

Meeting Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee (GERC)

2012-02-07

PRESENT: Susan Swetnam, Cathy Peppers, Ben Crosby, Erika Kuhlman, Jerry Lyons, Sarah Mead, Jenny Semenza, Michael Spall, Rebecca Braden, Tara Johnson and Julie Melton

ABSENT: (No ASISU representative selected)

GUEST: Ken Trimmer

The meeting convened at 15:00 with a quorum present.

ITEM ONE: Introductions and Purpose

New members of GERC were introduced. Ken Trimmer, the former co-chair of the group that revised the GER structure, discussed the recent events that have led to the current form of the committee. He distributed documents that define our Bylaws as well as the revised Undergraduate General Education Requirements. We discussed the new objectives (general education categories) and how the existing GER courses were reassigned to these objectives. We also discussed the generation of three new categories. To better understand our responsibilities, we constructed a timeline for departmental and university deadlines.

ITEM TWO: Election of Officers

We elected a new chair: Susan Swetnam, vice chair: Cathy Peppers and a secretary: Ben Crosby.

ITEM THREE: Plan for future action

- Susan will prepare a draft email to send to the faculty regarding our upcoming deadlines
 - 3/1: Departments must review GERC Appendix 3 (which describes the reassigning of previously existing GE courses to the new objective categories) and either approve or suggest changes to the assignments.
 - 4/1: Departments must use a structured form to propose that existing (but not previously GE) courses to be added to Appendix 3. (Does this circumvent the UCC process if these submissions are directly to us?)
 - 9/20: GERC will have decided which previously existing courses will be matched with objectives. GERC will begin to assess if new courses proposed to the UCC meet the defined 'student learning outcomes' and can be classified as satisfying an objective.
 - 12/1: all decisions are complete and submitted to the UCC and the catalog.
- We need to draft a structured form for departments to use when requesting that a given course (proposed or existing) be considered for satisfying a GE objective. Examples of previous forms (from 2008) will be forwarded to the chair by Crosby.
- We will decide on a different meeting time and place with tele/video conference capabilities
- We need to decide when and how to assess the suitability of existing GE courses within the new GE objectives (Spring 2013?)

Meeting adjourned at 16:50.

Minutes Approved by GERC

Reviewed and Accepted by UCC:

Meeting Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee (GERC)

2012-02-14

PRESENT: (All Present) Susan Swetnam (Chair), Cathy Peppers (Vice-Chair), Ben Crosby (Secretary) Erika Kuhlman, Jerry Lyons, Sarah Mead, Jenny Semenza, Michael Spall, Tracy Payne , Rebecca Braden, Tara Johnson and Julie Melton

ABSENT: (An ASISU representative has been requested)

The meeting convened at 15:00 with a quorum present.

ITEM ONE: Approval of Previous Minutes

Committee discussed the previous minutes. Some corrections were suggested and implemented. Minutes were approved by the committee.

ITEM TWO: Meeting Time and Location

We decided to shift meeting times to Tuesdays, 2:30 - 4: 00. As necessary, we will meet on the second Tuesday of each month. If necessary, we will also meet on the fourth Tuesday. Geosciences conference room is available for a meeting location. Next meeting: Tuesday, Feb. 21, 2:30, location PS-233.

ITEM THREE: Memos to Department Chairs

We discussed draft memos prepared for the department chairs explaining our deadlines. The first memo explains a March 1 deadline for departments to verify the “mapping” of extant goal courses to new objectives. A second memo focuses on an April 1 deadline for applications to add an extant non-goal course to a new objective.

For the first memo, we suggested that it better emphasize the urgency of each department to carefully read and verify Appendix 3. We decided to send different memos to CoSE and CAL departments. CoSE will get a memo that just asks for verification of Appendix 3. CAL’s memo will include recognition of their memo to us and their proposed changes. GERC approved a suite of changes to the draft memo.

For the second memo, we made editorial suggestions including the addition of 2 omitted GERC members and the need for more carefully stating how we will evaluate the mapping of extant non-goal courses to the new objectives. GERC approved a suite of changes to the draft memo.

ITEM FOUR: Discussion of “General Education Course Approval” Form

We discussed the previous form including its content and how it was routed through Curriculum Council and our committee. We agreed that it was necessary to provide a sample to applicants (ENG 1102 was suggested as a good example). We brainstormed how the existing form could be improved and decided to ruminate for one week and approve a final version at the next meeting. The suggested form is attached.

Meeting adjourned at 16:50

Minutes Approved by GERC

Reviewed and Accepted by UCC:

General Education Course Approval Form

College and Department: _____

Course Name and Number: _____

General Education Objective: _____

Catalog Description: _____

Signatures

Department Chair: _____ Date: _____

Dean: _____ Date: _____

Provide a brief description of the course including information about texts/resources used and assignments/exams given. Demonstrate rigor appropriate to a General Education course.

How does the proposed course satisfy each of the defined student learning outcomes for this particular objective? Provide specific examples.

How will you assess the course's ability to meet the objective's student learning outcomes?

Meeting Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee (GERC)

2012-02-21

PRESENT: (All Present) Susan Swetnam (Chair), Cathy Peppers (Vice-Chair), Ben Crosby (Secretary) Erika Kuhlman, Jerry Lyons, , Jenny Semenza, Michael Spall, Tracy Payne , Rebecca Braden, Tara Johnson

ABSENT: Sarah Mead, Julie Melton, an ASISU representative has been requested

The meeting convened at 14:45 with a quorum present.

ITEM ONE: Letters to chairs with instructions

- Letter regarding March 7 deadline
 - We have decided to bump the deadline for department verification/mapping of extant goal courses to March 7th.
 - We will need to assure that this letter does not discuss the date of the April deadline explicitly. Instead say, 'Another deadline in April...'
- Letter regarding the April (15?) deadline
 - We are considering bumping the deadline for department proposal of extant non-goal courses to ~April 15th.
 - We are uncertain if we should exclude Objectives 7 and 8 from that call. We worry that these objectives are not yet well enough defined and could generate confusion.

ITEM TWO: Gen. Ed. Course Approval Form

- Discussion of English 1102 example:
 - Committee agrees that this example should go out to the departments.
 - We have to make 2 changes: (1) add a statement regarding the periodic reporting of assessment to the GERC and (2) request 'Dean' signature and include a statement in the first section to requiring submissions to describing the course's rigor.
- How will we evaluate new Gen. Ed. courses? Does this form provide us with sufficient info?
 - We are responsible to assure the course's (1) appropriateness (ability to meet the student learning outcomes) (2) rigor and (3) quality of assessment.
- How will we evaluate existing Gen. Ed. courses?
 - Later, we will decide how to judge whether an ongoing course satisfies the student learning outcome for an objective.

ITEM THREE: College of Arts and Letters Memo

We discuss the suggestions from CAL chairs. There are a set of items that we can implement quickly and easily (Fine Arts instead of Arts, etc.). Other issues associated with changes to Appendix 2 (e.g. whether or not to disallow double dipping) will have to be referred, by us, back up to Curriculum Council.

- Discussion regarding double dipping.
 - Arguments against: creates difficulty/confusion in advising, creates overly-popular courses at the expense of others, dilutes the uniqueness of each objective
 - Arguments for: keeps student units at 36, helps student graduate earlier

- We were not able to get to all of the other concerns but agreed that they were important to discuss and are interconnected.
- We also recognized that many of the concerns of the CAL chairs are overlapping with concerns from COSE chairs (memo forthcoming).

ITEM FOUR: Making changes to Objectives 7 and 8

Susan will draft some suggested changes for objectives 7 and 8. We will discuss these at the next meeting and forward them to curriculum council.

Next meeting will be 2:30pm, 13 March, 2012 in PS 233 (Geosciences meeting room)

Meeting adjourned at 16:30

Minutes Approved by GERC

Reviewed and Accepted by UCC:

General Education Course Approval Form

College and Department: _____

Course Name and Number: _____

General Education Objective: _____

Catalog Description: _____

Signatures

Department Chair: _____ Date: _____

Dean^[c1]: _____ Date: _____

Provide a brief description of the course including information about texts/resources used and assignments/exams given. Demonstrate rigor appropriate to a General Education course.^[c2]

How does the proposed course satisfy each of the defined student learning outcomes for this particular objective? Provide specific examples.

How will you assess the course's ability to meet the objective's student learning outcomes?

Meeting Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee (GERC)

2012-03-13

PRESENT: (Quorum Present) Susan Swetnam (Chair), Cathy Peppers (Vice-Chair), Ben Crosby (Secretary) Erika Kuhlman, Jerry Lyons, Jenny Semenza, Michael Spall, Tracy Payne, Rebecca Braden, Tara Johnson, Julie Melton, Sarah Mead, Tom Ottaway (guest from COB)

ABSENT: an ASISU representative has been requested

The meeting convened at 14:35 with a quorum present.

ITEM ONE: Visit to Curriculum Council

- Susan reports that the CC was supportive and enthusiastic for us to work on goals 7 and 8
- We will work toward this goal over the next few meetings

ITEM TWO: Report regarding Chairs' assignment of extant courses to new objectives

- 75% of departments have responded
- No large changes or objectionable suggestions
- Many chairs avoided double dipping by removing their courses from one category or another
- We should have all department's responses by the next meeting

ITEM THREE: Revisions to Objectives 7 and 8

- Tom Ottaway, COB, Presents a description of a course he is revamping and looking for feedback
 - Teaches Bus 1101, Intro to Computer Information Systems, 0 credit lab. 3 credits total
 - Introduces computers: hardware, Bios, OS, software (half the semester)
 - Introduces information sources: the internet, no library, ethics, copyright, slander (second half of the semester)
 - Lab teaches Microsoft Office suite...but will now convert to 3 hour lecture, no lab.
 - 0010, remedial, will teach the lab materials, as necessary.
 - Shared documents with descriptions of information literacy
 - NCTE: Tom prefers this framework, as it simplifies the Info Lit Competency
 - Info. Lit. Competency Standards for Higher Ed. (ACRL)
 - Isenbergs Big 6 is also another framework suggested by Jenny S.
- Significant discussion regarding the structure of Goal 7, Critical Thinking
 - We work toward a resolution where we reduce Goal 7 to a 3 credit course
 - The courses will be college specific, at the 100-200 level
 - We discuss the components of this goal: (not a complete list)
 - Ethics: making sure you are representing all prepectives
 - Sound interpretation of existing information
 - Course help students in developing judgment, seeking a well-balanced view
 - Cathy will prepare revised language for this goal, based on our discussion
- Significant discussion regarding the structure of Goal 8, Information Literacy
 - A 2cr? 3cr? Course

- A course in each department/college? A few for the whole university?
- Discussion of components of this goal: (not a complete list)
 - When info is needed and locate and evaluate the info
 - What information is appropriate to a discipline
 - Discovery and Assessment of information
 - The ethical use of information (copy right, fair use, plagiarism, academic integrity, etc.)
- Jenny will prepare revised language for this goal based on our discussion

ITEM FOUR: Science Chairs Memo

- Concern over the demeanor of the language...haughty (who defines hallmark?)
- Will we change the name? We decide not to.
- Motion to reject concern (a) of the science chairs.
 - Amendment to motion:
 - Change text in bulleted point to, "...from two prefixes with a maximum of 4 credits from the health or applied sciences."
 - Voted to 7 yay, 1 abstain
- Universal agreement that we need courses with labs. We will restore this to 8 credits.
 - We vote on this and decide to require labs

NEXT MEETING: 2:30pm, 10 April, 2012 in ?? (not geosciences, admin. building)

- We will discuss the revised Objective 7 and 8 descriptions
- We will review proposals of extant courses fitting into Objectives 1-6.
- Ben will be absent. Cathy and Jerry will work together to prepare minutes.

Meeting adjourned at 16:40

Minutes Approved by GERC

Reviewed and Accepted by UCC:

April 10, 2012

General Education Requirements Committee Meeting. Started at 2:35pm.

Present: Sarah Mead, Cathy Peppers (Vice Pres.), Susan Swetnam (President), Tracy Payne, Julie Melton, Rebecca Branden, Jenny Semenza, Erika Kunlman, Jerry Lyons (interim secretary).

Item One: Correction to previous minutes. An "El" spelling correction on "Isenbergs 6." Minutes approved.

- Susan attended Curriculum Council; they voted unanimously to have two labs in Objective 5. A total of eight credits will be required.
- There is consensus that we are operating as we should as a committee.

Item Two: Consider meeting last Tuesday in April.

- Objectives 7 & 8. Kathy reported on her efforts along with Jenny. She wrote her revision assuming that the objective would be identified as an upper and lower division objective.
- Susan: looked at definition of Critical Thinking.
- Kathy offered her thoughts about definition. Others offered discussion. Discussion about lecture, tests, deepening thinking skills. Some feeling expressed about students getting their hands dirty in the sciences. Meaning hands on as opposed to multiple choice type experiences.
- Jenny suggested guidelines would be helpful.
- Everyone liked the main definition developed by Kathy.
- Susan: we should consider the upper/lower division issue. What does general education mean? Discussion ensued. Kathy shared College of Business view. There was some discussion about our role, and how we should stay to gen. ed. Requirements. There was some suggestion of two-part approach. Part one would be gen. ed., while part two could be discipline specific.
- Foundational taken first to be followed by a discipline specific course.
- Susan will write the ideas expressed and submit to the committee for review. Susan will draft the idea and we will vote by e-mail. Jenny moved in principle the language that Susan will give us and make goal seven into two parts. Kathy seconded, and the motion passed.

Item Three: Information literacy was discussed next. Jenny's work was considered.

- Content was discussed. Reviewed numbers 1-5 outcome content.
- Susan asked for other committee members views.
- Kathy made a motion that Jenny accomplish the same task as Susan. Julie seconded and the motion passed. Susan will write the head notes.

Item Four: Consideration of proposals

- CSED 1151 and 1152 with labs. Erica moved for approval, Rebecca seconded. All were in favor.
- HE 2200, discussion ensued. Methodology was questioned. More description relating to the objectives is needed. How this relates specifically relate to social science must be identified. Each of the objectives must be met. Jenny made a motion to remand, Tracy seconded. Motion passed.

- TGE 0135, Suggested only for COT students. Differences in COT requirements discussed. Motion made to deny based upon the technical concern that a course in the COT cannot be used for an academic degree by Jenny, seconded by Tracy. All in favor, motion passed.
- CSED 2256, Jenny moved to approve, Rebecca seconded. Discussion about format. Assessment needed more clarity as well as objectives. Rigor brought into question. Motion withdrawn. Moved by Kathy to remand and resubmit, Tracy seconded. All in favor, motion passed.
- Table proposals for objective 7, due to developing language for this objective.
- Education 2204 considered. Kathy moved to approve, Julie seconded. Motion passed.
- Business course, MGT 2216, considered. In-house statistics course. Kathy explained and described the course. Jerry moved to pass, Jenny seconded. Motion passed.

Susan will draft instruction. Be looking for that. Departments will be getting detail from Susan.

Next meeting will be April 24, 2012 at 2:30.

Minutes Approved by GERC

Reviewed and Accepted by UCC:

Meeting Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee (GERC)

2012-04-24

PRESENT: (Quorum Present) Susan Swetnam (Chair), Cathy Peppers (Vice-Chair), Ben Crosby (Secretary), Erika Kuhlman, Jerry Lyons, Jenny Semenza, Tracy Payne, Rebecca Braden, Tara Johnson, Sarah Mead

ABSENT: Michael Spall, Julie Melton, an ASISU representative has been requested

The meeting convened at 14:30 with a quorum present.

ITEM ONE: Curriculum Council (CC) Decision on Objective Modifications

- Changes to Objectives 5 and 8 were approved without discussion
- Changes in Objective 7 were suggested by the CC.
 - There will be not * in the course catalog noting which courses satisfy the goal
 - We discussed their proposed changes
 - The example on the back of the copy is not the most current version. This will need to be changed (By Ken or Ruth?) before it goes to Dean's Council
 - We will have to evaluate the different department's proposed 2nd tier courses
 - We decided to generate a mockup as an example (English capstone seminar?)
 - We will want to have the 'six starred' deliverables listed on the description
 - There is concern that a standardized test (Boards) is not a good measure of learning critical thinking. We will need to rephrase the draft letter, removing Board Exam and stating, "...another appropriate method."
 - Suggested change to second paragraph of letter so that last sentence reads, "...devise a tool for *developing* and assessing the field-specific critical thinking..."
 - There will be a lot of courses to evaluate in the fall, but most should be fast and easy.
 - There will be one course per degree or one per 'track' or 'emphasis.'
 - We have to be clear that we are assessing critical thinking in a course not a program. This will be changed in the last paragraph of the letter.

ITEM TWO: Evaluation of Proposed Extant Objective Courses

- Women Studies 2201: Objective 9
 - Concerns raised about a lack of course activities
 - We suggest a conditional acceptance, pending more detail on assignments and activities. We will also need a definition of the term 'analytical tools.'
- College of Technology 0135, Objective 6
 - We learn that the state board requires all COT courses to be approved by the Univ.
 - To increase efficiency, we may (if necessary) evaluate all these at once.
- Anthropology 1107, Objective 7
 - Accepted for 'tier one' objective 7.

ITEM THREE: Brief discussion of Transfer Student concerns

- We will get a digital version circulted of email from registrar's office

ITEM FOUR: Timeline for next year

- Deadlines to send to all deans, departments
 - Letter will state that proposals are accepted only in the early part of the semester, not through the summer.
 - September 7th, 2012: Proposals for extant courses for new objectives given new objective descriptions.
 - September 20th, 2012: Proposals for new courses that may fit new objectives given new objective descriptions.
 - October 15th, 2012: Proposals for courses that satisfy second tier of Objective 7

ITEM FOUR: We need a secretary

- CPI? Professional? We are overwhelmed. We will ask Laura

NEXT MEETING: In the early fall on an unspecified date.

Meeting adjourned at 16:10

Minutes Approved by GERC

Reviewed and Accepted by UCC:

Meeting Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee (GERC)

2012-09-11

PRESENT: (Quorum Present) Susan Swetnam (Chair), Cathy Peppers (Vice-Chair), Ben Crosby (Secretary), Erika Kuhlman, Jerry Lyons, Jenny Semenza, Tracy Payne, Rebecca Braden, Tara Johnson, Sarah Mead, Michael Spall, Julie Melton, an ASISU representative has been requested. Guest: Teena Rhoads.

ABSENT: All members attended.

The meeting convened at 14:30 with a quorum present.

ITEM ONE: Visitor, Teena Rhoads, College of Technology

- Discussion of how the CoTech defines their requirements for General Education.
- 15 Gen Ed Credits. The different programs use different courses.
- A social science and ethics classes are needed and planned to fulfill their requirements.
- Some classes are taught specifically in the CoT and others are taken outside.
- Committee discusses the value of: redundant courses taught two places on campus?, the generality of the proposed course (is it too specific?), are courses of equal rigor?,
- We will discuss this next time we meet.

ITEM TWO: Low submissions for extant non-goal courses. What to do?

- We are surprised at the small number of courses that have been proposed
- Fall of 2013 might be a light offering of courses!
- Shall we remind chairs and deans that we need more Goal 7/8 course proposals?
 - Many agree that we need to re-request these. Need to have a bold, clear deadline (Contact Ruth M. to get a clear deadline for catalog submissions) and a good description of Goals 7 and 8. (Information Literacy and Critical Thinking)
 - New courses go to Curriculum Committee first, then to us (are there some on-hold there now)? Or, do they go to CC and us at the same time? Sounds like they go to CC first. Can we really expect that the CC will approve things in time for us to see them? Susan will look into this tomorrow. Is this Sept 20 or Dec 18?
 - Memo needs to state that departments should not be overly concerned about accreditation.
 - Memo to chairs/deans need to state that we want to see for Goals 7/8 the terms InfoLit and CritThinking in course titles and catalog descriptions.

ITEM THREE: Discussion of submitted proposals for non-extant goal courses

- Goal 4: Humanities, Arts and Language
 - Music 1109, Survey of Jazz History
 - Is there enough rigor? Where does analysis come in?
 - We realize that we did not circulate the most recent version of the application
 - We will table this for today and revisit when we see the correct form.
- Goal 6: Social Science
 - CSED 2256, Deaf Culture and Community
 - Now a more complete application for our review
 - Impressed with a wide range of methodologies.

- Moved and seconded for approval. Discussion?
 - Concern that the course is too specific and may suggest that lots of different courses could fit into this goal?
 - Is there enough rigor and definitiveness?
 - What are the social/behavioral sciences methods involved?
 - Is this better for cultural awareness (Goal 9)?
 - We realize that we don't have a current version of the Goal Mapping. Susan will redistribute the most recent descriptions and mappings.
 - The vote is taken and we decide not to approve.
 - We move to remand the submission. 8/10 for remand
 - We have multiple issues as described above.
- Goal 7: Critical Thinking
 - Phil 2201: Introduction to Logic
 - Question about critical thinking test: this will be an assessment using a standardized test so students can assess their own progress.
 - Is there enough detail in the description? I guess it is ok.
 - Motion to accept: It passes
 - Poly Sci 2202: Introduction to Politics
 - Concern over whether this is social science or critical thinking, but it resolved
 - Concern over vague nature of assessment techniques, but we realize that we don't yet have a standard for this.
 - Concern is that course may be not going after the essence of the critical thinking, but it might be too applied to PolySci and not broad enough? Is it too discipline specific or should it be broad and cross disciplinary? The title and catalog description is not focused on the critical thinking aspect.
 - Vote (~~all approve~~) to remand because 'critical thinking' is not explicit enough in the title and catalog description.
- Goal 8: Information Literacy
 - Library : Intro to Information Research
 - Concern regarding the outpour of students that will need to take this class.
 - Still needs to pass curriculum council.
 - We vote for approval and it passes.
- Goal 9: Cultural Diversity
 - 2210 Introduction to Asian Philosophies
 - Concern regarding narrowness and whether the catalog description is complete enough. We are also concerned whether this Objective's courses focus on one or multiple cultures.

NEXT MEETING: Sept 25 ,Geosciences Conf. Room, 2:30

Meeting adjourned at 16:30

Minutes Approved by GERC

Reviewed and Accepted by UCC:

Meeting Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee (GERC)

2012-09-25

PRESENT: (Quorum Present) Susan Swetnam (Chair), Cathy Peppers (Vice-Chair), Ben Crosby (Secretary), Jerry Lyons, Jenny Semenza, Tracy Payne, Rebecca Braden, Tara Johnson, Sarah Mead

ABSENT: Erika Kuhlman, Michael Spall, Julie Melton, an ASISU representative has been requested

The meeting convened at 14:35 with a quorum present.

ITEM ONE: New Applications

- We will not have to wait for curriculum council. They will give provisional approval so that we can do our evaluations

ITEM TWO: Discussion of submitted proposals for non-extant goal courses

- Goal 4: Humanities, Arts and Language
 - Music 1109, Survey of Jazz History
 - Though discussed via email, we need to vote in person without an in-person motion to vote by email.
 - Should we have 'Practice' classes included in this goal? We will discuss this next time
 - We vote to **approve** this course: Approved.
- Goal 6: Social Science
 - COT, Workplace Relations, TGE 0135
 - Discussion over asterisk designation. Are we limiting it just COT students? We learn that some students can petition for these courses to be transferred if students leave the COT and go to another college.
 - There are missing information regarding assessment (what is the written report and presentation).
 - The idea of the course is good, but the application appears incomplete and there may not be enough rigor.
 - Vote to **table** the course until we have more information. Tabling approved
- Goal 7: Critical Thinking
 - Theatre 1118: Oral Interpretation
 - Concern over whether analysis counts as critical thinking.
 - Concern over clarity of activities...the 2-3 minutes are the duration that the students give their dramatic reading. Is there enough rigor in this?
 - Is there good demonstration about the course being reflective? Are there scholarly works or just primary literature.
 - We revisit the description of the objective and don't find enough explicit matches to the objective.
 - Motion to reject: All agree to **reject**.

- SOC 2248: Critical Analysis of Social Diversity
 - All like the way the proposal was prepared.
 - Move to approve: All agree to **approve**.
- Goal 9: Cultural Diversity
 - 2212: Comparative Folklore (cross-listed with Anthro)
 - Concern over rigor, but this is resolved
 - Enjoyed good example of course (should we share with others)
 - Vote to approve: All agree to **approve**

ITEM THREE: Future Efforts

- Do we need a rubric for the evaluating courses? This will standardize how we provide feedback to the applicants. Susan will consider this as she writes more of these responses to the applicants. Will a general tool arise for communicating our decisions to the applicants?
- How will we do assessment when the time comes? Will we use standardized tests for assessment?
- We will have another meeting on Oct 23.

NEXT MEETING: Oct 9, Geosciences Conf. Room, 2:30

Meeting adjourned at 15:31

Minutes Approved by GERC

Reviewed and Accepted by UCC:

Meeting Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee (GERC)

2012-10-09

PRESENT: (Quorum Present) Susan Swetnam (Chair), Cathy Peppers (Vice-Chair), Ben Crosby (Secretary), Jerry Lyons, Jenny Semenza, Tracy Payne, Tara Johnson, Sarah Mead, Julie Melton, Erika Kuhlman

ABSENT: Michael Spall, Rebecca Braden , an ASISU representative has been requested

The meeting convened at 14:35 with a quorum present.

ITEM ONE: Announcements

- Proposals are coming in quickly, but we cannot review things that don't come in
- Not very organized submission procedures but we will develop a structure for future years procedures based on how things went this year
- Curriculum council is discussing how to support/treat COT courses
- Minutes approved by the committee
- 5 proposals for review today (only 4 in the end)

ITEM TWO: Discussion of submitted proposals for non-extant goal courses

- Goal 7: Critical Thinking
 - PolySci 2202: XXX
 - Resubmission, committee likes the revisions
 - Move to approve: All agree to **approve**.
- Goal 8: Information Literacy
 - Geology 1108
 - Like hands-on and labs. Content motivated topics are good.
 - Multiple textbooks give more flexibility
 - In section 5, it would be nice to see more than a graph...other techniques?
 - Move to approve; all agree to **approve**.
 - Personal Finance 1115:
 - Is this taught in high school? What is the backstory? Does this fit information literacy? But is financial literacy the same thing as information literacy?
 - Could this class suggest a precedent that any field that uses data fits this Goal?
 - Is there too much emphasis on students personal finances?
 - All agree that this course is really valuable, but it may not fit the general education motif of crossing disciplinary boundaries.
 - Move to reject proposal: **7 support rejection**, 1 abstention.
 - CIS 1101: XXX
 - This has gone to curriculum council but is not yet approved.
 - Proposal built around Library template.
 - Desire for a more careful course description
 - Final Project should have a listing of some example topics.
 - Not clear if the final project is a part of the final exam.

- Not sure if there is enough description of the assignments.
- We decide to send this back for more details from the authors
- Geoscience will be used as an example proposal.
- Move to remand for supplemental information. All **approve**.

ITEM THREE: Future Efforts

- Hopper Topics:
 - Which of these courses can be taught as online courses?
 - Should we revisit critical thinking concepts
 - Should we consider 'Early College' courses? (High School teachers teaching college courses in the high schools for college credit)
 - We need to work on documenting our standard operating procedures so that we have a legacy of guidance.
 - We still don't have our student representative...

NEXT MEETING: Oct 23, Geosciences Conf. Room, 2:30

Meeting adjourned at 15:31

Minutes Approved by GERC

Reviewed and Accepted by UCC:

Meeting Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee (GERC)

2012-10-23

PRESENT: (Quorum Present) Susan Swetnam (Chair), Cathy Peppers (Vice-Chair), Ben Crosby (Secretary), Jerry Lyons, Jenny Semenza, Tracy Payne, Rebecca Braden, Tara Johnson, Sarah Mead, Erika Kuhlman

ABSENT: Michael Spall, Julie Melton an ASISU representative has been requested

The meeting convened at 14:40 with a quorum present.

ITEM ONE: Announcements

- Dean's Council and Curriculum Council is happy for our progress and meta-analysis.
- CC will discuss how the COT courses fit into the GER. Will the SBOE change their position?
- CC Chair will be helping prepare a more systematic method for proposal evaluation .

ITEM TWO: Discussion of submitted proposals for non-extant goal courses

- Goal 5: Natural Sciences
 - Nutrition, NTD 2239
 - Discussion of course centered on quality and value of the course
 - Discussion regarding the applied nature of course
 - Discussion regarding the concern that there is no lab, thus only 3 credits
 - Motion to approve: All agree to **approve**.
 - Motion to send a letter suggestion that they develop a lab. : All agree to **send letter**.
- Goal 6: Behavioral and Social Science
 - HCA 1115
 - Concern over rigor of course. Lots of 'description.'
 - Not much evaluation of students (just a few tests). Needs more rigor.
 - Document does not address our requested proposal format
 - Course seems too narrow.
 - There are concerns over the wording of concepts, lack of clarity. Typos.
 - Lacking foundational theories and concepts.
 - Industry orientation rather than providing foundations for students.
 - Motion to reject: All agree to **reject**. We will write a letter with our concerns
- Goal 7: Critical Thinking
 - Computer Science 1181
 - Is this critical thinking or creative problem solving?
 - Concern over whether there is a lab. No there is not, but there is homework.
 - Discussion over what is active learning. Guiding students and then letting them discover information and methods independently.

- Discussion over whether this is broad enough for all COSE students. Likely no. There will be more courses from each department.
 - Move to approve: All agree to **approve**.
- Goal 8: Information Literacy
 - The Historian's Craft, HIST 2291
 - Concern over the libraries responsibility to teach information literacy segments of extra library Objective 8 courses.
 - Erika suggests that they could remove that portion of the proposal, if necessary.
 - Should we develop a small document that describes what the library is capable of doing to assist courses in info literacy? All agree.
 - Move to approve, given the condition that the text regarding the Library's assistance be removed and the course catalog suggests that the course is open to non-majors; all agree to **approve, with 2 conditions**.

ITEM THREE: Future Efforts

- We will continue to evaluate proposals as they come in, we just make
- Hopper Topics
 - We need to develop a rubric for the different objectives, especially the new ones. Specifically, (1) we need to have language on what makes an complete proposal (assessment, how the demands are met), proposal and (2) specific evaluation criteria for goals 5-9. **Deadline the Friday the week prior to the Nov 6 meeting.**
 - General Proposal Guidelines, (1); Tracy
 - 5 – Natural and Applied Sciences; Tara
 - 6 – Behave, Social Sci; Erika
 - 7 – Critical Thinking; Cathy
 - 8 – Info Lit; Jenny
 - 9 – Diversity; Susan
 - Does the CS course suggest that it is like a studio course because it is so applied and has the flavor or practice through homework.
 - We did not get a revised version of the business course including the assignments in CIS.

NEXT MEETING: Nov 6, Geosciences Conf. Room, 2:30pm

Meeting adjourned at 15:40

Minutes Approved by GERC

Reviewed and Accepted by UCC:

Meeting Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee (GERC)

2012-11-13

PRESENT: Susan Swetnam (Chair), Cathy Peppers (Vice-Chair), Ben Crosby (Secretary), Jerry Lyons, Jenny Semenza, Tracy Payne, Rebecca Braden, Tara Johnson, Erika Kuhlman

ABSENT: Michael Spall, Julie Melton, an ASISU representative has been requested. Curriculum Council and a Provost Representative are invited.

The meeting convened at 14:35 with a quorum present.

ITEM ONE: Announcements

- Curriculum council is working on a new flow chart describing the process by which courses are routed through different committees.
- Susan went to Dean's council and got Kudos on our progress, credibility and transparency.
- Minutes require one adjustment. New text recommended, the minutes were revised and approved.
- We have been resent a course (Women Studies 2201) that we have already approved. This was simply because there is a form that needed to be filled out. It is necessary that we notify all future course proposers that they need to fill out the curriculum council form, 'Proposal for Course and/or Curriculum Change.' To facilitate this process, our website may be merged with the CC's. It will be great to have one place where forms for course changes or additions can be downloaded and uploaded.

ITEM TWO: Discussion of submitted proposals for non-extant goal courses

- Goal 8: Information Literacy
 - Digital Resources for Information Literacy, CIS 1101
 - This course was remanded for needing improved descriptions of assignments and better demonstration of rigor.
 - The committee is impressed with both the improvements of
 - Move to approve: All agree to **approve**.
 - There are now 4 courses that fit this objective. (Library, Geo, CIS, History)

ITEM THREE: Evaluation of Draft Rubrics

- Purpose of discussion: To develop a consistent method of proposal evaluation. The final document will be a single entity with all objectives in it. It will guide the decision making process for GERC members and provide extra guidelines for those developing proposals. We will post this on website with precautionary text such as, 'policies subject to change'
- Overall Guidelines: Discussed and to be revised
 - Rephrase on #5 on list
 - Foundations of learning vs. Practical/Applied skills?
 - Courses should not be too focused on applied life skills. These are not 'self-help'
 - Discipline Focus vs. Broad Applicability?

- Skills should be transferable across disciplines but maintain some theme.
 - Broad issues should be emphasized.
- What is the role prerequisites play in objective courses? Some will have them, others will not. Most courses should not have them unless they are necessary to assure the basic skill levels of students in the course.
- Should there be a statement that any department may propose a course for any objective?
- Assessment: we will expand this section as we formalize this topic.
- Objective 5: Applied and Natural Sciences
 - Tracy will merge the introductory materials in this rubric into the 'overall' document
 - Needs more emphasis on the values of labs and hands-on activities. Note though that labs are not explicitly required under Objective 5.
 - Scientific method should be mentioned in these guiding documents
- Objective 6: Behavioral and Social Sciences
 - We need to define the social and behavioral sciences. What are these disciplines?
 - Committee really likes the expanded definitions of the learning outcomes.
 - Should all rubrics further define the learning outcomes for each goal? Most say yes.
- Objective 7: Critical Thinking
 - Should there be a particular critical thinking course in each department/major or should there be a smaller subset of courses that are cross disciplinary? Most say a course in each department is ok.
 - 'secondary' could be replaced with 'instrumental'
 - Shortening last few sentences of paragraph 2.
 - In paragraph one it is worth mentioning that questions should be open ended or ambiguous enough to allow for multiple perspectives with more than one correct solution.
 - 'and...other types of primary research' at the end of 3.
- Objective 8: information Literacy
 - These points should be made as statements rather than questions to avoid confusion over what exactly the committee is evaluating for.
 - It would be great for professors that are teaching *Objectives 7 and 8* courses to get together in the spring semester and discuss course design so that it is clear what we are looking for. This will help when we start doing assessments in the future.
- Objective 9: Culture
 - Important to focus on comparative topics rather than just single cultures.
 - Student assessments should encourage students to draw analytical conclusions, not just answer factual statements.

ITEM FOUR: Future Efforts

- Committee composition for next year:
 - Susan, Ben and Rebecca will all be leaving the committee next year. Maybe Jenny too.

- Term limits are supposed to be three years. We will set up a rotation to assure persistent institutional memory in the committee.
- Hopper Topics:
 - None this week

NEXT MEETING: Dec 11, Geosciences Conf. Room, 14:30pm

Meeting adjourned at 16:00

Minutes Approved by GERC

Reviewed and Accepted by UCC:

Meeting Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee (GERC)

2012-12-11

PRESENT: Susan Swetnam (Chair), Ben Crosby (Secretary), Sarah Mead, Jerry Lyons, Jenny Semenza, Tracy Payne, Rebecca Braden, Julie Melton (in Meridian), Greg Nelson (UCC representative)

ABSENT: Cathy Peppers (Vice-Chair), Michael Spall, Tara Johnson, and Erika Kuhlman. An ASISU representative has been requested. Curriculum Council and a Provost Representative are invited.

The meeting convened at 14:35 with a quorum present.

ITEM ONE: Previous Minutes

- Motion to approve the previous meeting's minutes. All agree to **approve**.

ITEM TWO: Discussion of UCC's decision not approve the General Education Objectives

- Visitor to meeting , Greg Nelson (UCC representative)
 - UCC made an official vote to stall the implementation of the new Gen Eds
 - There needs to be a final decision before the end of the semester for these to be implemented in the fall of 20 13.
 - Greg will do what he can to get the council back behind the new Gen. Eds.
 - It is expected that higher administration will force the UCC to accept the Gen Eds regardless of their internal decision.
 - GERC requests that the UCC needs to allow GERC to make their own evaluations of whether courses meet the General Education criteria. Otherwise we are redundant
- Concerns from expressed by Engineering
 - Concerns expressed at both the UCC meeting and an internal Engineering meeting Monday that Susan was invited to.
 - Engineering has previously been able to not require some of Gen Eds. Susan will clarify the precedent behind this.
 - Engineering is now concerned with how the new Gen Eds will fit into their program.
 - They are concerned with the Geosciences course for Objective 8.
 - Existing rules in the Gen. Ed. system (2 upper division courses can suffice for a course in a particular department) may enable Engineering to not need to take as many Objective courses. Susan will look into this as well.

ITEM THREE: Letter to Dean's Council

- Susan has made valuable changes to the first paragraph and other parts of the document following revisions suggested by GERC members and others. The letter was read and available to the GERC members for evaluation.
- Motion to approve the changes to the Dean's Council Letter. Motion **approved**.

ITEM FOUR: Revision of Geosciences proposal

- The only changes made to the proposal were to remove all references to engineering. These changes were made at the request of the School of Engineering.

- Discussion over the grading structure. It is fine.
- This proposal is commended for being a well-structured, well thought out proposal that serves as a model for other submissions.
- Motion to approve the proposal as revised. Motion **approved**.

ITEM FIVE: Discussion of Objective 8 Rubric

- A guiding statement:
 - Information literacy is foundational to the research process.
- There is concern that this feels a little bare. When distributed, we need to include the general rubric for all Objective courses. We will try to add more flesh here.
- Susan has made suggestions to the language for the first numbered point:
 - ...research process. While the course will naturally focus on a specific topic or topics as the basis of research, it will foreground the cognitive and mechanical process of acquiring, assessing and using information in an effective and ethical way.
- Do we need a more explicit definition of what constitutes information? A follow-on sentence in 1 defines this.
 - Addressing complex questions requires obtaining, evaluating and synthesizing information from multiple sources (such as secondary literature, datasets and primary sources).
- In place of '3' we will list the student learning outcomes as detailed in another document.
- These changes have been implemented in the original document and sent to Jenny and Susan.

ITEM SIX: Discussion Objectives for the Spring Semester

- First meeting of the semester needs to include a discussion of the implications of these changes on students, especially those transferring to ISU. The AAS waiver of Gen. Eds may be unfair to students who transfer before finishing that degree. This will be assessed.
- We need to continue to work on revisions of the 'philosophy of general ed.' statement. This might include a statement regarding the transferability of credits from other institutions.
- Continue working on the rubrics for all the Objectives.
- Continue to evaluate the 'two lab' requirement. The Dean's concerns are well founded.
- Start to vet the grandfathered courses to see if they still meet the new objectives.

NEXT MEETING: Jan 22, Geosciences Conf. Room, 14:30pm

Meeting adjourned at 15:50.

Minutes Approved by GERC

Reviewed and Accepted by UCC:

Meeting Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee (GERC)

2013-01-22

PRESENT: Susan Swetnam (Chair), Cathy Peppers (Vice-Chair), Ben Crosby (Secretary), Sarah Mead, Jerry Lyons, Jenny Semenza, Tracy Payne, Rebecca Braden, Tara Johnson, Julie Melton (in Meridian), and Erika Kuhlman;
Guests: David Blakeman and Greg Nelson (UCC representatives)

ABSENT: Michael Spall. An ASISU representative has been requested. Curriculum Council and a Provost Representative are invited.

The meeting convened at 14:30 with a quorum present. Future meetings will have to be brief.

ITEM ONE: Previous Minutes

- **Motion** to approve the previous meeting's minutes. All agree to **approve**.

ITEM TWO: Roster submitted to Academic Affairs

- Deans meeting was held to discuss the General Education Requirements.
 - Letter from UCC and GERC was discussed at the meeting. The Deans discussed what to do with the GE structure. Plan was to remove both 7 and 8. UCC Chair suggested a compromise to do one or the other. This change needed to be approved at the Provost level. The ultimate decision was not shared with others at the university until after Christmas break.
 - Deans were concerned that there were not enough courses to support Objectives 7 and 8. Could this change in the future? With more courses available for these objectives, would both 7 and 8 become required?
 - Is there a plan to reduce the number of credits required for general education (from 36 to 30?)
- This is the information that has been passed to us by Ruth Moorhead.
- At present we have not say in what is going into the next catalog
 - Students will have the choice of taking one class from Objectives 7 or 8.
 - The two-lab requirement (objective 5) has been dropped to only one. This has been expressed as a major concern from Bio and Geo.
- Is Gen. Ed. (Academic Affairs) moving to Learning-Outcome-Based vs. Course Based materials. What does this really mean? Who determines whether a given course meets some set of standards? Will there be exams that students will have to take to prove that they have met these requirements. In this model, students will take courses in their own department to meet many of the Goals. This is a concern from some departments that there are too many credits required in the Gen. Ed.
- What is our plan of action?
 - Wait a year once there are more courses approved?
 - Hold workshops to evaluate how well the current Gen. Eds. are working?
 - Continue to not see this as a done-deal but a step in the progress toward acceptance.
 - We can share the catalog copy with our constituents.

- The current operating rules designate that our (GERC) role is providing input but not actually making the decisions. These decisions reside with the upper administration.
- **Motion** to have Tracy and Kathy will prepare a document that will provide guidance on how we will proceed. This will be used in future meetings to guide our course of action. All agree to **approve**.

ITEM THREE: What are the credit requirements at other universities?

- From Sarah Mead: Report regarding transferring in credits from other universities. What are other universities requiring of their students? We find that most other universities require roughly two courses and 1 lab (7 credits), not two labs (8 credits) as we had expected.

ITEM FOUR: Continued Development of Rubrics for the Objectives.

- We will complete these by mid-February
- These will be necessary for whether we grandfather-in courses into the new system.
- We need to have an overall, comprehensive guide, independent of the individual objectives
- We can look at what we have already approved to define what we are looking for.
- We need to have a consistent format for the specific Objectives.
 - 1. Start with a reference to comprehensive rubric for ALL objectives
 - 2. General statement of philosophy of what **does** and **does not** fit the objective.
 - E.g. define what rigor means for this objective. This would have to be consistent across the courses.
 - 3. Provide specific standards for evaluating the Learning Objectives. This way the courses know explicitly what is expected of them. The more specific the better.
 - Pose these expectations as questions:
 - “Does the course teach...?” Should these be statements instead?
 - Should we have departmental representatives help in drafting this? Maybe not.
 - What sets the standards in Objectives that include many disciplines? Will each proposal have to provide some demonstration of meeting a national standard?
 - 4. We provide examples of exemplary proposals.
 - Maybe just link out to a couple documents?
- ASSIGNMENTS:
 - Work on all our statements...looking at what we have already approved, and sticking to these guidelines. Bring a statement for the philosophy of the objective and an example. We will discuss these at the next meeting.
 - 1-susan
 - 2-rebecca
 - 3-tracy
 - 4-susan
 - 5-ben
 - 6-erika
 - 7-cathy
 - 8-jenny

- 9-jerry

NEXT MEETING: Feb 12, Geosciences Conf. Room, 14:30pm

Meeting adjourned at 15:45.

Minutes Approved by GERC

Reviewed and Accepted by UCC:

Meeting Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee (GERC)

2013-02-12

PRESENT: Susan Swetnam (Chair), Cathy Peppers (Vice-Chair), Ben Crosby (Secretary), Sarah Mead, Jerry Lyons, Jenny Semenza, Tracy Payne, Rebecca Braden, Tara Johnson, Julie Melton (in Meridian), and Erika Kuhlman;
Guests: David Blakeman (UCC representative)

ABSENT: Michael Spall. An ASISU representative has been requested. Curriculum Council and a Provost Representative are invited.

The meeting convened at 14:30 with a quorum present.

ITEM ONE: Previous Minutes

- **Motion** to approve the previous meeting's minutes. All agree to **approve**.
- Minutes and draft-Rubrics will now be also sent to David Blakeman.

ITEM TWO: Announcements

- Susan is being asked about the new GenEd scheme. We need to get the new catalog description posted online so folks can start advising students and planning courses for next year. Does CC need to approve something? We have requested to have the final version posted to our website. We will get this done ASAP.
- We will need to post rubrics as soon as we are done with revisions.
- No major news from CC. There is an attempt to define how minutes are distributed between subcommittees, councils and administration.

ITEM THREE: Review of Rubrics

- Initial notes:
 - We should assure that the 'model' proposals describe core classes that fit the objective really well. This may require waiting till we request proposals from the 'grandfathered' group.
 - How much should we involve host departments in rubric development? Does this make the rubrics too narrow? We suggest seeking a balance where feedback is welcome but not necessary or prescriptive.
 - Rubrics for each Objective should not repeat guidelines that are in the Overall document.
- Objective 1
 - In section 3, we will use questions to describe what we expect to see in proposals.
 - We need to make sure we emphasize written English. Should we use the words primary and secondary to differentiate the two emphases of the course? The length of 2 bulleted blocks of text should emphasize that the written component is emphasized.
 - In the second bullet, '...as relevant to written English.'
- Objective 2

- We need to make sure we emphasize spoken English. This requires flipping phrases or words in two locations.
- Objective 3
 - How prescriptive should the student assessment be?
 - Maybe the 5th bullet should be removed from here, stripped of specifics and added to the Overall Guidelines? Should we mention the two types of student assessment?
 - Formative Assessment: less consequential, useful feedback
 - Summative Assessment: feedback that significantly impacts the grade
- Objective 4
 - No changes necessary. Clarification provided on foreign language classes.
- Objective 5
 - Request to rephrase bullet regarding atomic structure to be less specific. “The nature of matter...”
- Subsequent objectives will be discussed via email and finalized at the next meeting.
- Overall Guidelines
 - We will work on these during the next meeting.

NEXT MEETING: Feb 19, Geosciences Conf. Room, 14:30pm

Meeting adjourned at 15:50.

Minutes Approved by GERC

Reviewed and Accepted by UCC:

Meeting Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee (GERC)

2013-02-19

PRESENT: (Quorum Present) Susan Swetnam (Chair), Cathy Peppers (Vice-Chair), Dave Blakeman Erika Kuhlman, Jerry Lyons, Jenny Semenza, Julie Melton, Tracy Payne, Rebecca Branden, Tara Johnson, Sarah Mead, JoAnn Hertz visiting.

ABSENT: Ben Crosby (Secretary), Michael Spall, an ASISU representative has been requested

The meeting convened at 14:34 with a quorum present.

Minutes reviewed, Initial notes, there is an extra "too." Remove. Motion to approve, seconded, and approved.

Item One: JoAnn Hertz visited to explain how central advising will be doing to advise students with regard to how courses taken previously will/will not be counted.

The switch with regard to the Objective #5 labs creates a discrepancy between what the students are required to do and what is written.

Item Two: New Proposal; TGE0135, objective 6. We are taking another look at it. Discussion ensued. Moved to accept with the provision that an assessment plan or method is provided once the rubric is developed.

Item Three: Review of Rubrics. **We are starting with the general rubric first.** Discussion ensued. We looked at Version #3. Number 3 in Rubric, add "title and description" to the first bullet. Word changes under #4-Rigor made by Tracy to the document. Under #5, several word changes suggested. The description was shortened. Number 6, changes suggested. Number 9, prerequisites were discussed.

We should add that these courses for General Education Requirements are only for 100-200 level courses.

Approval moved and seconded, Unanimously approved.

Item Four: Objective #6, changes suggested, moved and approved.

Next meeting is February 26th at 2:30.

Move to Adjourn, seconded. Approved.

Minutes Approved by GERC

Reviewed and Accepted by UCC:

Meeting Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee (GERC)

2013-02-26

PRESENT: Susan Swetnam (Chair), Ben Crosby (Secretary), Sarah Mead, Jerry Lyons, Jenny Semenza, Tracy Payne, Rebecca Braden, Tara Johnson, Julie Melton (in Meridian), and Erika Kuhlman; Guests: David Blakeman (UCC representative)

ABSENT: Cathy Peppers (Vice-Chair), Michael Spall. An ASISU representative has been requested. Curriculum Council and a Provost Representative are invited.

The meeting convened at 14:35 with a quorum present.

ITEM ONE: Previous Minutes

- Minutes not distributed, they will be evaluated next time we meet.

ITEM TWO: Announcements

- Last Meeting: Approved overall rubric and approved Objective 6
- David is working on getting our committee secretarial support.
- Need to have revision dates on all rubric documents.

ITEM THREE: Review of Rubrics

- Objective 1: Written English
 - Brief discussion of revisions since last meeting
 - Motion to **approve** rubric, all approve.
- Objective 2: Spoken English
 - Brief discussion of revisions since last meeting
 - Motion to **approve** rubric, all approve.
- Objective 3: Math
 - Brief discussion of revisions since last meeting
 - One small language change removing reference to previous exams
 - Motion to **approve** rubric, all approve.
- Objective 4: Humanities
 - Brief discussion of revisions since last meeting
 - Motion to **approve** rubric, all approve.
- Objective 5: Physical and Applied Sciences
 - Remove nutrition as a guideline for now but add it back in once both applied and science sources are available.
 - Brief discussion of revisions since last meeting
 - Motion to **approve** rubric, all approve.
- (Objective 6 was already approved)
- Discussion of the document that outlines the committee's viewpoint of how Objectives 7 and 8 should be viewed. The document describes the types of classes that might fit and other ways that we can begin to implement these new courses (workshops, etc.).
 - Is it important that we take a stance on the decision to have only 7 or 8?
 - Create a neutral but forceful statement.

- Motion to **discuss again this once our rubrics are complete**, all approve
- Objective 7: Critical Thinking
 - Discussion of revisions since last meeting
 - No exemplary courses will be listed
 - Language and content in rubric is applauded
 - Suggestion to add “seeking, understanding and **comparing**”
 - Item 2: Should cut last sentence at the end of paragraph under point 2
 - “(and epistemology?)” will be cut.
 - “see (demonstrate?)” will be cut.
 - Motion to **approve** rubric, all approve.
- Objective 8: Information Literacy
 - Discussion of revisions since last meeting. Revisions largely shortened the rubric.
 - Suggestion to “open the accordion” a bit more again
 - Needs to be formatted again to be more like the others, pulling the open bullets back one step to make them black bullets and then provide more specific examples like a discussion of plagiarism and copyright as open bullets. Also need to focus on the ‘process’ of selecting sources. Remember that there were courses that we did not approve and the concerns that these proposals raised should inform the rubric.
 - Decide to **revise the rubric and review again at the next meeting**.
- Objective 9: Behavioral and Social Sciences
 - Discussion of revisions since last viewing
 - Provide qualifier to allow more than just American History/Culture to be discussed.
 - Are there significant examples of assessment and activities? (discussed in open circles)
 - Need to make the main bullets into questions rather than statements to be comparable with the other rubrics.
 - Turn paragraph statements into open bullet statements.
 - Motion to **approve** rubric with small changes, all approve.

ITEM THREE: Hopper Topics

- Who is in charge of approving petitions?
- We will need to distribute these approved rubrics to the departments and colleges. March 8th is when these should be finished and posted.
- On March 8th we will also send out a letter requesting proposals for ‘grandparented’ courses. April 9th may be our first meeting where we discuss these. Submission deadline for those considered in the Spring of 2013 is April 2nd. We will also need a deadline for September for proposals to be considered in the Fall.
- Committee members will each suggest 3 ‘greatest hits’ proposals and submit to Susan.

NEXT MEETING: March 12, 2013, Geosciences Conf. Room, 14:30pm

Meeting adjourned at 15:40.

Meeting Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee (GERC)

2013-03-19

PRESENT: Susan Swetnam (Chair), Cathy Peppers (Vice-Chair), Ben Crosby (Secretary), Sarah Mead, Jerry Lyons, Jenny Semenza (not present but Sandy as stand-in), Tracy Payne, Rebecca Braden, and Erika Kuhlman; Guests: David Blakeman (UCC representative)

ABSENT: Tara Johnson, Julie Melton (in Meridian), Michael Spall. An ASISU representative has been requested. Curriculum Council and a Provost Representative are always invited.

The meeting convened at 14:30 with a quorum present.

ITEM ONE: Previous Minutes

- **Motion** to approve both previous meeting's minutes. All agree to **approve**.
- Misspelling of approve with one p missing was noted and resolved.

ITEM TWO: Announcements

- We now have a secretary, Catherine Read, who will help with distributing documents between UCC and ourselves. She will also be the intermediary for all incoming proposals.
- Website (<http://isu.edu/gened/>) changes are afoot. Catherine Read (fsenate@isu.edu) will help. We will have model proposals (Geosciences Objective 8 and another proposal?) posted there as well as the rubrics.
- Rubrics have been approved at the UCC and have been passed on to the Provost's office for viewing/approval.
- The Women's Studies course was moved to Objective 6 rather than left in Objective 9 as we approved. This was done because it was perceived to create issues for transfer students (according to Kandi Turley-Ames and Laura Woodworth-Ney). Sarah will look into what the real issue is and report back next time.
- The course 'Deaf Culture and Community' was placed under Objective 6 for the 2013-2014 catalog even though we did not approve it. This error was pointed out but no action was taken. BIOL 1102 was similarly accidentally added to the list but was removed when pointed out. Deaf Culture and Community will be taught this coming year. We will require a new proposal. GERC will reevaluate this course in the year to come. At that time we can evaluate whether it meets the GERC requirements.
- Rotations in GERC will now be managed by Catherine. Here is an initial plan.
 - Five will rotate out in May 2013: Susan, Ben, Erika, Rebecca, Michael
 - Four will rotate out in May 2014: Jerry, Tracy, Julie, ?
 - Four will rotate out in May 2015: Sarah, Cathy, Jenny, Tara
- Faculty Senate report from Jerry:
 - SBOE representative was there, working toward a unified plan for all Idaho universities. She was appealing to the universities for help. She has an unfunded initiative. There are expectations to increase the number of graduates (certificate, diploma, degree, etc.)

by 2020. 'Common Core' and STEM initiatives will impact the skills of incoming students and may affect the placement of incoming freshmen and the courses available to them.

ITEM TWO: Proposed GERC bylaw changes from UCC

- Changes are suggested for the procedure we use to move minutes to the UCC. The chain is now much cleaner. We will approve our own minutes and then forward them to UCC for consideration rather than approval.
 - **Motion** to approve changes to bylaws. All agree to **approve**.

ITEM THREE: Review of Rubric for Objective 8

- Suggestion to include (under credibility) the designation between 'scholarly' and 'popular' sources. Print and digital material should to be mentioned.
- Is 'examine' a stronger word than 'identify'? We can replace it with 'assess' or 'analyze' to make it more active.
- In #2, should we emphasize that the course should build student skills that extend beyond the discipline? Susan will make a change to separate out the two points that are made in this sentence. Fix usage of 'among' and 'between' in sub-bullet. 'Identify' is not a strong enough word and if we can, we should replace it with 'recognize' which implies higher order thinking. In 3, sub-bullet, need to be more explicit.
 - **Motion** to have Susan make the discussed changes. All agree to **approve**.

NEXT MEETING: April 9, Geosciences Conf. Room, 14:30pm

- new goal 7 course proposed by engineering
- Theatre course will be evaluated then as well
- Proposals from grandfathered in courses will pour in on April 2

Meeting adjourned at 15:40.

Bylaws of the GENERAL EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS COMMITTEE

Latest Revision ~~October 20, 2011~~ March 19, 2013

I. NAME

The name of the committee is the General Education Requirements Committee (GERC). The GERC is a subcommittee of the Curriculum Council. The GERC reports directly to Curriculum Council.

II. PURPOSE

The purpose of the GERC is: to consider all courses and policies that relate to the University's general education requirements; to evaluate, on a regular basis, the university's general education courses for appropriateness, rigor, and assessment; and to make general education curricular recommendations based on these evaluations to the Curriculum Council. The General Education Objectives [as proposed in 2011] are to be reviewed on a staged 5 year cycle (meaning that not all of the Objectives need be evaluated at once).

III. MEMBERSHIP, SELECTION AND RECALL

- A. Committee Composition:** The GERC consists of **15** members, **11** voting members and **4** non-voting members.

There are eleven (**11**) voting members:

- two (2) from the College of Arts and Letters [one (1) from Fine Arts and Humanities departments, and one (1) from Social Science departments];
- two (2) from the College of Science and Engineering [one (1) from Engineering, Mathematics, and Physics, and one (1) from Biological Sciences, Chemistry, and Geosciences]
- two (2) from the Division of Health Sciences;
- one (1) from the College of Business;
- one (1) from the College of Education;
- one (1) from the College of Technology;
- one (1) from the University Library, and
- one (1) from ASISU.

There are four (**4**) non-voting members:

- one (1) from Instructional Technology Services,
- one (1) from the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs,
- one (1) from the Office of the Registrar
- one (1) from the Curriculum Council.

B. Election/Appointment Process

Voting faculty members are elected by the faculty of the appropriate division, college, or school. The student member is appointed by the Associated Students of Idaho State University (ASISU). The non-voting members from Registration and the Office of the Provost are appointed by the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. The non-voting member from Information Technology Services is appointed by the Vice President for Finance and Administration. The Non-voting member from the Curriculum Council is elected by the Curriculum Council. Should an elected member resign or be

unable to serve, his or her replacement will be elected by the faculty of the appropriate division or college. Should a non-voting member resign or be unable to serve, his or her replacement will be appointed by the corresponding administrator or the Curriculum Council. Should a student member resign or be unable to serve, a replacement will be appointed by the president and vice-president of ASISU.

C. Terms of Membership

All elected members serve three years. Elected members may serve for no more than two terms consecutively. Additional terms are permissible once the faculty member is off the committee for a minimum of one term. Exceptions can be made in the case of mid-term vacancy (See 3B). The student is appointed for a 1-year term with option for a 1-year reappointment. In the first year, those on the Committee will determine the rotation of elected members, so that the terms of 1/3 of the members expire each year.

D. Attendance and Substitutes

Members are expected to attend all meetings and to inform the Chair of the Committee when they cannot attend. Voting members who cannot attend a meeting may send a substitute with voting proxy from the member's constituency.

IV. OFFICERS AND MEETINGS

A. Selection of Officers

The GERC elects from among its voting members a Chair, a Vice-Chair, and a Secretary. The Chair would preferably have Curriculum Council experience and be tenured. Each officer serves for one year, and may be reelected for a second term. In the event of a mid-term vacancy in any of these offices, the GERC will elect a person to serve the remainder of the unexpired term.

B. Meetings

During Fall and Spring, the GERC meets from 3:00 -5:00 p.m. on the 2nd Tuesday of each month and additionally as needed. The Chair must call a meeting upon the request of at least three (3) of the eleven voting members within two working Tuesdays of the request.

C. Duties of the Officers

The Chair calls meetings, presides over meetings, and provides a report of the GERC's activities to the Curriculum Council. The Vice Chair serves in the absence of the Chair. The Secretary records and distributes minutes of the GERC meetings.

V. MINUTES, QUORUM, AND VOTING

A. Minutes

Minutes are kept for each meeting by the Secretary, and ~~prepared in accordance with the format set by the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. Subsequent to the GERC's approval of the minutes, they are submitted in a timely manner (one working week) to the Curriculum Council for review. The Curriculum Council forwards approved minutes~~

~~to the Deans' Council for Academic Affairs for review.~~ submitted to the University Curriculum Council (UCC) in a timely manner, subsequent to the GERC's approval. UCC will review actionable curricular items and notify the subcommittee of all feedback and decisions. A copy of GERC minutes will be attached to UCC minutes which are forwarded to the Provost.

B. Quorum

A quorum is six (6) of the eleven voting members of the GERC or their proxy holders. A quorum may be established in person or via email in the event of an email vote.

C. Voting

Voting on motions that have been seconded at a regular meeting may be conducted by mail or email unless at least three (3) voting members request that it be done in person. A majority vote is required for passing a motion. In the event of a tie vote, the Chair will vote. All business of the committee shall be governed by *Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised*.*

VI. BYLAWS AMENDMENT PROCESS

Bylaws may be amended by a two-thirds vote of the voting members, provided members have received advance notice (one working week) of the proposed changes. In the case of an email vote, the motion passes only if eight (8) of the eleven voting members vote for it. The Curriculum Council must approve all amendments of the bylaws. The GERC will review its bylaws within three years of the date of its last review.

VII. BUSINESS ITEMS

The GERC receives its business items from the Curriculum Council. Business not completed by the end of Spring semester will be continued in the following Fall.

**Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised*, is the authority in all matters not covered by these Bylaws and/or approved operating procedures. [However, this edition is not available at that link. See Roberts Rules of Order Revised (4th edition) full text online at <http://www.rulesonline.com/>. The Curriculum Council representative from the Office of Academic Affairs is "sure" that office will be able to underwrite the purchase of a current edition.]

Bylaws changes approved by GERC: March 19, 2013

Reviewed and approved by UCC:

Meeting Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee (GERC)

2013-04-09

PRESENT: Susan Swetnam (Chair), Cathy Peppers (Vice-Chair), Ben Crosby (Secretary), Sarah Mead, Jerry Lyons, Tracy Payne, Rebecca Braden, Catherine Read, Tara Johnson, and Erika Kuhlman;

ABSENT: Jenny Semenza, Julie Melton (in Meridian), Michael Spall. An ASISU representative has been requested. Curriculum Council and a Provost Representative are always invited.

The meeting convened at 14:35 with a quorum present.

ITEM ONE: Initial Discussion

- SBOE: General Education Objectives are being considered and may affect our current scheme.
- We need to discuss the concerns regarding the Communications rubric, but we need to address the proposals in hand first.

ITEM TWO: Previous Minutes

- Changes made to extra words in Item 2, bullet 5. Names fixed in rotation schedule.
- **Motion** to approve both previous meeting's minutes. All agree to **approve**.

ITEM THREE: Consideration of proposals from legacy GenEd courses

- Music 1100, Fine Arts Objective (4), Introduction to Music
 - Technical, historical and analytical portions are well explained.
 - Motion to accept as is. All agree to **approve**.
- Music 1106, Fine Arts Objective (4), American Music
 - How specific can courses be and still fit general education?
 - This one has breadth both in terms of history and style.
 - Motion to accept as is. All agree to **approve**.
- Music 1108, Fine Arts Objective (4), The World of Music
 - Motion to accept as is. All agree to **approve**.
- (Though Jazz History was resubmitted, we have already approved this proposal)
- Dance 1105, Fine Arts Objective (4), Survey of Dance
 - Appreciated the quality of the proposal and the depth of the course.
 - Suggestion: this should be considered as a model proposal
 - Motion to have this as a model. All agree to **approve**.
 - Motion to accept as is. All agree to **approve**.
- Art 1100, Fine Arts Objective (4), Survey of Art
 - Good analytical framework. Consistently a good course.
 - Motion to accept as is. All agree to **approve**.
- Art 1101, Fine Arts Objective (4), History of Western Art I
 - Comparison and contrast essays are appreciated.
 - Motion to accept as is. All agree to **approve**.
- Art 1102, Fine Arts Objective (4), History of Western Art II

- Motion to accept as is. All agree to **approve**.
- Theatre 1101, Fine Arts Objective (4), Appreciation of Drama.
 - Motion to accept, seconded. Discussion.
 - Discussion and experience with a specific technique.
 - Concerns over online course
 - Motion to accept as is. All agree to **approve**.
- History MC/Art 2210, Fine Arts Objective (4), History and Appreciation of Photography
 - Move to accept, seconded. Discussion
 - Foundational theories are not well addressed in proposal (done in student reports?)
 - We don't have enough specifics to be confident that the course will continue to satisfy the bulleted requirements of the objective.
 - Motion to remand and ask for clarification. Seconded. All **approve**.
- POLS 1101, Behavioral and Social Science (6), Intro to American Govt.
 - Motion to accept, seconded
 - Concern over catalog description and whether it is consistent with the current version.
 - Exemplary following of rubric points
 - Motion to accept as is. All agree to **approve**.
 - Motion to designate this as an exemplary course for Objective 6. All **approve**.

ITEM FOUR: Consideration of non-extant courses

- Theatre 1118, Oral Interpretation of Literature
 - Move that we consider, seconded
 - Move to approve, seconded. Discussion
 - Course description is good but is not the same as what is in the current catalog.
 - Concerns over grammar and abbreviation.
 - Discussion of whether this meets our critical thinking rubric.
 - Glad to see that students have to justify decisions as made.
 - Motion to approve. One abstention and **all others approve**.
- Mechanical Engineering 1165, Structured Programming
 - Motion to discuss, seconded
 - Course is only 2 credits and thus cannot meet the Objective requirements.
 - There are also concerns regarding whether the course includes discussion of ambiguous subjects that do not have definitive answers. (as required for critical thinking)
 - More specifics are needed regarding course assignments and tasks. Provide more examples.
 - Motion to reject. All **approve**.

NEXT MEETING: April 23, Geosciences Conf. Room, 14:30pm

-honors courses

-communication rubric discussion

-Women's studies, transfer issues? To be assessed under Objective 9?

Meeting adjourned at 15:40.

Meeting Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee (GERC)

2013-04-23

PRESENT: Susan Swetnam (Chair), Cathy Peppers (Vice-Chair), Ben Crosby (Secretary), Sarah Mead, Jenny Semenza, Jerry Lyons, Tracy Payne, Catherine Read, Tara Johnson, Julie Melton (in Meridian), David Blakeman (UCC Chair), Mary Hofle (MechE.), and Erika Kuhlman;

ABSENT: Rebecca Braden, Michael Spall. An ASISU representative has been requested. Representation from Curriculum Council and the Provost's office are always invited.

The meeting convened at 14:35 with a quorum present.

ITEM ONE: Previous Minutes

- One correction in the attendance was pointed out: Jenny Semenza was absent that day. Minutes were approved as corrected.

ITEM TWO: Initial Discussion and Announcements

- We will have a picnic sometime in mid-May. Fun.
- Mary Hofle (ME-1165) is visiting to field questions regarding her proposal and provide clarification.
 - Extra documentation was provided including course details: position in Engineering curriculum, enrollment, etc.
 - Are students formulating problems independently or just translating a word problem to code? An example from senior design: need to move soil from A to B and then spread out the material. There are embedded glitches that complicate the solution. There is no one correct answer. (is this an example from the course under consideration?) The ambiguity of the solutions to problems increases through the semester as the students become more competent.
 - The critical thinking criteria as outlined in the rubric fit the engineering definition.

ITEM THREE: Grandfathered Courses

- Honors 1101: (Objective 1, Written language)
 - Previous incarnations provided credit for writing and literature and fine arts. Will the current courses still satisfy the different objectives? No.
 - Concerns are: why not satisfying the Humanities objective instead of written language? It is not clear that the writing is the emphasis. Reading and interpretation is emphasized but writing is not at the foreground of the course.
 - Suggestion to remand for improved description of the writing process and better adherence to the rubric. We need to be clear regarding our need for specifics. Vague descriptions of honors courses will not do.
 - Move to Remand. Seconded. All approve.
- Honors 1102: (Objective 4, Humanities)
 - Confusing formatting of proposal. It is written like a syllabus. It does not follow the rubric or the proposal format.

- Move to Remand. Seconded. All approve.

ITEM FOUR: Modification of the Objective 2 Rubric

- Revised rubric is focused more on peer review and uses updated professional standards.
- Some questions regarding the clarification of language, but these were not major
- Motion to approve, all approve with one abstention.

ITEM FIVE: Corrections to the GERC Bylaws

- We recognized that the document needs consistent naming of the UCC.
- In the beginning of the document we will define the name as the Undergraduate Curriculum Council and use the abbreviation UCC throughout.
- Motion to approve the bylaws given the suggested changes. All approve.

ITEM SIX: New Courses

- EDUC 1110, Education in U.S.
 - New course needs to go through UCC. Better to start as an 1199, experimental course. Other issues need to be resolved before our consideration.
 - Proposal removed from our consideration for now.

ITEM SEVEN: Concerns regarding Art courses and which Objective they belong in

- Humanities and Fine Arts are now in the same Objective, which makes categorization more complicated. NEA: *Arts* is focused on technique, *Humanities* is focused on the study and analysis of existing works. This would mean that most Arts courses fall under Humanities, not Arts. This means that we are potentially incorrectly grouping courses by discipline (which department it falls under) rather than approach (practices vs. study of existing works)
- Is it possible to just change the headings of the three categories? (Arts, Humanities, Letters)
- This is a big issue and something to be addressed next year.
- Motion to have Susan write a letter explaining the complications of moving the course between categories and the implications for other courses. We will not make changes at present. All approve.

ITEM EIGHT: Are 2 credit courses sufficient to satisfy objectives?

- According to Laura Woodworth-Ney, yes, 2 credit courses are sufficient, given COMM as an example.
- There appears to be an erosion of requirements to satisfy the needs of transfer students.
- If a course is too brief, we may argue that it is not rigorous enough to satisfy the rubrics for the objective.
- This is an issue that we will have to address next year. No decision made.

NEXT MEETING: April 30, Geosciences Conf. Room, 14:30pm

-CLEP, MechE 1165 proposal, Women's Studies, Petitions, Election of interim chair.

Meeting adjourned at 15:40.

Meeting Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee (GERC)

2013-04-30

PRESENT: Susan Swetnam (Chair), Cathy Peppers (Vice-Chair), Sarah Mead, Rebecca Branden, Jenny Semenza, Jerry Lyons, Jim Wolper (for Tracy Payne), Catherine Read, Tara Johnson, Greg Nelson (UCC Vice Chair), and Erika Kuhlman

EXCUSED: Ben Crosby (Secretary), Julie Melton (in Meridian)

ABSENT: Michael Spall. An ASISU representative has been requested. Representation from Curriculum Council and the Provost's office are always invited.

The meeting convened at 14:35 with a quorum present.

ITEM ONE: Previous Minutes

- Approved with no comments.

ITEM TWO: Initial Discussion and Announcements

- GERC picnic Thursday, May 9 at 5:30 p.m. in Susan's yard. Please RSVP so she will know how much food to provide, bring beer or wine if you so choose.
- Susan sent letters to the authors of the proposals considered last meeting to inform them of the committee's concerns and decisions.
- Peter Vik will make sure his successor submits revised proposals for HONS 1101 and HONS 1102 in the fall.
- Susan announced the Provost's Office had changed the Gen Ed Requirements Course List to delete the number of credits required for each Objective, leaving it as a simple total of 36 Gen Ed credits needed for graduation. This leaves open the possibility of an Objective being fulfilled by a one-credit course. The ramifications of this change and questions of rigor should be investigated by GERC again in the fall.

ITEM THREE: Grandfathered Course

- ME 1165: (Objective 7) resubmitted proposal
 - The original concern about this course having too few credits was made moot by the Provost's decision mentioned above.
 - The question whether this course meets the Critical Thinking criteria remains a concern. The coursework described by the proposal appears to be straightforward introductory computer programming problems where the students work with given assumptions and follow the instructions which tell them exactly what to do to solve the problem. Class time is spent analyzing various solutions and discussing the merits of each; however in each case there is one solution that is clearly the most efficient and best answer.
 - Could be improved by including problems that require calculating and comparing different models to see which model fit the data better.
 - Susan asked about consistency, since this course is similar to CS 1181 which was approved, should this one be approved too? Not necessarily.
 - This course appears to be a good course for teaching the basics that students need to know to continue on and there is some progressive building on acquired skills, but the

course doesn't seem to take the acquired skills to the level of critical thinking that would translate across disciplines. This proposal might fit under a different objective.

- Move to Deny. Seconded. All voted to deny.

ITEM FOUR: C.L.E.P. Exam and Credits for Objectives 4 and 9

- Under current policy in the 2013-14 catalog, students partially fulfill Objective 4 by earning 8 CLEP credits plus taking a "LANG" 2201, or 16 CLEP credits plus "LANG" 3301. Since one semester of a first year language course satisfies Objective 4 and one semester of a second year language course satisfies Objective 9, the question has arisen whether to allow 16 CLEP credits plus "LANG" 3301 to partially satisfy Objective 4 (Humanities/Foreign Language) and fully satisfy Objective 9 (Cultural Diversity).
- The CLEP exam does not test oral and written language skills, nor does it address any cultural aspects of language study as the upper division language courses do.
- Greg clarified with Sarah that CLEP exam credits are posted on a student's transcripts as fulfilling required courses and prerequisites.
- A student may CLEP out of part of Objective 4; it is Objective 9 that is the problem.
- GERC can say that "credit by CLEP examination does not fulfill credit for Objective 9" on the basis that the CLEP exam does not require discussion of culture.
- Moved, seconded, and approved to send to UCC the following recommendation:
 - Students may gain credit by CLEP examination for up to four credits to fulfill the Foreign Language component of Objective 4 (Humanities, Fine Arts, Foreign Languages) of ISU's General Education Requirements. Students may NOT use CLEP examinations in Foreign Languages to fulfill Objective 9 (Cultural Diversity).

ITEM FIVE: Placement of Women's Studies course

- WS 2201 course was approved by GERC as an Objective 9 Cultural Diversity course, but at an upper level of approval it was put under Objective 6 Social Sciences instead. The Administration's rationale for the change was that in other universities Women's Studies is a social studies course so there is a credit transfer concern.
- The interim solution for 2013-14 was to put the course under both Objective 6 and Objective 9, with a note that it can be used to satisfy one objective or the other, not both.
- GERC has been at pains to ensure no course is listed under multiple objectives to prevent potential double-dipping.
- Erika said that the instructor of the course is not a social scientist and the course was geared toward culture and diversity, so it shouldn't be under Objective 6.
- Bring this up again next year; it needs to be resolved but GERC cannot do anything about it for this coming year.

ITEM SIX: Who is in charge of approving petitions?

- Susan said petitions have never come through GERC, they are signed off by the student's advisor and then they go to the department offering the course for evaluation by a faculty member who has expertise in the course, including examining the syllabi. After that, petitions go to the college dean for approval.
- If GERC were to take on the task of approving petitions, it would be very labor intensive.
- Discussion about the origin of this question; it arose from a petition by a student in the College of Technology.
- No action was taken.

ITEM SEVEN: Elect Interim Chair to conduct GERC business over summer.

- Catherine needs a contact person designated by the committee to consult with her over the summer regarding GERC business, questions, and incoming proposals. This person would call the first meeting in fall and coordinate the agenda with Catherine.
- Chris Hunt from the Registrar's office intends to form a small committee soon to work over the summer on a new online catalog and curriculum proposal submission process that will affect UCC and probably GERC. Someone from GERC should, at a minimum, be kept informed of the proposed changes, or perhaps sit on the committee.
- Jenny nominated Cathy Peppers who accepted the nomination. Seconded. Elected by unanimous vote.

In the next few days Susan will send a reminder letter to the Communication Sciences and Disorders requesting a new proposal be submitted for the CSED 1181 course. She will also send a letter to all departments reminding them to submit proposals for their "grandfathered" Gen Ed courses between now and the September 10, 2013 deadline. Submissions this spring and summer are encouraged.

HOPPER TOPICS:

- Revisit Objective 7 Rubric – doesn't fit THEA 1118 proposal well
- Require new proposal for CSED 2256 Deaf Culture and Community course if department wants to continue teaching it beyond 2013-14 academic year.
- Discuss designation of courses and Categories within Objective 4 – Arts, Humanities vs. Arts, Letters
- Credit Hours within Objectives (e.g. ME 1165, 2 credits).

NEXT MEETING: to be announced in Fall 2013

Meeting adjourned at 15:45.