

General Education Committee Meeting

March 11th, 2016

Meeting was called to order at 8:30am

Present: Akcali, Elif; Brophy, Timothy; Colon, Elayne; Czarnecka-Verner, Eva; Greer, Creed; Hass, Christopher; Koropeckyj-Cox, Tanya; Krigbaum, John; O'Sickey, Lynn; Palmer, John; Poceski, Mario; Radunovich, Heidi (acting chair); Rea, Jennifer; Sarajedini, Vicki; Smith, Brenda

Absent: Bowers, Clifford; Butler, Emily; Cochrane, Shannon; Julian, David; Lindner, Angela; Parlette, Brianna; Reynolds, Alison

Guest: Griffith, Casey; Orr, Kevin; Percival, Susan dos Santos, Silvio; Shorey, Tobin

1. **Approval of draft minutes from [February 12th](#), meeting**
 - Committee member provided corrections to be included in approved minutes.
2. **Update from the Assessment Sub-Committee: Christopher Hass**
 - From "Meeting Summary" document:
 - "This subcommittee meeting centered on options for the viable assessment of SLO's which could be seamlessly adopted by current and future General Education courses. The concepts of Signature Assignments and SLO Specific Assignments were presented and considered within the context of two courses (ARH 2000 & AST 1002). Both approaches present an opportunity to examine course/student achievement data while being incorporated into pre-existing course assessments. Signature Assignments allow for multiple SLO's to be assessed within a single, heavily weighted assignment, at the same time. Whereas SLO Specific Assignments entail the use of separate assignments assessing a single SLO at a time.
 - The subcommittee would like to:
 - Collect data from ARH 2000, in regards to SLO Specific Assignments.
 - To observe the development of Signature Assignments within AST 1002."

3. Update from the Academic Standards for Excellence, Sub-Committee: Creed Greer

- There are practical frustrations regarding whether courses are rigorous enough to count for General Education credit.
 - Attendance
 - Reading
 - How to measure proficiency through written papers. 200-300 words; is this enough to show proficiency?
 - Is there an amount of work for the college level to consider a good standard?
 - In peer institutions: students expected to perform 2-3 hours of work outside of class per credit hour.
 - However, surveys say students actually do 1 hour of work per credit hour.
- No quantitative statement(s) anywhere regarding standards of excellence in higher education courses.
 - Carnegie hour is a poor measure
 - Doubtful that a quantitative measure can be determined
 - Faculty determines standard
- Should the committee develop more broadly formed statements of excellence?
 - Measures concerning reading, but broadly stated
 - “Substantial reading”: then leave it to the determination of individual faculty
 - Reading load should be appropriate for course level and expected standards
 - Less reliance on setting rules; greater emphasis on consensus/moderation
 - Clarification of standards under which GEC already operates.
 - Should establish platform/framework for rigor, “Obviousness of rigor” which meets the “consensus of group”
- Sub-Committee should create a list of minimal principles for standard(s), more uniform, something which may be shared with faculty/submitters.
- Sub-Committee will regroup to address minimum standards.

4. Courses for review:

- [\[Previous Committee comments for returning courses\]](#)

| Course # | Title | Current GE & WR | Request | Status |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------|---------------|
| FOS 2001 | Man's Food | | B | Recycle |
| MUL 2010 | Introduction to Music Literature (to be named: Experiencing Music) | | H, N | Approved |
| RUT 3524 | Russia Through Film | | H, N | Denied |
| RUT 3101 | Russian Masterpieces | | H, I | Tabled |
| RUT 3506 | Creative Lives: Writers, Artists, and Extraordinary People | | H, N | Tabled |

FOS 2001 Man's Food

- **Main concern:** Provide specific evidence of strong academic rigor and a solid departure from previous iterations of course.
- Requesting additional information in regards to:
 - In order to better assess the rigor of the new course the committee would like the instructor to provide a sample of the actual assignments, quizzes, and exams from the course.
 - Provide specific readings within the schedule of weekly topics and relevant areas
 - Inclusion of how and where students will learn proper reading and review of scholarly research relating to topic(s) of course.
 - Both on a population research basis, and individual (dietetics) research basis.
 - Provide examples of student generated data and hypothesis testing, which cannot be easily fabricated and exhibits a departure from previous iterations of the course.
 - Is topic of genetically modified foods included within the topic range of course?
- Committee would like instructor to attend April meeting to respond to questions/concerns.
- Committee would like course to be reviewed (with revisions) at April meeting.
- Motion to **Recycle**. Motion Seconded. Motion Passed.

MUL 2010: Introduction to Music Literature (to be named: Experiencing Music)

- **Approved** for H and N.
- Recommend minor fixes:
 - Fix general typos within syllabus.
 - i.e. it is "Jimi Hendrix" rather than "Jimmy Hendrix".
 - Revise statement concerning C- as not passing grade.

RUT 3524: Russia Through Film

- Committee feels that the course requires a significant amount of restructuring and revision, which warrants a new submittal. Recommend starting over rather than trying to address committee concerns within current course framework.
- Main concerns of committee:
 - Grade breakdown by assessment;
 - Attendance and Bonus points: 10% of grade is attendance, however this may be made up by optional bonus point assignment; essentially providing two options to achieve full credit for 10% of grade.
 - Participation: The committee feels that the provided rubric for participation is not practical, nor does it provide adequate evidence of achievement/meeting learning objectives for GE or course. Syllabus evidences instructor's desire for students to "do the work" prior to coming to class, but lacks an adequate/sufficient measure of meeting SLO's within current design.

- In-class tests: 2 questions per test requiring short responses, which accounts for 30% of course grade.
- Final assignment: Film review essay is not appropriate for a final assignment for a GE credit course. There is a lack of objectives for the assignment and it does not appear to involve any research, but rather focuses on opinion of student.
- Inconsistency of assignment percentages within documents.
- Lack of Rigor
 - Assessments do not have consistent rigor or regularity throughout course, which does not allow for assessment of student progress over time.
- Wikipedia still used as source/without discussion or its viability within academic work.
- The notations of H and N within the weekly schedule of topics do not provide enough information (for students and/or committee) regarding how the GE designations will be reflected within each topic/class.
- Motion to **Deny**. Motion Seconded. Motion Passed.

RUT 3101: Russian Masterpieces & RUT 3506: Creative Lives

- **Tabled** for next meeting
- Committee would like to have Committee members volunteer to reach out and work with the instructors for each course.
- It appears there are consistent areas which need addressing within these 3 courses (RUT).