

**General Education Review Steering Committee  
March 1, 2017 Meeting Minutes**

**NOTE: THESE MINUTES HAVE NOT BEEN REVIEWED BY ATTENDEES**

**In attendance:**

Co-Chairs: James King, Melissa Boog

Maarten Pereboom (Fulton Dean), Karen Olmstead (Henson Dean), Brian Stiegler

FULTON Faculty: Elizabeth Kauffman, Shawn McEntee

HENSON Faculty: Stephen Habay

LIBRARY Faculty: James Parrigin

PERDUE Faculty: David Emerson

SEIDEL Faculty: Randall Groth

James started discussion with the following issue: How will diversity fit into the model? It was initially part of the discussion and needs to be revisited. This topic led to a broader discussion of requirements within the model.

**Meeting Requirements on Multiple Levels**

Courses could meet requirements on multiple levels: meeting the Curricular Components requirement as well as a Learning Outcomes requirement (ex. diversity, sustainability, writing-intensive).

- Would this open up opportunities because inclusion would no longer be based solely on department?  
OR
- Would “double-dipping” requirements be limiting the number of courses that would meet both levels of requirement (ex. Written Communication and Intercultural Knowledge)
  - How many sub-requirements would be required?
    - Ex. 2 out of 5 skills.
- Focus on student-learning-outcomes as the basis for inclusion in General Education.
- We are considering narrowing down our number of assessable learning outcomes to make General Education manageable and allow the individual programs to address other learning outcomes integrated into the model.
  - Reducing the number makes it possible to make assessment a continual process.
- Does every student need to meet every requirement/aspect of the SU mission?
  - We have to create a system where they are exposed to all the requirements.
- The difference between Foundational Knowledge and Essential Capabilities was discussed:
  - Knowledge is the informational content gained.
  - Capabilities are the skills for success across the disciplines.
- How do we assess what students know upon entering and what learning has ensued? Currently, UARA does the Gull Week assessment. Looking forward, part of the proposed FYE would provide a captive audience to assess progress.

**Working Model Discussion**

The committee revisited the current version of the working model and confirmed that it reflects decisions made by the committee.

- Concern was shared that changes will be seen by some members of the campus as X Dept. is in and Y Dept. is out.

- The department-based model could be changed into a model that doesn't include the departmental HEGIS codes (department name acronyms, ex. HIST, BIOL), but it explains the courses based on the outcomes.
- We have to show to COMAR that we're meeting requirements; we don't have to make that the public face to our campus. We need to use our own language to explain the "why" of taking a course.
  - No longer: This is something you have to take
  - Now: This is what you'll be able to do.
- How would we revise the working model to avoid the HEGIS codes?
  - Describe what the requirement looks like. We need language that is precise to the category not the typical discipline.
    - We need to create learning outcomes and from there we can work on creating the accurate names for the categories.
  - OR
  - Do we create the categories and then decide which courses/learning outcomes could be included?
- The work of the General Education Learning Outcomes (GELO) group is needed.
  - GELO's current task is to streamline the number outcomes.
- It was suggested that a group look through the catalog and identify courses (regardless of current General Education designation) that could be included in the "or alternative" spot to help faculty imagine beyond the current model.
  - This would provide a full picture of what could be included – see beyond the HEGIS code
  - This idea of double-dipping also could help with the pressure of requirements of professional programs.
    - This concept of double dipping is not foreign to current General Education, though.
- Brian shared that we could actually apply this learning outcomes/description model to our current General Education program and it would open up the possibility for inclusion based on learning outcomes as opposed to departments.
  - We would still need to integrate a First Year Experience (FYE) and capstone.

### **Integrative Experience (TIC)/First Year Experience (FYE)**

Discussion surrounded these questions: Should these be stand-alone courses? What does this look like? How realistic is this?

- The number of courses needed to be taught are a huge addition to what we already do (approx. 40 sections per semester of an academic year – with possible multiple faculty teaching a course, at least in the beginning).
  - We don't to want create something that will be primarily taught by adjuncts.
- The hope was that some upper-level courses course be reimagined so it wouldn't be additional but adaptive.
- We need to look at the logistical implications – what do other comparable campuses do?
- Shawn will share the logistical concerns with the FYE committee.
- There needs to be something built in that assesses the pedagogy.

### **FYE/Information Literacy**

James Parrigin reported that assessment has shown this information literacy (IL) is one of our most dire needs.

- To allow the integration of this, our current library staff could support a 1-credit course, taught in four, seven-week sessions per librarian per semester.
- The FYE Group has created a sample syllabus to show how this 1-credit IL could be married with a 3-credit FYE.
  - Would faculty following the 4-credit model be willing to teach a 3-credit course, especially since Fulton faculty would teach many. This would have an impact on faculty loads. Maarten was no longer in attendance at this point in the discussion to weigh in.
  - Could FYE courses be designed to meet multiple requirements to absorb some of the load?
  - The savings of having library faculty teaching the 1-credit could offset the costs used to compensate the 3-credit faculty.

### **Committee Communications**

To assist with the committee's communication of its ongoing work, a MyClasses "course" for General Education will be created. The current Faculty Senate-supported site is insufficient for our needs.

- Who will be allowed access?
  - Everyone – all with an .edu address
- How often will the enrollment change?
  - Start of fall and spring semesters

### **General Education Administration**

The maintenance/leadership aspect of General Education is a concern as we look toward implementation and the inevitable evolution.

- Committee vs. Department
  - A committee would be comprised of revolving faculty members.
  - A department would have its own infrastructure that can continue to facilitate the process.

The committee agreed that they must stress to the administration that a new entity is a prime need to implement and support General Education. This will lead the discussion of the committee's next meeting.

**NEXT MEETING:** Friday, March 17, 3-5 p.m., Seidel Dean's Conference Room

#### **FOR DISCUSSION:**

- Strategizing the administrative piece that will be needed to support General Education.
- Report from GELO, if available.

cbs