MINUTES

General Education Council, 3:30 PM November 1, 2016, ELL 205


II. Dr. Ward motioned, seconded by Dr. Ramsey, to approve the November 1, 2016 minutes. Two typos were noted and corrected, and the motion passed unanimously.

III. Old Business

a. Dr. Drzyzga asked if people had discussed the PASSHE Board of Governors’ approved changes with their departments. No major discussions were noted.

b. Report from UCC representative, Dr. Moll, said no formal course proposals were discussed at the meeting, but they did create an ad hoc committee to review the upcoming GEC revised program.

c. Report from standing committees:

i. Dr. Girard discussed the Assessment committee’s work to create a common rubric that would be used across courses for more meaningful data results. The draft was sent to the program committee to help design a better system. They will be meeting next week and will review the math assessment.

ii. Dr. Meyer reported that the Budget committee met on Nov 17th and reviewed a proposal from Dr. Godshalk, Harrow and Greenberg for $1397. The committee motioned to support the proposal. Dr. Godshalk attended and he thanked the committee for their expeditious work and stated that a similar, previous field trip was highly enriching to the students. The motion passed unanimously.

iii. Dr. Cella reported that the Entry Year Experience committee met and made a motion for GEC to consider their EYE document. Until specific courses are identified in the new GEC program, it is difficult to specify specific courses. A few different dated versions of the document had been distributed which caused some confusion, and then a discussion arose as to the courses and the need for cohorts. Most agree that EYE needs to develop a set of skills not just individual courses. Many such as Dr. Stokely, Dr. Burg, and Dr. Johnson reiterated the need to reinforce learning from course materials to extend to skills that are gained from links to extracurricular activities, library services, and food services, which in an ideal world would be great, but may not be achievable right now on this campus. The committee was asked to meet to discuss cohorts, learning objectives, and the library dimension, and to bring their discussion back to the January/February meeting. Dr. Greenberg motioned, seconded by Dr. Shirk, to table the motion made by the committee and have them report back at next meeting. All were in favor and the motion passed unanimously.

iv. Dr. Bergsten reported that the Program committee had met and reviewed several course proposals.

1. The English department put forth an English 190 proposal sponsored by Dr. Janifer. The committee supports the proposal and motioned to have the course count in category B1.
Some discussion arose as to the amount of reading expected in a 100-level course and if at some point a higher level 290 or 390 should be considered. Dr. Janifer stated that the course emphasis is on longer works of literature but the total amount of reading is analogous to other courses at the same level. All were in favor and the motion passed unanimously.

2. The program committee motioned to support an existing Spanish course that is currently face-to-face be offered as a summer or winter online course. This was already approved by UCC and thus the motion was mute.

3. The program committee motioned to support a new Spanish 15x: Latino Literature be offered as a category B1 literature course. All were in favor and the motion passed unanimously.

4. The program committee motioned to support a new Spanish 150x: Latino Pop Culture be considered a category B2 course. All were in favor and the motion passed unanimously.

5. The program committee motioned to support a special section of a computer science course 1xx: Intro to Computer and Metacognition be considered for category A. The course will be taught as a new number and dedicated to students who express computer science interest but have not declared a specific computer science major. All were in favor and it passed unanimously.

6. The program committee introduced their draft proposal for a revised program. The goal is to reduce the overall size of program, be in compliance, align with assessment, be cross-disciplinary, and more flexible. The draft attempts to set a set of consistent goals and objectives, with tags that are correlate to goals, and each tag aligned to a specific rubric and learning outcome. Please distribute these drafts to the faculty. Everyone must be aware of the changes. A discussion arose as to the input of faculty, the possibility of having a campus wide vote and the implications and magnitude of this general education reform. Dr. Shirk motioned, seconded by Dr. Greenberg, to have open faculty forums and student senate input on these issues. All were in favor and the motion passed unanimously. Dr. Drzyzga will send the draft digitally to all faculty, and Dr. Moll argued persuasively that the email should blatantly state that this is a draft proposal. Everyone was encouraged to take this back to their departments. Also, remind departments that change is coming. They may not like this draft but something has to happen before our next Middle States self-study and review, so every faculty member needs to be aware of the implications.

IV. Dr. Girard motioned, seconded by Dr. Shirk, to adjourn. The meeting concluded at 5:06 pm.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Alison E. Feeney