

Council of General Education
Minutes for April 30, 2009

Attending: John Miller, David Casagrande, Sofura Boukari, David Haugen, Steve Bennet, Kathleen O'Donnell Brown, Phyllis Rippey, Amy Brock, John Hemingway, Doug Huff, Judy Dallinger (ex-officio), James Schmidt (ex officio)

Meeting called to order at : 3:30

Minutes: Approved

Phyllis: Discussion of assessment reports. I am assuming that will submit an assessment report that will contain the writing report. In the larger assessment report, I was trying to capture our thoughts and that we thought the assessment protocol worked. I will also include Judy Dallinger's Excel spread sheet. On second thought—should we include the writing report? They are two different sorts of assessment. On the other hand this will show anyone who is assessing the General Ed program that we are assessing writing. Even so, I don't want to confuse the two kinds of assessment or make it seem that we are confusing them.

David Casagrande: Discusses the writing report: The response rate was higher with the shorter survey. Both reports found similar results as to how much writing is going on.

Phyllis: The writing committee report has some specific recommendations that we need to endorse or not. Does anyone else have any comments they want to add?

Kathleen: Please turn “professor” to “instructor.”

Phyllis: That change is fine—as long as professors don't mind being called instructors.

David Casagrande: Jim Schmidt recommended that we ought to give the survey every third semester.

Phyllis: Can we have a motion to that effect?

John Hemingway: Moves:

David Haugen: Seconds

Motion passes unanimously.

Phyllis: What is disturbing about this report is how many of the smaller classes aren't doing writing.

David Casagrande: We said we weren't going into policing. That leaves educating the faculty.

Phyllis: We send a TeleStars message to the faculty twice a year to remind. Perhaps we should vote on this and make it a formal requirement to send these messages?

Sean Cordes: Moves.

David Haugen: Seconds.

Bill: Is this a bylaws change?

Phyllis: No. Rather, it is a policy that fulfills the committee's charge.

David Casagrande: makes a suggestion

Motion: In furtherance of these efforts a Telestars message regarding the Gen Ed writing requirement will be sent by the chair every semester.

Motion passes unanimously.

John Hemingway: Makes format change suggestions for the report to use bullet points to break out recommendations.

Phyllis: The council wishes to bring to the attention to Associate Provost that FYE classes need to be especially reminded of the writing requirement.

Phyllis: Now, lets look at the Gen Request Form that Judy Edited.

Judy Dallinger: We added the reminder about only 100 and 200 level courses being considered for Gen Ed. We also added new language about assessment.

David Casagrande: Why do we ask twice about multiculturalism as a goal? That seems redundant.

David Haugen: The CCPI course form has that—so that's why we have it.

David Haugen: But, as it is our form, we *can* amend it.

Phyllis: I believe we added “F” (multicultural issues) so that wouldn't get lost. On the other hand, I thought every Gen Ed class was supposed to be addressing multicultural issues. So, if we remove “F” that might make people think that only multicultural studies classes were to address those issues.

David Casagrande: Reads from GERC report language saying that multicultural issues are to be addressed across the curriculum. (page 7).

John Miller: maybe add language to “F” in support of *multicultural pedagogy*.

Phyllis: That would be okay.

Sean: We should reference the language in the GERC report that explains the reason for “F.”

Phyllis: Okay. We will put a hyperlink in the form to that language.

Discussion of the phrase “where relevant” in “F” leads to a discussion of how multiculturalism plays across the curriculum. Math department used as an example of where this is difficult. Bill points out that some Math professors have made an effort to show how different cultures have contributed to math.

Phyllis: Multiculturalism is meant to be an integral part of the General Education curriculum. That is an ingredient of this curriculum that was discussed and voted on. We are not debating whether we care about multiculturalism, but whether we should place this expectation on the request form and how.

David Casagrande: No one has made a motion to amend “where relevant” so we can leave it in.

Sean: If we made this an online form, we could force people to fill out this part of the form.

Phyllis: So do we want to add “or pedagogy” after “perspectives” to the language in “F” and adding a hyperlink to the GERC report.

Sofura: Maybe what people need is simply to take a fresh look at what they are teaching.

John Hemingway: I will second the motion (made by John Miller) to add “or pedagogy” to “F.”

John Miller: Adding pedagogy permits the consideration of pedagogical issues that GERC had of what a Gen Ed course is supposed to do.

David Casagrande: “Or” permits people the choice of using “pedagogy” or not.

Phyllis: Those in favor of the language as amended?”

Motion passes with one abstention.

Phyllis: We will also add a hyperlink to the GERC report. I also think we should vote on the form as a whole. Can someone make such a motion?

David Haugen: Moves

David Casagrande: Seconds

Motion passes unanimously.

Judy Dallinger: Discusses changes to assessment protocol.

Phyllis: How assessment data flows: Departments send their Gen Ed assessment data to the Provost's office. The Provost's office shares that data with Gen Ed Council. The Gen Ed Council sends aggregated data to Senate. Moreover, the Provost's Office may pass the aggregated data to the Deans. This way everyone gets the same data.

David Haugen: We need to get the Senate's approval if we are changing this. They approved the original document.

Phyllis: David, do you want to say this should go to the Senate for a vote?

David: I don't know what the protocol is.

Phyllis: I think we have the power to amend this document. But perhaps you are right. But, do you want to make a motion to ask for permission?

David: I will make that motion.

Bill: Seconds it.

Phyllis: Rehearses the legislative history of assessment plan.

Amy Brock: How often will the GERC report go up for amendment.

Phyllis: Never again.

Sean: I don't know that committees need to report / ask for permission every time they change their method of gathering data. My recommendation is to say nothing to the senate or simply inform that it has been amended and then the Senate can request more information.

John Miller: If the Senate doesn't like the way we do assessment, they can tell us.

David Haugen: Is the GERC report the controlling document?

Phyllis: That is the question. Uses judicial analogy of certiorari.

John Hemingway: We could say that we decided revisions to the process of assessment were needed. If the Senate wants to challenge us on that, so be it.

Phyllis: David's point is that we don't have the right to make a substantial change to the plan of assessment.

Sofura: If we insert amended, we could keep the document as it is—with our changes.

Phyllis: David, we could tell the Senate in our report that we could make a statement that we have amended or revised the plan of assessment. We would draw their attention to it and if they had questions, they could raise them at the senate.

David: I accept that as a friendly amendment.

Motion passes unanimously.

Phyllis: We are before faculty senate with the Fine Arts / Humanities requirement. We also have a final meeting in May. Be thinking of officers for next year for this committee.

Bill