

# General Education Council

October 9, 2008

Meeting began promptly at 3:30

Attending: Phyllis Rippey, Steve Bennet, John Miller, Douglas Huff, Dennis DeVolder (guest), Jim Schmidt (ex officio), Ron Williams (guest), Judi Dallinger (ex officio), Sean Cordes, David Haugen, Larry Ball (guest), Sofura Boukari, David Casagrande, John Hemingway

Phyllis: Approval of the Minutes

Phyllis: Introduces Dennis DeVolder.

Dennis DeVolder: I am asking every council and committee to review their policies and procedures document. Faculty Senate has a document for CGE dated January 23 of 1997. Does it need to be revised? It is not Dennis DeVolder's impression that the GERC document contains any revisions of CGE policy.

Dennis: Discussion of phasing in the Foreign Language / Global Issues requirement,

Phyllis: CGE needs to develop a form or process which will allow consideration of new Gen Ed courses that also intend to identify themselves also as Global Issues .

Dennis: The Council on International Education will determine which classes are going to be Gen Ed/

Phyllis: I will meet with CIE to determine if sequencing between CGE and CIE needs to occur.

Phyllis. I am reordering the schedule to discuss Approval of the College of Business' BAT 279

Larry Ball: We'd like to encourage more students to study abroad. This class is meant to encourage freshmen and sophomores to get acquainted with foreign studies with the hope that they will go for a semester as a junior or senior.

Phyllis: This class is an experiment. We would only be approving it for Gen Ed for Spring 2009.

John Miller: "How does this course address the "relative power among peoples" language in the multicultural justification?"

Larry Ball: That's a very good question. That is something we could look at.

John Miller: I would encourage you to speak explicitly to this issue when you submit the proposal to Faculty Senate.

Phyllis: Any objections? None. Course approved.

Phyllis: Reordering the agenda so that Ron Williams may speak to the Illinois Articulation Agreement vis

a vis transfer students, the state IAI, and WIU Gen Ed. The senate would like a clearer message from us as to why we did not endorse the IAI's transfer rules.

Ron Williams: We would like WIU to be a bit more competitive and transfer friendly.

David Haugen: Are we the only university that does not accept the IAI Gen Ed as the entirety of the Gen Ed.

Ron Williams: No. Eastern, Northern, Springfield, and Edwardsville.

John Miller: Do we really know that we are losing students over six hours?

Ron Williams: No. It's anecdotal.

John Miller: Are these thirty transferrable hours or remedial hours?

Ron Williams: Only transferrable hours.

Phyllis Rippey: What is the chance that we could get some data on the nature of this problem?

For some students the six hours might make a real difference. But students transferring into Arts and Sciences shouldn't have that problem.

John Miller: This creates, or could create, a double standard for students. Some students will follow the IAI Gen Ed and others will have to follow WIU.

Sean Cordes: Discusses the community college option.

Phyllis Rippey: Explains the "thirty hour rule."

John Miller, "We are only talking about six hours. It's not an undue burden. If we don't waive residency requirements, for example, why do we waive the Gen Ed?"

Phyllis Rippey: This is the Provost's decision to make. We're not enthusiastic about this change.

Sean Cordes: Is there any data?

Judi Dallinger: Not specifically.,

Phyllis Rippey: What if we look at the number of people who come in with thirty hours and only need the seven hours?

Sean Cordes: Are we the only school that requires more hours than the IAI?

Phyllis Rippey: There are differences.

John Miller: Let's move the question;

Bill Thompson Seconds

Phyllis. 7 opposed. 2 Abstentions

Phyllis: We oppose the change because we want to remain in charge of our curriculum AND we don't find seven hours to be an undue burden to transfer students.

Phyllis: Let's return to the Agenda, specifically to consideration of AAS materials.'

John Miller: Let's consider them together. They all have the same problem. They don't say how they are going to measure anything.

Phyllis: You need to articulate how you are measuring what you are measuring.

Sofura: We can change that.

Sofura: We have courses that can fall into two areas. Evaluation processes will differ by teachers. I will be glad to insert examples.

Jim: Also, the learning outcomes are not learning outcomes, but only restatements of the goals. A learning outcome is something a student might do or achieve that allows us to see whether a student has met a goal.

Phyllis: Provides an example of a learning outcome.

Phyllis: Perhaps the University's Assessment Taskforce could work with AAS to articulate learning outcomes, etc.

Judi says that working with the task force is doable.

Phyllis: Judi has the task force been meeting with departments?

Judi Dallinger: Yes. Lori Baker-Sperry, Aimee Shouse, and I met with Art and Theater and may soon be meeting with Math. We have every hope that Art and Theater will be able to gather usable data.

Phyllis: Asks for Writing Committee Report:

David Casagrande: I actually do think we have a pretty good idea of how much and what kind of writing is going on out there. We had poor response from Math and Foreign Language. We're not sure why. I spoke with Terri North. She e-mailed back. She did three follow ups on the survey and doubted that any one else would respond. But, what about a follow-up surveys this fall?

Phyllis: We could do that. A majority of the council was comfortable with the survey. We need to continue to find out what is going on with writing and Gen Ed.

David Casagrande: Make the survey shorter and less cumbersome. Also, we discovered that some departments don't require faculty to file syllabi. So that will make getting data in that way difficult.

Phyllis: Gives history in re: Goldfarb, W requirement, etc. Have we undermined writing across the curriculum by getting rid of the W? It is also the case that Gen Ed courses are expected to include writing.

David Haugen: I think the problem is that people simply did not know that they were supposed to provide feedback with revision.

Phyllis: That's why we sent the information about Gen Ed and Writing to faculty last January and this past August.

John Miller: Is it that faculty feel that revision will drive grade inflation?

Phyllis: As far as this council is concerned: are we trying to find out what writing is going on? Are we trying to cultivate writing? It's my view that we are not in a place where we can make a rational argument about whether to change the writing requirement.

David Haugen: We need to submit a report about the state of writing. What else are we to do?

Sean Cordes: We could ask each departments—in their assessments—to discuss what kinds of writing they are doing in gen ed.

Phyllis: That's a good idea.

Bill: Mentions doing a survey during the All Faculty Meeting next August

Phyllis: Good idea. But, let's return to what we can do right now. Can the writing subcommittee bring back a survey? Also, we will use the assessments to give us more information. We'd like to approve the survey at the next meeting.

David: Let's do the survey sooner rather than later.

Phyllis: I don't know any new requests coming at us.

Jim Schmidt: A few are coming but not right away.

Phyllis: Let's say we will meet in two weeks and discuss the survey. We will also review policies and procedures.

Meeting adjourned: 4:56 pm