

# General Education Committee

February 8, 2010 – HUB 119

## MINUTES

Present: Lourdes Aviles, Samuel D. Brickley II (Chair), Mary E. Campbell (consultant, non-voting), Christopher C. Chabot, Corey J. DeGroot (student, voting), Wilson A. Garcia, Elliott G. Gruner, Jong-Yoon Kim, Jillian Spring (student, voting), David Zehr [nine voting members]

Vacant: Dean of the Academic Experience

Presenter: Marcia Blaine

*Recorded in the order in which the agenda item was discussed.* Sam Brickley called the meeting to order at 2:30 pm. He welcomed Jillian Spring as our new student representative. Annie Gagne is now the student Trustee and there are several meeting conflicts between the Board of Trustees and this Committee.

1. **Approval of December 14, 2009.** *Approved by general consent.*

### 2. Course Proposals

a. Early Review (approved); sunset date is 5/2014:

- CSDI 1xxx Computers: Fact, Fiction, Fantasy and Film (SSDI)

b. Early Review (not approved):

- HIDI 13xx Gilded Ages in American History 1867-1933 (SSDI)

How does the Social Science Department distinguish between PPDI and SSDI? The instructor sent e-mails to clarify. From students' perspectives, how would they see SSDI? This course is dealing with a specific period, looking at how self is created. But it is a self that is in the past. This was an upper-level course; why is it going to a 1000 level? Staffing. The instructor could have a greater influence.

Can understand SSDI because of the instructor's e-mails; need the same information in the syllabus. It would be best for students and potential adjuncts to have it in the syllabus. Can't have two different syllabi.

The instructor indicated that the Committee seems to be imposing new requirements, especially to historians. Does every SSDI have to include all parts of SSDI?

It is most important that students understand that this is SSDI. The instructor wants SSDI but does not want it as PPDI. The instructor prefers not to include what one member of the Committee wants. Another member saw the original syllabus as SSDI and is hesitant to tell people what to put in the syllabus; will accept the original syllabus without the extra items.

It is up to us to change if we deem it necessary. Subjective standard. Committees work by majority vote. One member wants to see more in the syllabus. One member understood SSDI; unless it is information the member needs, the member does not like long syllabi. Students choose a course based on the course description. The course cannot be two Directions  
*Approved 8-1-0-0 as per amended syllabus. Sunset date is 5/2014.*

c. Standard Review; sunset date is 5/2014:

- MTDI 1200 Concepts in Weather and Climate Change (SIDI)

## General Education Committee

Procedural issues. Department Chair e-mailed Committee Chair about practices of the Committee. Didn't know that a Committee member was e-mailing the instructor. Does the Committee member represent the Committee? The instructor was unclear if the e-mail was from the Committee or from one member. The Department felt like they had to make the changes suggested by the Committee member in order for the course to pass. Early Review is different; we all look and have the opportunity to voice concerns. In Standard Review we have not talked about the course even through e-mail. If the department submits materials and the deadline is passed, should we entertain the new material? We should have some things written down about Early Review; would be helpful. The Committee member responded to the instructor based on the discussion that occurred at the retreat January 26<sup>th</sup>. Frustrated with how we have treated people who have come here. Don't have consensus yet on what should be done, e.g., at least the paragraph about Gen Ed, skills that they will cover and some assessment. In Early Review Committee members send their communications only to the Committee. Should such discussion occur with Standard Review? Practical issues of workload. Develop procedures for the Committee as the Committee plans to create procedures for Early Review. Potential for improvement in syllabus. Could scan proposal to be sure information is there. E-mail them as a suggestion. Reasonable people can disagree on the subjective. We don't have clear protocols for Early Review or for Standard Review. Don't want to squelch any speech/discussion. It's how much we ask to have in the syllabus. The syllabus is an assessment piece. What ought to be in the syllabus and where and be concise. It can be chaotic to have individuals e-mail with the proposer. Express concern to the Gen Ed Chair who can combine the comments and send them to the proposer. Respond within 24 hours to proposer and identify it as Early or Standard Review. Get rid of Standard Review. Only do Early Review which allows for us to discuss. Some concerns with e-mail when the proposal is being discussed and work load. We need to continue our discussion on procedures. Committee member questions come to the Chair who combines and sends to the proposer. Are we voting on the course or the syllabus? On the original syllabus did not see the skills of Gen Ed being assessed. See page 11 of the General Education Handbook, Review of Courses. Syllabi: "Syllabi of General Education courses must include the written description of the General Education component (from this document) including the list of skills to be developed." Should be readily apparent from the syllabus. How detailed and how specific does one have to be on the syllabus?  
*Approved 9-0-0-0, based on the original syllabus.*

3. **Reports** – none given based on the lateness of the hour.
  - a. Set timetable for spring agenda items (Sam et al.)
  - b. Global Awareness Connection Focus Group (Lourdes)
  - c. First year courses (Elliott)
  
4. **Announcements**  
None given based on the lateness of the hour.

The General Education Committee meets on the second and fourth Mondays of the month from 2:30 to 3:30 pm in HUB 123. The next meeting of the Committee will be **February 22, 2010**.

## General Education Committee

The Chair declared the meeting adjourned at 3:55 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary E. Campbell, Scribe  
Director of Curriculum Support

*These minutes were approved February 22, 2010.*