

General Education & Diversity Committee
October 16, 2009
Submeet & Confer Notes

Present: Steven Gilbert, Rachelle Toupenca, Hahn-Huy Phan, Patrician Hoffman, Brian Martensen, Gina Wenger, Buddhadev Roychoudhury, Kimberly Contag

The meeting began at 8:05 am.

CETL Gold Workshops: Rachelle met with Stewart Ross (CETL), who supports running the workshops. She also has been in contact with Julie Carlsen. Julie's proposal for the workshop was distributed. This workshop would focus on the use of experiential and reflective components in courses. It would not focus on how to meet the Gold rubric. The committee felt this was more valuable to instructors and could be run during one or two morning sessions. An afternoon session by some committee members and/or Julie Kerr-Berry on how to tailor specific courses to meet the rubric could then be held. People could choose morning, afternoon or both.

Some issues arose with running the workshop during December on a non-duty day as the Valley Writing Workshop is done. The stipend would be about \$200, but would limit the number of participants to perhaps 15. Also, overlapping the Valley Writing Workshop could cause some faculty to choose. Instead, it was suggested to offer as part of Professional Development Day. We will contact Leslie Peterson in the Library since she is running that event. We would also like to send an all faculty email to announce the event soon. The general structure would then be that Carlsen would run 2 sessions in the morning and a Gold rubric session would run in the afternoon. The afternoon session could be run by Julie Kerr-Berry and/or Maria Bevacqua. Rachelle will contact them. We should get the registration for the workshops up on CDS before the email is sent out so that people could register immediately. We will need to think about what kind of space (room with computers?) we will need.

Discussion of CSET Curriculum Memo: A memo from the CSET Curriculum committee had previously been distributed. The memo calls for an open discussion regarding Gen. Ed.'s role in the conversion to the 120-credit cap. The memo itself does not ask for a reduction or a specific action, but rather a discussion. The issue here seems to be faculty governance and a general feeling that Gen. Ed. reduction was taken off the table before adequate faculty input had been allowed.

It was noted that the part of Gen. Ed. that is the Minnesota Transfer Curriculum really can't be changed and some discussion took place regarding which categories would be under discussion for cuts. It seems that the suggestion may not be to cut categories, but rather to allow more double counting. That is, the current policy is that if all categories are met in under 44 credits, students must continue to take courses up to 44 credits. One suggestion is that the categories remain, but this total count could be lower. Ron Nickerson seemed to suggest some programs could apply for an exemption and have a lower count. Some concern was raised regarding how this application

process would occur and who would decide on exemptions. Another option is that the Gen. Ed. count is a minimum and departments are allowed to increase that count. As such, lowering the credit total system wide and allowing individual programs to increase it would (a) give governance to departments, (b) eliminate the need for a governing body to judge exemptions and (c) be less complicated.

It was noted that we are giving power to credits as opposed to content of the courses. A large purpose of Gen. Ed. is to see the interrelatedness of the categories. In that sense, double counting should be encouraged. It was suggested that we gather more information on the request and also look at sister MNSCU schools regarding their policies. Some information was sent out along these lines by the CSET Curriculum Committee and Brian will forward to the committee.

As a side note, there seems to be some redundancy in some requirements. This probably can't be cleaned up until the next time Gen. Ed. is revised as a whole.

Assessment discussion at Meet & Confer: The assessment revision memo was discussed at yesterday's Meet & Confer. Some concern was expressed that many pieces that should be done in the process are not being done, especially with regards to reporting and implementing the results/recommendations. Such issues could eventually cause problems with accreditation.

The meeting adjourned at 8:56 am.

Respectively submitted by
Brian F. Martensen