

General Education & Diversity Committee

November 20, 2009

Submeet & Confer Notes

Present: Steven Gilbert, Rachelle Toupence, Patrician Hoffman, Brian Martensen, Gina Wenger, Buddhadev Roychoudhury, Kimberly Contag, Marcius Brock

Visiting: Heather Camp

The meeting began at 8:05 am.

Course Proposal Revision Issue: For proposal #276, the CDS did not display the revised version, but rather the old version. The revision was distributed by email and the committee agreed to accept the course proposal.

Student Learning Outcomes: Steve distributed a document from the Assessment & Evaluation Submeet proposing to define the relevant terms for student learning outcomes for the campus as a whole. That committee is asking for input. We may look at these suggestions as a committee in an upcoming meeting.

CETL Workshop: No announcement for the workshop has gone out yet, but it will go out when professional development day activities are sent out. We may want to advertise separately. Our role in the sessions is not to help create courses but rather to illustrate how to meet the standards of the Gold rubric. It was suggested that we create a few sample proposals and ask members of the workshop to discuss whether each meets the requirements. The committee will devote its last meeting of the year to this issue.

Category 1A Competency Revision: Heather Camp outlined for the administration the English Department's desire to revise the competencies in 1A, which she had presented to us at last week's meeting. A pilot program will be run next Fall and a final proposal for the revisions would then be submitted. The relevant issue is one of procedure. This committee would be the place to send a proposal for revision and it would then be vetted through the submeet, FA Executive Committee and then through their Meet & Confer. There appears to be some autonomy for our University to set its own competencies and in determining if we meet MNSCU's transfer curriculum competencies. At their level, Category 1 has a single set of competencies, many of which are met by our 1B. (It was later pointed out by email that 1A would still probably need to address 51% of those competencies.) It was suggested that Heather check with UCAP and relay this conversation to them and ask for any recommendations. Finally, one should be aware of deadlines to make catalog copy. If UCAP needs to approve, then a proposal would have to get to them by November 2010 to be included in the 2011-2012 Catalog. If they do not, then the deadline is early spring (around March) 2011.

New Member: Jose Javier Lopez of Geography has joined the committee as the SBS representative. Introductions were made. We welcome his participation and will send him minutes of past meetings to get him up to speed.

Assessment Revision: Jackie Lewis and Mike Miller have not been able to meet with us, but we will try again for the spring semester. The suggestion seems to be for us to make a proposal and send to Assessment and Evaluation. Gina will follow up with them and emphasize the suggestions of last year's memo. There seems to be some confusion around campus over what

was actually being emphasized in that memo. The two options were to fold into program review or become part of the VSA (Voluntary Student Assessment) program. The intent was not to suggest that the latter was the preferred option. One issue with program review is that individual departments will assess their courses, but the category as a whole may not get assessed. Each course is not required to meet each competency, but as a collective the courses must address every competency.

It was suggested that everyone read the Category 5 report from last year as it makes many suggestions that illustrate the problems with the current system. The issues are essentially:

- 1) Faculty involvement is difficult to achieve, yet faculty desire autonomy in assessment of their departments.
- 2) Where does the handling of the assessment process belong? This committee has interest in the reports, but not necessarily the means to administrate the reporting system. Last year's memo was meant to illustrate that the current process is not functioning as it should be, but was not motivated by the desire to push the process elsewhere.
- 3) What is the process to change the assessment process?

Class Scheduler: A web-based utility (www.mnsu.edu/schedule/) has rolled out (in beta version) that helps student schedule their classes and then registers them for those classes. The system helps with overlapping courses as well as filling major, gen. ed. and other requirements. Right now the system can find Gen. Ed. courses for students, but in the future may be able to find courses for specific categories (including diverse cultures) to help students make sure to meet the requirements.

General Education Guidelines Language Issues: The current language in the guidelines of the bulletin is a bit confusing and some language in the Purple requirement should perhaps be changed to make proposals easier to evaluate. In the spring, we will look at these issues.

Blanket Substitutions: A recent appeal pointed out that a course in the 2008 catalog should have had a lab component attached. A blanket substitution will have to be done. Brian will contact the department, make sure that we understand the issue correctly, and submit the substitution to the registrar.

The meeting adjourned at 8:58 am.

Respectively submitted by
Brian F. Martensen