**GENERAL EDUCATION MEETING**

**January 27, 2020**

**Location: HUB 123**

**2:30-4:00**

**AGENDA**

1. Approval of Minutes (In Moodle)
2. Invited guests
	1. Irene Cucina: PE 3565 WRCO (see below)
3. Old Business:
	1. ARDI 1200 CTDI
		1. Not passed due to missing votes.  Vote count from department: 6 approve; 0 disapprove
	2. BIDI 1090 SIDI and BIDI 1240 SIDI: Passed
	3. ME 3350 TECO and MU 3240 TECO
		1. ME is no longer on the table. TBD
4. New Business:
	1. All straight yes votes:
		1. AR3160 QRCO: 7 yes, 0 abstain; 0 no
		2. CJ4805 WRCO: 7 yes; 0 abstain; 0 no
		3. PODI1101 SSDI: 7 yes; 0 abstain; 0 no; 0 missing
		4. CM2000 TECO: 7 yes; 0 no; 0 abstain (possible example syllabi)
		5. SW 4020 TECO: 7 yes; 0 no; 0 abstain
		6. FR 4815 DICO INCO: 7 yes; 0 no; 0 abstain
		7. PHDI 2100 SIDI; 7 yes; 0 no; 0 abstain (votes were added to moodle)
		8. FR 3130 WRCO; 7 yes; 0 no; 0 abstain
		9. FR 3135 WRCO; 7 yes; 0 no; 0 abstain (I have votes, if they are missing)
		10. AE 3060 DICO: 6 yes; 0 no; 0 abstain; 1 missing
		11. HIDI 1340 PPDI: 7 yes; 0 no; 0 abstain
		12. MT 2000 GACO; 7 yes; 0 no; 0 abstain
		13. MT 3720 WRCO; 7 yes; 0 no; 0 abstain
		14. HE3200 WECO: 7 yes; 0 abstain; 0 no (HE3200 discipline votes: 11:0:5 (absent)) received via email
		15. AP3101 TECO: 7 yes; 0 abstain; 0 no (AP3010 discipline votes: 11:0:5 (absent)) Received via email.
	2. Discussion items or missing votes:

\*= Passed the vote, but needs to be discussed or awaiting final votes

* + 1. \*AR3060 QRCO: 7 yes; 0 abstain; 0 no
			1. Discussion item: on voting (yes vs no vs abstain)
		2. TE 3300 DICO: TBD
			1. Discussion item: one-person discipline votes, not enough. Also, who would the voting parties be?
		3. LIDI 2450 CTDI: TBD
			1. Discussion item: one person votes AND possible CTDI applicability questions
		4. PE3565 WRCO, QRCO: TBD
			1. Discussion item: Missing votes (emailed the program) and WRCO needs to be discussed. WRCO is a did not pass. Votes were emailed as: 14 yes; 0 no; 1 absent.
		5. PO3125 TECO: 6 yes; 0 no; 0 abstain; 1 missing
			1. Discussion item(s): Needs to add HoM to syllabi (I have already told Pat about this). Also “though I would like to see more tech use other than qualtrics, it looks like they have numerous opportunities to explore ethical use and impacts of technology”. Thoughts?
		6. CMDI 2015: TBD
			1. Discussion items: The SSDI-specific course evaluation statistics were not included in the proposal. Could we request those? Encourage instructor to interpret the Habits of Mind more robustly and specifically (eg turning in assignments is not a strong example of problem-solving). Also communicate that SSDI Course Skills are now optional. (These have been requested)
		7. CM3005 INCO: TBD
			1. Needs more information on integration and cross-discipline issues.
			2. Please see Appendix 1
		8. \*FR 2030 DICO GACO: 7 yes; 0 no; 0 abstain
			1. Discussion items: the DICO and GACO combination is tough for me as it seems too easy to over-emphasize one and claim credit for both. The GACO is clear in the materials, but I was a bit on the fence with the DICO. I think enough is done to examine French cultures locally as a means to consider one's own cultural identity to justify the DICO….. I agree with Joey that the DICO was really sparse. The 2.6 on the course eval question about equity and social justice is an indication that students might also not see the DICO. I guess my question is how we "police" any of this. I'm going to vote yes on this but I'd like to tell Kate about our concerns with the DICO so she's paying attention to it…. I will email Kate about our concerns.
		9. \* CD 2360 DICO: 7 yes; 0 no; 0 abstain
			1. Discussion item: Could we suggest (is it our place?) that they add their discipline or some context to the name of their course? Such a broad title would suggest that more than EEYD majors may benefit from this course
		10. \*HIDI1410 PPDI: 7 yes; 0 no; 0 abstain
			1. Discussion item for the department: The class sessions move chronologically from past to present, but the syllabus doesn't really indicate how students will CONNECT the two (aside from" students will use primary documents to construct their own interpretations of causes and effects"). I'm sure this happens, it's just not explicit from the syllabus or notes. I will send a note to Becky.
		11. \*FR 2040 GACO DICO; 7 yes; 0 no; 0 abstain
			1. Discussion items: Syllabus doesn't include the standard Gen Ed description; discipline vote; and “yes but I think we need to do some more education about the HoM because I think she is trying to explain integrated perspective in that part of the sunset renewal form but she seems to be confusing that HoM with interdisciplinarity.”
		12. \*AG2300 TECO: 7 yes; 0 no; 0 abstain
			1. Discussion items: I'm going to vote yes on this but there seems to be a bit of a mismatch between the learning objectives of the course and the evaluation items. I don't clearly see that anything other than use of technology is actually being evaluated/graded despite the fact that all the other aspects of TECO are part of the course objectives. I think we should provide this feedback to David (unless I'm missing something?)
	1. Other Business (for the record):
		1. Request to move to 4 credits: ENDI 1440, HI 3480, HIDI 1610, ME 3550, FR 1011, FR 1012, FR 2023, FR 2024, FR 3035, SP 1011, SP 1012, SP 1013, SP 1014, SP 2023, SP 2024, ARDI 2311 (this is up for sunset, will need to be renewed next year), HI 3485, ENDI 1320 (this is up for sunset, will need to be renewed next year), NR 3500
		2. PO 1035, HI3145, HI3351, GE 4110, HI 3775, PO 3255, IS 3470, HI 3341 , HIDI 1455, PYDI 2280, BUDI 2300, GE 3020, WSDI 2500 (Possible table, possible change. We shall see once the provost votes).
		3. Request to obsolete: CHDI 1770, CHDI 1760
		4. MISSING: Nursing sunset…
1. CIM Issues?
2. Final approval of Gen Ed syllabus requirements
3. Gen Ed Task Force- If time permits
4. Next meeting

Reminders for next meeting: Some voting (Nursing, Women’s Studies, the language courses from James Whiting)

Appendix:

Response from Metty concerning CM 3005 INCO:

As per INCO requirements, we make connections across disciplines. While there is overlap in these traditions, they are not the same thing even as one draws some of its thinking from the other.

Actually, a course on just semiotics should qualify for INCO on its own because it is such an interdisciplinary field - my alma mater (UQAM) offers a PhD in semiology that I'd considered. This is a field that does indeed (as you correctly point out) draw on the same parent, but the 20th century semioticians additionally drew on media studies, on cultural studies, philosophy of communication, feminist theory - and their work infects studies in those fields and so many others. Today's visual rhetoric is similar to semiotics (and in turn draws on it) and so it is also interdisciplinary.

The course completely meets the Integrated Perspective of the Habits, and our use of semiotics and rhetoric from feminist and other perspectives (look at the readings) I think well responds to this element of INCO:

 We live in a world where scholarship is increasingly interdisciplinary. The educated person recognizes the challenges and rewards of drawing connections between fields of knowledge and of applying alternative methods of inquiry to solve problems.

I think the assignment in the sunset renewal is simplistic (it is designed to be completed in class) but it demonstrates students applying "alternative methods of inquiry" and concepts to varied texts. Again this is possible because we are dealing with very interdisciplinary fields to begin with.

Finally, I agree that the lab component is geared to be interdisciplinary; it is actually designed to be forward-thinking (if we move to INCAP the course will be prepared to meet some of its requirements), and of course, it is a way to further apply the concepts covered in rhetoric and semiotics.