformers in coming years.

This meeting will feature:

- Opportunities to see general education "in action" in many institutions;
- Results of a national survey of general education practices and trends;
- Results of a national survey of states mandating transfer requirements;
- Promising and unpromising policy directions;
- Reports from national projects dealing with raising expectations for college learning, learning communities, and transfer from two- to four-year institutions;
- How regional and specialized accreditation agencies will view general education in the future; and
- Conversations with authors of works on general education.

[Return to top](#) | [Hotel Information](#) | [Registration Form](#)

Resolving Conflict and Building Community: Successful Approaches

March 2-4, 2000

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Most of us cling to the hope that the university will be a place where logic reigns over emotion, where cooperation prevails over competition, and where reflection coupled with civility remain defining characteristics. But there is no doubt that the current era of downsizing, restructuring, and fiscal constraints is producing tensions that increase conflict and discord that can damage an institution's community and its learning environment. More than ever, there is a need to work together to solve complex problems and resolve disputes in order to establish working and learning environments in which all members of a university community can flourish. Success depends on deep commitments from all parties to work together to resolve difficulties and chart a productive course.

The abilities to manage disputes, build consensus, negotiate solutions, and deal with conflict are increasingly important skills for everyone to acquire. This working conference will provide an introduction to basic conflict resolution and community-building strategies. Active engagement through case studies, observation, and informed group discussion will be emphasized. Participants will learn proven techniques that can be used in a variety of professional and personal settings.

Sessions will address: Consensus Building and Team Development; Negotiating Relationships; Facilitation and Mediation Skills for Meetings; The Supervisor as Mediator; and Managing Your Own Well-being Under Stress.

[Return to top](#) | [Hotel Information](#) | [Registration Form](#)

Integration of Liberal And Professional Studies: From Aspiration to Improved Practice

April 6-8, 2000

Tacoma, Washington

Few issues feature more prominently in higher education's curricular reform

**GENERAL EDUCATION COURSE PROPOSAL
FAST TRACK SUBSTITUTE COURSE FORM**

For _____ (domain)

[Note: Substitute courses replace a previously approved general education course, and are designed for students in a specific program or who have a special interest in the subject matter. Please also note that the model requires that substitute courses meet the general education goals.]

Department or Program _____

Semester Course Number _____ [Substitutes for _____ (course number).]

Course Title _____

Catalogue Description:

Faculty qualified to teach course. _____

Estimated number of sections to be offered in Fall 2000 _____, Spring 2001 _____

Other departments that require this course _____

Please note that general education fast track substitute course proposals (send 14 copies) must include this page and a syllabus. The GEC committee may request a semester syllabus and/or the Criteria Response and Narrative.

Submitted by (Department or program chair signature) (date)

Reviewed by (Dean's signature) (date)

Certified by (Coordinator, GEC, signature) (date)

(Chair, Academic Senate, signature)

(date)

GEC Proposal Number (GEC Use Only) _____

Relationship of proposed semester courses to current quarter courses:

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE MINUTES 11-12-99

ABSENT: none

The committee welcomed Ram Kasuganti as the new representative from the college of business.

Jenkins asked committee members about another meeting time because he would be gone next Friday, and, of course, there was no school on Thanksgiving Friday. After much discussion, it was agreed that the committee would meet on Tuesday, November 16th, at 7 AM (until 9). Breakfast would be provided.

The chair noted that a committee member has indicated dissatisfaction with how quickly the committee had considered 990074, Descriptive Astronomy. It appeared that the syllabus was no more descriptive than the one sent back for Conceptual Physics. Jenkins asked committee members if they agreed. He had not circulated the course proposal because of this question and his concern that we be consistent. Reiff indicated some specific areas in which the Astronomy syllabus spoke to certain goals. The committee was satisfied, and affirmed its certification of the course proposal.

Jenkins opened a discussion on how to handle the Philosophy and Religious Studies courses. He believed that there were too many, and that the department should be given the option of reviewing them, and making their own cuts. He also indicated that some of the courses might be substitute courses, some might belong in a different category, and some had too general a prerequisite (any 2600 level Philosophy or Religious Studies course). Tessier responded by arguing that no limits had been placed on course proposals by the Academic Senate, and that P&RS had the right to be considered on a course by course basis, just as other course proposals had been done. She noted that we had accepted other single section courses, and that the only criteria should be whether or not the course met the general education goals. She did not believe that the present system led to a cafeteria style approach, and cited University of California at Irvine as an example of a university with many options for a student, including 27 possible sequences of courses in history. She wanted the one-by-one consideration because it would give her specific guidance in taking the courses back to the department and fostering their acceptance of a more limited number. After all, Communication & Theater had received consideration of their large number of courses (17 in all) on such a basis.

Jenkins pointed out that a significant number of the Communication & Theater proposals were either for capstone, intensive, honors, or substitute courses. Of the 17 there were only two offered for societies and institutions, and 4 for artistic and literary perspectives. One of the 17 was the oral communication course itself, which fit into the basic skill area.

Tessier indicated that having gone through the courses on a one-by-one basis that she could then take them back to the department and deal in a better fashion with the issues raised by the committee. The Dean of A&S, Barbara Brothers, is indeed concerned about

single section courses, but there is no indication why. Tessier believed that committee review would enable her to understand some of the concerns raised, although she herself was in favor of the ability of students to have a wide choice, especially in regard to depth.

Ritchey responded that CASGEC had concerns about the overall number, and asked Tessier why there were so many more courses than proposed by other departments. She responded that philosophy and religious studies was primarily a service department, and that many of its courses were designed to reach the general student body. Maraffa contended that 2/3rds of the departments in A&S were similar to P&RS, but they had made the cuts. In the spirit of what other departments have done, he advocated that P&RS examine their own course and make appropriate cuts. Maraffa advised the committee to regulate ourselves or have other agencies, such as North Central do it for us. He also presented the idea that students also have electives and minors. He believed that P&RS was overlooking the fact that students would take many of their courses out of interest or choice, and not to satisfy the general education requirements. In addition, students might and do take philosophy or religious studies as a minor.

Munro spoke in behalf of looking at the courses. Funk asked about the Dean's signature, and whether we should consider courses not signed by the Dean. The committee reaffirmed its prerogative to examine all course proposals regardless of the dean's signature, but that the committee had to take into account the reasons for the lack of a dean's signature. Pusch indicated that he thought some of the courses belonged in special topics, but he did think they merited consideration as general education courses.

Hunter moved, seconded by Munro, a motion to consider the philosophy and religious studies courses one-by-one. Motion passed 10-3. Maraffa then moved, Mosca seconded, a motion to consider the courses by domain and in ascending course numbers within the domain. Motion passed.

990076 – GEOL 1510, Geology of National Parks. The committee decided to send the course back to re-examine fulfillment of goals 1, 2, 3 and to ask that the syllabus reflect the goals, assessment, and assignments talked about in the criteria section.

990077 – SOCIO 3745, Medical Sociology. Jenkins argued that this course looked like a specialized course for professionals. He presented the statement from North Central that general education "is not directly related to a student's formal technical, vocational, or professional preparation; it 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." He cited in particular the title and the description of the course as an indication of its intent and purpose. It was to prepare NEOUCOM students for medical careers. Mosca argued that other students did take the course, and that we should be willing to consider them as beneficiaries of such a course. Why harm them? Jenkins also contended that this course probably did not teach that much science, and did not meet goal 7. It was possible to reframe this course so that it covered goals 9 and 11, and fit within the special topics category. Funk suggested that we should ask the instructors who actually took the course, how such a

~~took~~
taught

specialized course served the purposes of general education, and what was the type of fieldwork required. The committee decided to secure the answers to these questions.

Jenkins indicated that the committee would bypass any intensive or capstone course proposals until the regular courses had been considered.

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE MINUTES 11-16-99

ABSENT: Pusch

Jenkins began the meeting by reiterating the motion from the previous meeting that called for the committee to consider the Philosophy & Religious Studies courses by domain and in ascending order by course number. He suggested beginning with the societies and institutions domain. There was also discussion regarding the fact that the Dean of Arts and Sciences had not signed all of the courses. The committee reaffirmed its belief that it could consider such courses as long as it examined the objections of the dean to these proposals.

990082 – PHIL 2600, Introduction to Philosophy. Tessier presented the department's rationale that this course belonged in societies and institutions. She noted that a basic philosophy course has long been accepted as a general education course. Jenkins argued that it was a personal and social responsibility course. Philosophy has traditionally been a humanity. Since it does not belong in artistic and literary perspectives, it comes closest to goal 4. He also contended that philosophy was about the meaning of existence, the study of what is knowledge, and similar areas that made it more about ethics and morality than societies and institutions. Tessier responded that philosophy was an underpinning to how people lived within a society, and that the material was constantly related to societies. Jenkins responded that many disciplines not in societies and institutions related their material to society, but that did not make them part of the societies and institution domain. English, for instance, taught about literature in relation to the society in which it was written, but it was a humanity and not a social science. He also pointed out that the general education model called upon each domain to relate its material to the society in which we lived. That relation did not make the course a part of the societies and institutions domain. Tessier thought, however, that the course did provide a sufficiently developed coverage of what was primarily material for societies and institutions. Hunter moved, with Castronovo seconding, a motion to approve the course. The motion did not pass, and the committee decided to send the course proposal back to the department for re-consideration of its domain.

990098 – RELIG 2631, Introduction to World Religions. Jenkins indicated that he thought the course merited general education certification, but he wondered whether it automatically fit within societies and institutions or personal and social responsibility. It is possible for such proposals to fit in either domain depending upon the emphasis. If a course talked primarily about religions from a theological viewpoint, or as a body of values and beliefs, then it should fit into personal and social responsibility. If, on the other hand, it traced the development of religious thoughts and institutions over time, and emphasized the impact of that religion on a particular culture or society, such as Mustansir Mir has done with the course on Islam, then it merits consideration as a societies and institutions course. Tessier argued that indeed this course was of the second type, that it was clear in the proposal how it did so, and that it had the look and feel of a

societies and institution course. Schneider moved, Hunter seconded, a motion to certify. Motion passed.

990100 – RELIG 2617, Introduction to Eastern Religions. Jenkins asked why this course was equivalent to the introductory course on world religions. It seemed more specialized. Why did it not have Introduction to World Religions as a prerequisite? Tessier responded that it was a survey course, that it covered a lot of material, and that it served as an introduction to more specific courses on religions in that area. Tessier moved, Schneider seconded, a motion to certify the course. Motion passed.

In discussing the above courses, the issue arose of what was a legitimate prerequisite for some of the Philosophy and Religious Studies courses. A number of them had a prerequisite of any 2600 level P&RS studies course. Jenkins pointed out that this violated the earlier resolution of the committee that a course must have a general education course as a prerequisite if it were an upper division course to be offered for general education credit. It was also possible for a student to take only one of the introductory level P&RS courses, and take 5 or 6 upper division level courses in the same department, and thereby enable a student to cover the domains of societies and institutions, personal and social responsibility, and selected topics and electives. Such a possibility was a violation of the requirement of breadth. Hunter moved, Reiff seconded, a motion that an upper division general education course proposal must be linked to a specific general education course as a prerequisite, and build upon that course. Kasuganti argued that this motion might exclude his upper division course proposals from the college of business. It was pointed out to him that such proposals could use any course approved for a specific domain as a prerequisite; the course did not have to be within the college of business. The motion passed.

Jenkins opened discussion on the next meeting. He noted the limited disposal of course proposals today, and suggested that there was a need to meet again next week. He offered Tuesday morning at 7 am. The committee agreed. Maraffa moved, Funk seconded, a motion that the committee cover only 1500 and 2600 level courses next week. It would facilitate the passage of course that can be offered in the upcoming year; Tom pointed out that students would probably not take 3700 level courses until two years from now. Motion passed.

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE MINUTES 11-23-99

ABSENT: Castronovo, Kasuganti, Pusch, Tessier

Jenkins began the meeting by announcing that Tom Shipka had sent a letter to the committee regarding the 3700 Philosophy and Religious Studies proposals; they were reconsidering the package and would resubmit. He reminded the committee that it had decided to cover only 1500 and 2600 level course proposals today. In response to a question about the order of the proposals, Jenkins noted that the course on the Introduction to Women's Studies was not being examined because of the absence of Tess Tessier, nor would any lower level P&RS proposals for the same reason. He also did not want to bring forward any proposals sent back and responded to until we had covered all the new proposals. The time factor was his major concern.

990105 – MUSIC 2616, Survey of Jazz. Funk moved, Ritchey seconded, a motion to certify. Jenkins raised a question about the narrowness of coverage, and noted that there was nothing in the proposal that indicated that the course would provide a general introduction to musical forms or theory. Funk responded that she thought it was as general as the course on rock n' roll. Hunter asked about which students took this course. Funk noted that often it was majors, but that the course was open to the general student body, and had no prerequisite. Motion passed.

990106 through 990109 – Music History & Literature I,II, III, IV. Funk commented that these courses were substitute courses. Since the committee was not considering such courses at this time, Jenkins asked committee members to set the proposals aside, and write substitute on the front page. He would be sending out the fast track form shortly. Mosca indicated that there was a need on the part of the departments in her college to have substitute courses identified for the programs committee. Jenkins said he was aware of the urgency of their consideration, but that the regular proposals needed to be dealt with first. He was hoping to cover all of the proposals by early December.

990110 – CRJUS1500, Introduction to Criminal Justice. It was decided to send this course back to the department for the following reasons: 1) inclusion of comments on goals 1, 2, and 3; 2) no indication of who the students would be (in particular, is this primarily a course for majors); 3) a reaffirmation that regular faculty would be teaching this course; 4) elaboration in the criteria section on the second requirement; 5) confirmation that it has the resources to offer this course as a general education course (the department is short-staffed in regard to coverage of its majors).

990111, CLTEC 2687 and 2687L, Microbiology in Health Care. Hunter argued that this course was not teaching about science concepts, but applying them to a specific problem; thus, it violated the criteria that a science course not be an applied science. Jenkins pointed out that this course was directed toward the professional development of healthcare students. Such an objective did not meet the standard of North Central that a general education course not be one "directly related to a student's formal technical,

vocational, or professional preparation...” Ritchey asked how this course imparted common knowledge, or was a part of every student's course of study. Munro commented that he did not understand how these arguments applied, but he did understand Hunter's concern about the applied part of this course proposal. Mosca indicated that his course had come forward because of the fact that biology was not including appropriate material in its substitute general education course. This was material that was needed by various programs in the health area. Maraffa pointed out that this was not the concern of the committee, but he did feel that the biology department should be accommodating. Ritchey moved, Hunter seconded, a motion to reject this course. Motion passed with six ayes, two nays, and one abstention.

990112 – CHHS 1510, Introduction to the US Health Care System. Jenkins expressed concern about whom the course was offered for, and also asked why it did not fit more under personal and social responsibility (goal 9). Mosca responded that the course would not be counted toward any of the majors in the college. It was designed for the general student body. She also argued that the health care system was an institutional development, and should reside in societies and institutions. Schneider moved, Hunter seconded, a motion to certify. Motion passed.

990113 – FNUTR 1551, Normal Nutrition. The committee felt that the proposal did not respond sufficiently to the criteria or in the narrative. Moreover, the syllabus was not a semester syllabus. It was also indicated that the proposal needed to address one other goal beside goal 9. The course was sent back.

990114 – HMEC 2680, Consumer Economics. Concerns regarding this course included: 1) lack of a schedule in the syllabus; 2) single-section course (60 students); 3) concern about whether it would be taught since Dr. Elias was not teaching regularly, and Ms. Draa was not a regular member of the faculty (the course was not presently a general education course); 4) the need for a much more detailed response to goal 9; 5) the reference on page 3 under the narrative to the fact that "Consumer Economics is an upper level course”

990017 – POLSC 1560, American Government. The committee agreed to send back this course based on concerns about whether it fit into personal and social responsibility or societies and institutions. Considering the title of the course and the course syllabus, the committee felt that the course fit within societies and institutions. The committee was also concerned about: 1) the lack of a description for the course; 2) the need to demonstrate on the syllabus how goals 1, 2, and 3 are met; 3) the need to link the arguments to the criteria more directly; and 4) whether other faculty would be committed to teaching this course for the ethics and moral reasoning domain. The GEC is not saying that this course, under any form, can not be considered for personal and social responsibility. It also wants to encourage the political science department to resubmit because the GEC believes that the course should definitely be a part of general education.

Jenkins reminded committee members that the NEXT MEETING WILL BE ON FRIDAY, DECEMBER 3, AT 1 PM. PLEASE SET ASIDE THE ENTIRE AFTERNOON. The committee will begin with the following course proposals: 9900121,990130,9900131,990136. Then it will take up any 1500 or 2600 philosophy and religious studies course proposal, including 990083,990086,990097,990098,⁷ 990099,990101, and 990120. The committee will not consider the P&RS 3700 level proposals until the department has made further recommendations based on Tom Shipka's letter to the committee. Then we will examine 990103. Finally, please bring the economics proposals, including 990028,990078,990079,990118, and 990119, as well as 990114 (consumer economics) and 99990066 (engineering economics). If there is time, we will consider rewritten proposals.

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE MINUTES 12-3-99

PRESENT: F. Castronovo, D. Funk, A. Hunter, B. Jenkins (chair), R. Kasuganti, T. Maraffa, N. Mosca, P. Munro, J. Pusch, MJ Reiff, N. Ritchey, B. Schneider, T. Tessier

Jenkins opened the meeting with a welcome for the Provost, Jim Scanlon, who came at the request of the committee to discuss some of his concerns regarding general education. Scanlon began with an observation that he was expressing his own opinion, and that the committee had the job of determining what the general education program would be at YSU. Scanlon then told the committee that the recent visit of North Central had resulted in a citing that called for an interim report from the university regarding its progress on general education. North Central was appearing for its first visit since the 1988 report, which had not been a good one for YSU. There had been criticism of the distribution model of general education then used at YSU, and little was done to change until after 1993. Much progress had been made since then, and North Central was pleased with that progress, but a new model had not been implemented as of 1998. Scanlon expressed concern that although North Central had expressed approval of the changes that had been made, there could be problems and a three-year visit by North Central. He wanted to avoid that possibility.

One problem could arise from the number of courses. Scanlon argued that the Academic Senate had passed a resolution supporting a modified core, which meant that the number of courses in general education should be limited. He noted that many smaller, private colleges did have a core, but that was not possible at YSU as a comprehensive university. Obviously, there was quite a gap between a fifteen-course core, and the hundreds of courses available in the distribution model. Scanlon contended, however, that the number should be closer to the core, hence a modified core, rather than to the huge number of courses presently available. When asked for a number, he said that there was no magic number; it was a matter of judgement. However, it was a goal of general education and of North Central that students have as common an experience as possible. Thereby, the number of courses should err on the side of commonality.

Scanlon also spoke to the issue of breadth. North Central called for both breadth and depth. By depth it meant the major, or perhaps the minor. Electives were also a way of achieving depth. Breadth, however, applied to general education courses. Within a general education course, for instance, there must be breadth of coverage. A course must not be too narrow. Anglo-Saxon literature from 704 to 717 should not be permitted. On the other hand, British Literature was probably broad enough because it would cover poems, drama, essays, novels, etc., but 17th century British Literature was too restrictive. Within a domain there should also be breadth. In Artistic and Literary Perspectives a student should not take all courses in the English department, or in the Music department. The issue of breadth also affected the number of 700 level courses. Although Scanlon did not object to a student taking a 700 level course in general education, he thought that too many of such courses would work against breadth.

In regard to making a judgement about whether a course fit within general education, Scanlon noted that it must be definitely shaped by the general education goals; reflect those goals in the syllabus; provide some breadth of coverage of the area; and be designed for the general student, not the major. He contended that a course that primarily served majors was not a general education course.

Finally, Scanlon spoke in regard to single-section courses, as well as the number of courses from a single department. He believed that too many courses offered as single-section created too many courses and led us back to a cafeteria approach. When asked about the fact that only courses that met the goals were approved, he commented that there was still a danger of straying from a modified core. He would prefer that single-section courses be taught at least every semester, and that they have 60 to over 100 students, the purpose being to provide students with a common experience. He was also concerned about departments that had too many courses in different domains because students might take such courses without achieving breadth.

After Dr. Scanlon left, Jenkins asked committee members about the dinner at Springfield Grille on December 13. The dinner will be at 6 pm.

- Committee members were asked about the AAC&U convention on general education to be held February 24-26 in San Antonio, Texas. The GEC would pay the entire fare. Jenkins encouraged new members of the committee to attend as a means of finding out more about general education, particularly on the national level.

Jenkins passed out responses to the GEC regarding various course proposals that it had sent back. Among the responses were Clyde Morris' rewritten proposals for Economics in Action, Bob Weaver's written response to our questions on medical Sociology, Charles Singler's rewritten Geology of National Parks, Bill Mullins' and Gail Okawa's memo on Studies in Multiculturalism, Steven Hanzely's syllabus for Physics 1500, and Jan Gill-Wigal's proposal for a health and wellness course from the counseling department. The committee will consider these rewritten proposals after looking at new course proposals. Jenkins also explained that he had gotten out the fast track substitute course proposal form, and that the science departments were already in the process of submission through Arts and Sciences. He has also received a telephone call from Paul Sracic of the Political Science Department, who, after a conversation with Bill Binning, chair of the department, has decided to submit American Government as a societies and institutions course. In addition, the committee was reminded that it had received an earlier response from Martin Cala regarding ISEGR 2624,990066.

Jenkins announced that proposals 990136 (ASTRO 2608, Sound), 990139 (POLIT 2640, Comparative Governments), and 990140 (ENGR 1500, Engineering Concepts) had been received too late to be considered for next year, as per the committee decision to accept no course proposals that came to the GEC after November 1, 1999. Several committee members were concerned about rejecting these courses for next year. Ritchey indicated that CASGEC had considered both of the arts and sciences courses, and had passed them on to the GEC. Jenkins believed that the deadline should be held to because of the need

to prepare advisement handbooks and class schedules for next year; it was important that the changeover flow as smoothly as possible. Hunter and Schneider wanted to permit courses to come in up to the spring deadline of the Registrar's office, and be included for general education credit for next year. Since the procedure was in place for present curriculum changes, they did not believe that it would adversely affect students in the fall. Tessier moved and Hunter seconded a motion that GEC consider all of the courses that had arrived, including the three mentioned by Jenkins, and that it consider no other course proposals after 12-3-99 for inclusion in next year's general education program other than those for capstones, intensive components, and substitutes. The motion passed with Schneider abstaining.

The committee discussed possible meeting dates for next week. Jenkins will be on jury duty, so there is a need to schedule multiple possibilities. After much discussion, the committee decided to meet on **Friday, December 10, at 1 pm**, if Jenkins was available, and/or **Monday, December 13, at 1 pm**.

As per the agenda, the committee considered:

990102 – NURSG 2601, Family Concepts for Providers. Mosca explained that this course had been several years in the making, and represented an effort to create a general education course from Health & Human Services. Professors Kuite and Phillips had designed a course that would not be required by the programs in HHS. The decision was made to return the course for consideration of the following problems: 1) the title sounds as if the course is intended for majors in health care provision; 2) the description notes that the course is intended to cover material that is of concern to providers; 3) under the section Other Departments that Require, the statements lead the committee to think that the course is not for the general student body, but rather for students in the health disciplines; 4) the degrees of the faculty and the syllabus suggest that the course may focus more on the family from the standpoint of goal 9, which would lead to its inclusion under personal and social responsibility.

990130 and 990131 – ART 1541, 1542, Survey of Art History I, II. The committee decided to consider the two courses together. Committee members spoke favorably. Tessier moved, Reiff seconded, a motion to certify. Motion passed.

990136 – ASTRO 2608, Sound. Some committee members raised the question of whether the course was an interdisciplinary consideration, and whether physics might not want to propose the course for Selected Topics. Hunter was concerned about the narrow focus of the course; sound was a small segment of the general education survey, or introductory course.

990097 – RELIG 2631, Religion and the Earth. Jenkins apologized for not having gotten the proper copy of this course (as within the domain of personal and social responsibility, rather than societies and institutions). He found the copy, passed it out, and asked members to be ready to consider the course as the next meeting.

990086 – PHIL 2609, Technology and Human Values. Ritchey moved, Castronovo seconded, a motion to certify. The dean of Arts and Sciences had signed off on this course. Motion passed.

990101 – RELIG 2621, Religion and Moral Issues. Jenkins was not sure if the dean had signed this proposal, but Ritchey assured the committee that she did approve of the course. Ritchey moved, Schneider seconded, a motion to certify. Motion passed.

990083 – PHIL 2619, Introduction to Logic. Hunter moved, Pusch seconded, a motion to certify. The motion passed to include this course in Selected Topics.

990099 – RELIG 2605, Myth, Symbol, and Ritual. Reiff moved, Castronovo seconded, a motion to certify. Tessier explained how this course met various goals as required by the domain of Selected Topics and Electives. Motion passed.

990120 – PHIL, 2630, Critical Thinking. Jenkins asked Tessier to distinguish between a course on logic and one on critical thinking. She explained that critical thinking was more practical, and spent time on identifying arguments. Jenkins commented that Bruce Waller, who taught this course, had a textbook that emphasized the application of critical thinking toward jury duty. Since this duty was an important part of citizenship, Jenkins suggested that Waller be asked to include more reference to that part of the Preface to the General Education Goals. Hunter moved, Ritchey seconded, a motion to certify. Motion passed.

990103 – WMST 2601, Introduction to Women's Studies. Jenkins apologized for the placement of this course. It had come in at the same time as the philosophy courses, and had become mixed in with them. It was noted that, while this was a single-section course, it should attempt to be offered every semester, and be open to many students. Mosca moved, Munro seconded, a motion to certify. Motion passed.

Jenkins asked that, considering the lateness of the hour, the committee look at the Economics package (990028,990078,990079,990118, and 990119) as a package to be discussed with action to be taken next meeting. Jenkins noted that Principles I had not been received by the GEC, but Ritchey indicated that it had passed CASGEC. Jenkins had talked to Tod Porter, Chair of Economics, earlier in the day, and asked him to provide a copy of the course proposal for Principles I. He had done so during the meeting. Jenkins assigned Economics 2610, Principles I: Microeconomic Theory and Policy course proposal number 990149.

Jenkins explained that Economics in Action was now 1500A, and that ABCD had passed the University Curriculum Committee. Questions arose about why such a device was being used. There was no indication of what the course title (1500) was, or the general description. The courses did not appear to have a common theme other than Economics. Ritchey believed that these courses should be returned, and Economics requested to come up with an appropriate title or description, such as Applied Economics. He made a

motion to that effect, seconded by Schneider, but Jenkins asked that he be permitted to talk to Porter about possible resolutions to the problem.

Some committee members wondered about the inclusion of the Principles sequence as regular general education courses; perhaps they should be substitute courses. Jenkins indicated that Porter believed that they were general education courses, and preferred their inclusion rather than that of Economics 1500A. Schneider was taking Principles I and argued that it was a regular general education course. He then offered a motion to reject courses ECON A,B,C,D, but it died for lack of a second. It was decided that Jenkins should find out answers to some of the committee's questions regarding these courses for the next meeting.

The meeting concluded at 5 PM.

Proposals for General Education

1. "In order that breath shall be maintained in general education, students must take courses from at least two different academic disciplines in each of the following domains of the General Education Model: Natural Sciences, Artistic and Literary Perspectives, Societies and Institutions, Personal and Social Responsibility."
2. "All general Education Course Proposals, including intensive and capstone courses, must be submitted to the General Education Committee by November 1. If approved and ratified, they will be included in the *Undergraduate Bulletin* for the following Academic Year.
Courses submitted after Nov. 1 will be acted upon, but inclusion in the *Bulletin* is not guaranteed.
Courses are General Education Courses once they have been entered into the Senate Minutes as having been ratified. Once entered into the Senate Minutes, they may be offered for General Education Credit even though they may not be listed in the *Undergraduate Bulletin* as such.
If the General Education Committee or the Academic Senate revokes General Education Certification for a course, this action will go into effect at the start of the next Academic Year, after the said action has been recorded in the Senate Minutes. If Senate action occurs after registration for the Fall Semester has begun, that course remains a general education course through the end of that Fall Semester."

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE MINUTES 12110199

ABSENT: Funk, Maraffa, ██████████, Ritchey

Jenkins went over the list of courses. He asked if committee members had received a copy of MGT 4850, a capstone proposal, and passed out a resubmitted copy of SPED 2630, which had been renamed as Individuals in Society. Also he reported that he had communicated with various departments that had submitted proposals regarding the concerns of the General Education Committee (GEC), but he had not received back updated proposals or at least an answer to questions raised by GEC from Criminal Justice for CRJUS 1500, Human Ecology for HMEC 1551 & 2680, Nursing for NURSG 2601, or Political Science for POLIT 1560. He did, however, receive an inquiry from Philosophy & Religious Studies about their Introduction to Philosophy course (2600, 990082). Department members felt that it fit better within the Selected Topics domain because it dealt with material from a wide variety of general education goals. Tom Shipka was wondering whether that was appropriate or whether he should submit it under personal and social responsibility. GEC decided that it would consider either proposal submitted by the department. There was no guarantee of acceptance, though.

GEC began to discuss the economics package. Jenkins repeated that the course Economics 1500 with four designations of A, B, C, D had passed the University Curriculum Committee, and that Tod Porter preferred that we consider it in its present form rather than as separate courses. Jenkins noted, however, that each proposal must pass muster, so the GEC must consider each course separately regardless of its placement within the curriculum. Jenkins also reminded committee members that Porter preferred that the Principles sequence be accepted as regular general education courses, rather than as substitutes. He also wanted their approval over that of 1500A, Economics in Action. Hunter argued that the Principles sequence was composed of courses that were on a more difficult level than a basic general education course in economics, and so should be substitute courses. He made a motion to that effect, but then withdrew that motion. The committee decided to examine each of the 1500 courses individually.

990028 – ECON 1500A, Economics in Action. Hunter moved and Schneider seconded a motion to certify. Jenkins commented that Clyde Morris had rewritten the syllabus to reflect the assignments based on goals 1, 2, and 3. The motion passed

990118 – ECON 1500B, Panic & Prosperity: U.S. Economic Policy since the Great Depression. Hunter compared this course with the comments of the Provost at last week's meeting that breadth was needed in individual courses. He moved, Kasuganti seconded, a motion to reject this course as too narrow in coverage. The motion passed.

990078 – ECON 1500C, Rich & Poor: Diversity and Disparity in the Workplace. Hunter noted that each of the remaining courses was too narrow, and made a motion, seconded by Kasuganti, to reject the proposal. Motion passed.

990079 – ECON 1500D, Sports and Entertainment Economics.

Hunter moved, Tessier seconded, a motion to reject the proposal. Motion passed.

990149 – ECON 2610, Principles I. Hunter reaffirmed his belief that this course should be a substitute course. He made a motion, seconded by Kasuganti, to ask economics to resubmit the proposal as a substitute. After Tessier discussed why she did not think that the course was a substitute, Hunter withdrew his motion. She felt that Economics 2610 covered some basic economics concepts, and was not a more difficult level of coverage. Reiff also commented that the course data suggested that it was taken by a wide variety of students. The additional problem of allowing a student to take 1500A and 2610 was discussed. Since the two courses were similar in coverage of basic economics concepts, it was suggested that students should not take both for general education credit. Tessier made a motion, seconded by Schneider, to certify the proposal with the proviso that a student could not take both Economics 1500A and Economics 2610 for general education credit. The motion passed.

990119 – ECON 2630, Principles II. There was some discussion of the fact that this course did not draw on as wide a variety of students as Principles I. Tessier moved, Munro seconded, a motion to certify with the proviso that a student could not take both Economics 1500A and Economics 2630 for general education credit. The motion passed with Hunter abstaining.

990060 – PSYCH 3734, Applied Behavior Analysis. Jenkins reminded the committee that it had considered the course too narrow in focus. It appeared to offer only operant conditioning rather than other theories as explanations of human behavior. Hunter commented that the response from Steven Flora and Jane Kestner to the committee justified the coverage of operant behavior only, and did not respond to the need for broader coverage of theory, even though there was some minimal coverage. Hence, he felt that the course should be rejected. Schneider moved, Reiff seconded, a motion to reject. The motion passed with one abstention, Tessier.

990061 – PSYCH 3707, Psychology of Intimate Relationships. Jenkins noted that Julie Thomas had redone the syllabus in response to the concern that the assignments did not reflect the achievement of goals 1, 2, and 3. Tessier moved, Schneider seconded, a motion to certify. Motion passed.

990062 – ENGL 3790, Topics in Multicultural Literacy. Jenkins pointed out that there was a change in title to Studies in Multiculturalism. He also noted that the prerequisite was ENGL 551, not a 1500 or 2600 introductory course about literature. It seemed that the spirit of the criteria for Artistic and Literary Perspectives called for the student to take a broader literature course prior to this specialized 3700 level literature course. He had talked with Gary Salvner, chair of the English department, who felt that an introductory course as a prerequisite was in order. Reiff commented that she did not see such a prerequisite as a problem. Jenkins was worried that Bill Mullins might be concerned about the possible rejection of this course, and so he asked for a motion that certified the

course with a proviso that the prerequisite be an introductory general education literature course. Hunter moved, Tessier seconded, a motion to certify with the aforementioned proviso. The motion passed with one nay, Schneider.

990066 – ISEGR 2624, Engineering Economy. Changed from ISEGR 3724. Initially, there was some discussion of the prerequisites, and a concern raised about whether some of them were appropriate. It was noted that SPCH 2652 was not the general education course, nor was it anticipated that this course would be submitted for approval. Jenkins also noted that MATH 1549 was the course submitted by the mathematics department as a substitute, not 1550. Kasuganti raised questions about the type of economics offered, and noted that it appeared to be following basic accounting principles. Reiff commented that the original syllabus supported Kasuganti's observations. Tessier observed that the course did not appear to cover broad-ranging economic concepts. Jenkins disagreed with its placement in societies and institutions since it was applying accounting principles to engineering projects, which are scientific in orientation. Reiff made a motion, seconded by Pusch, to reject this proposal. The motion passed with one nay, Munro.

990073 – PHYS 1500, Conceptual Physics. Jenkins noted that Steve Hanzely had resubmitted the syllabus to reflect assignments related to goals 1, 2, and 3. Schneider moved, Kasuganti seconded, a motion to certify. Motion passed.

990075 – COUNS 1587, Introduction to Health and Wellness in Contemporary Society. Changed from COUNS 4887. Schneider believed that this course would be objected to, and that we should wait to consider it until after the University Curriculum Committee had finished with this course proposal. He made a motion, seconded by Tessier, to table. The motion passed.

990076 – GEOL 1510, Geology of National Parks. Jenkins commented that Singler had returned an updated syllabus with assignments relating to goals 1, 2, and 3. Hunter expressed some concern about the difficulty of the course. Castronovo moved, Schneider seconded, a motion to certify. Motion passed with Hunter abstaining.

990077 – SOCIO 3745, Medical Sociology. Jenkins pointed out that Bob Weaver had responded to the three questions asked by GEC about who takes the course, whom the course is designed for, and what the field assignments are. Jenkins commented that, although the course does seem to be taught more broadly and for a general education audience, the title, Medical Sociology, and the description are in conflict with the stated intentions. North Central would be concerned about the "integrity" issue, an apparent conflict between what is in the Catalogue or Bulletin and what is actually taught. Schneider moved, Tessier seconded, a motion to send back the course because of the need to change the course title, description, and prerequisite to reflect the fact that the course is a general education course. In regard to the prerequisite, it was felt that students who had been admitted to the NEOUCOM program should not be given a pass for SOCIO 1500, since the purpose of general education was to provide students with broad coverage.

990136 – ASTRO 2608, Sound. Jenkins explained that he had talked with Warren Young, chair of the Physics Department, about this proposal. In response to a question about whether this course covered musical forms, he commented that it was primarily scientific in focus. When asked about how narrow this course might be in regard to physics as a science, he argued that it was a broad in coverage as American History was to the field of history. Schneider moved, Mosca seconded, a motion to certify. Motion passed.

990139 – POLIT 2640, Comparative Governments. The committee was concerned about the absence of a course description on the cover page, but Jenkins explained that it was the same as in the present catalogue. There was also concern that there was no indication of the number of students who take the course and that the syllabus talked about a five-credit option. It was believed that a mistake was made in not changing the credits to four for the semester system. Hunter did not believe that the course made some comparison to the American system of government, but Jenkins pointed out a sentence in the narrative that covered that concern. Schneider moved, Castronovo, seconded a motion to certify with the proviso that a new front page be provided with the course description, there be a change on the five-credit option, and that information be provided on the number of students taking the course.

990140 – ENGR 1550, Engineering Concepts. Munro spoke in favor of this course, and expressed the hope that it would gain acceptance. Hunter also indicated support for this course. Committee members asked that the prerequisite be checked for appropriateness. Jenkins commented that this course appeared to be an introductory course for the purpose of preparing a student to become an engineer, and that such a course would violate the principle that a course must be designed for the general student body. Munro responded that non-engineering students could take this course. Mosca commented that Nursing had considered proposing its introductory course in nursing as a general education course, but had concluded that it was more of a career-oriented course than one for general education. Pusch commented that education had reached a similar conclusion regarding its introductory course.

Castronovo referred to the syllabus and the fact that the students spent half of the course learning about operating a computer. Jenkins noted that the narrative argued that the course was "designed to introduce the student to the world of engineering and provide a base for the skills needed to be a successful engineer in today's ever changing world. This course is open to any university student who may have curiosity or interest in a career in engineering." He concluded that this statement demonstrated the career orientation of the course. Tessier observed that there was an apparent conflict here between courses in the liberal arts that served as introductory courses to the discipline and courses in the professional schools. Jenkins observed that an introductory course in philosophy or economics did not discuss what it took to succeed in a career, or the types of paths one might follow in pursuing a job in the profession. Rather such courses introduced students to the basic principles or concepts of the discipline. Acquaintance with the knowledge base of the discipline rather than preparation for a career was the focus of such courses. To Munro's response that he did not quite understand the

objections to the course, Jenkins commented that engineering needed to decide what concepts from its discipline should be taught to the general student, not to attract that student to be an engineering major, but rather as a part of the base of general knowledge that would serve the general student body well in their personal and public lives.

Both Hunter and Castronovo spoke enthusiastically in support of the idea that engineering could develop such a course, and that it would gain approval. GEC decided to send back the proposal with the proviso that it would consider a resubmission of a course tailored to the general student body.

990051 – SPED, Individuals in Society. Consideration of this course was delayed until the next meeting.

Jenkins led a discussion regarding the next meeting. He asked if members could attend a meeting later next week, but there were problems for many members. It was decided that Tuesday, December 14, at 1 PM was the date for the next meeting. Jenkins would spend Monday trying to get responses from appropriate departments. He noted that there would be no more meetings beyond that prior to the new year. A question arose about Fridays as the meeting time for next quarter. It was decided to continue to hold GEC meetings on Friday afternoons.

The last topic to be discussed was the suggestion from Brandon Schneider that the committee consider limiting what students can take in the interest of achieving breadth. One possibility was to require students to take courses in any domain from at least two different academic disciplines. Hunter argued that we had already made a decision this past summer regarding this area, and that we had decided to allow colleges or departments to make a decision regarding which courses might be taken. He was concerned that returning to the Academic Senate might open up the door to further revision. Castronovo and Kasuganti expressed concern about the tightness of professional programs, and what impact such a motion might have on them. Kasuganti argued for a localized decision making on the college or department level. Jenkins commented that, although it would be necessary to take professional school requirements into account, there still remained a majority of students who might not achieve breadth in the various domains. It seemed appropriate to ask them to do so. The meeting ended without any action being taken.

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE MINUTES 12-14-99

ABSENT: Funk, Hunter, Maraffa, Reiff, Schneider

990139 – POLIT 2640, Comparative Governments. Jenkins explained that the department of political science had returned a front page with a course description, that the five-credit option was a mistake on the syllabus, and that the course would attract 60 or more students each time. It was decided that the department would not have to resubmit a syllabus with the change to four-credit option. A discussion ensued over whether at the previous meeting GEC had passed a motion to certify. Members were not sure, so Castronovo moved, Tessier seconded, a motion to certify. Motion passed.

990117 – POLIT 1560, American Government. The committee felt that the course proposal met the criteria for the societies and institutions domain, but noted that the syllabus did not follow through on the assignments relating to goals 1, 2, and 3. Jenkins indicated that he would ask for a syllabus change, and that, having obtained it, he would circulate it among committee members for feedback. If there were not objections, he would consider it to have achieved certification.

990051 – SPED 2630, Individuals in Society. Committee members commented favorably on the course proposal. Questions were raised, however, about the course title because of its suggested breadth, and the lack of a 15-week course outline. It was decided to ask for a change in the title possibly to Exceptional Individuals in Society, and for a semester course outline. In addition, there should be a check on the number of student taking the class. Jenkins was instructed to encourage the development of this course.

990082 – PHIL 2600, Introduction to Philosophy. Philosophy has decided to submit this course under the Selected Topics and Electives domain. Ritchey and Pusch seconded a motion to certify. After a number of favorable comments, the motion passed.

Tod Porter and Rochelle Ruffer appeared before the committee to discuss the rejection of 1500 B,C,D. Porter argued that each of these courses covered basic economic principles through the subject matter, and that they were not narrow in that sense. He passed out a sheet comparing Economics 2630 with 1500 B. Most of the ideas relating to macroeconomics had developed since the great depression; hence, he argued that coverage of U.S. experience with government and economics since that time would give the student an exposure to the concepts of Principles II. In regard to the course on Rich and Poor, he contended that it too focused on many basic economic principles as well as the goal relating to diversity. He pointed out that two major societal phenomena that students should understand were government intervention in the economy and the distribution of wealth. Ruffer talked about the Sports and Entertainment course. She continued with Porter's line of thought that these courses may have a specific topic, but that each requires understanding of some basic principles of economics. She had devised the course to attract students who might not want to take an economics course in the hope

that they would indeed gain some basic understanding of economics. Questions arose regarding the lettering of the courses, the depth of the Sports and Entertainment course, etc. When asked whether each of the 1500 course should be taken, or whether only one should be taken, Porter responded that he would be satisfied if only one were allowed. He was also satisfied with the fact that GEC had ruled that a student could take ECON 1500A or Principles I and Principles II.

After Porter and Ruffer left, the committee continued to discuss the economics proposals. Committee members did not like the 1500 A, B, C, D sequence, but were unsure as to how to handle these proposals. Jenkins proposed that he ask Porter to put his response in writing, and that he would circulate to all committee members so that we could discuss the matter further at the January 7th meeting. The committee concurred. Jenkins thanked all the committee members for their hard work, and wished all a happy holiday.

MINUTES
GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE
DECEMBER 14, 1999

Absent: Robert Levin (Bram Hamovitch sat in as an observer), Zachary Griffith, Robert Harvey

Jenkins congratulated the newly elected representatives from Business (Joseph Antenucci), Education (Robert Levin), Engineering (Jeannette Garr), Fine and Performing Arts (Frank Castronovo), and Health and Human Services (Nancy Mosca). The committee met from 9 am until 2:30 pm to discuss the various letters submitted by faculty or administrators regarding the latest draft of GER criteria.

Here are some of the decisions made by the committee because of our discussions of those letters:

- 1) add disability to the list described under the diversity goal (12)
- 2) per the Barger memo, clarify that both Writing I and Writing II have a 5000 word minimum; drop "as already established" on Page 3, line 2; eliminate "these factors" on page 12, bullet number 2.
- 3) substituted Shipka's paragraph on critical thinking. It will allow for a wider definition of critical thinking.
- 4) decided that the Committee has no particular pedagogical that it will require, but that the course proposal must explain how pedagogical approaches used within the course will help to reach the goals.
- 5) reaffirmed the principle that the courses labeled as intensive do not have to offer all sections as intensive; also acknowledged that those faculty teaching an intensive component do not have to meet the 18 hour graduate course requirement for teaching that intensive component.
- 6) recognized that a student could fail an intensive component and still pass a GER course, but could come up with no way to police that problem.
- 7) discussed the possibility of allowing substitute courses within programs as long as they meet GER goals. We will return to this discussion.
- 8) decided that citizenship is a part of general education, but in a broad sense. We are encouraging political science to submit their courses on American government under the Societies and Institutions category. It is also possible that

they could design a course on citizenship and ethics that might fit under Personal and Social Responsibility.

- 9) agreed that general education courses should be designed for the non-major, and that specialty courses serving programs could gain certification if they meet the goals.
- 10) decided to change the wording regarding faculty qualifications to permit departments to assure the General Education Committee that their faculty meet North Central standards.
- 11) stated that film will count as part of Artistic and Literary Perspectives
- 12) added language to clarify that the goals under Natural Science do call for an examination of how society affects the development of science, as well as the opposite.
- 13) changed the language under Goal 9 to make it physical, mental, or emotional well being, and to include the family.
- 14) Dropped the references to self-disclosure and ability to enter interpersonal relationships from the criteria under the oral communication course.
- 15) changed the wording regarding the inclusion of goals 5, 10 and 12 in all GER courses to reflect the notion that these are encouraged goals, not required.
- 16) included a statement that faculty teaching interdisciplinary courses, such as those offered by American Studies or Black Studies, need only have coursework in one of the disciplines involved.
- 17) added a note that the suggested addition goals under Goal 8 are not separate from that goal, and are to be worked in as subordinate to that goal. In short, courses will not be required to cover these goals as will be done in their home categories.
- 18) added wording to clarify electronic technologies. Also noted that "using a computer" as indicated in the writing section involves the use of a word processing package to write the paper.
- 19) changed bullet 2 on page 3 to 3000 or 4000 level.
- 20) agreed that foreign language courses could be submitted for GER credit, as an oral communication course if they did all the things required under the criteria for that course. It is more probable that foreign languages would submit their courses with an oral communication intensive component.
- 21) eliminated the citation to incorporate goals 4 and/or 12 on page 2.