

**GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE
Minutes for Meeting #3 – November 5, 2015**

- 1. The meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m.** on Thursday, November 5, 2015 in Library Conference Room A, Chairperson Kinnie presiding.

The following members were present: Professors Boudreaux-Bartels, Buxton, DeCesare, Echevarria, Irvine, Mead, Orr, Stout, and Williams; Vice Provost Beauvais, Dean Richmond, and Ms. Boyd-Colvin.

The following members were absent: Professors Bide and Lloyd.

Guests: Associate Dean Morokoff and Director Derbyshire; Professors Maier-Speredelozzi, and Onorato.

- 2. Announcements and Reports**

Chairperson Kinnie welcomed Professor Boudreaux-Bartels to the Committee as the new representative from the College of Engineering.

Chairperson Kinnie said that Director Derbyshire and Associate Dean Morokoff were joining the meeting as members of the Cultural Competency panel; Professor Maier-Speredelozzi was in attendance as the Chair of the Mathematical, Statistical, or Computational Competency panel; Professor Onorato was in attendance as the Chair of the Arts and Design panel.

Chairperson Kinnie summarized the requests to the Committee as outlined in the October 29, 2015 Memorandum from GEIST.

- 4. Ongoing Business**

- a.** Chairperson Kinnie asked each general education outcome approval panel chair to report on their approval process. The purpose of the request was to share individual approaches to course approval and standardize the process. Professor Irvine reported on courses submitted to the Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematical (STEM) panel. Professor Mead reported on courses submitted to the Social and Behavioral Sciences panel. Professor Williams reported on the courses submitted to the Humanities panel. Professor Onorato reported on the courses submitted to the Arts and Design panel. Discussion ensued after each report. Professor Buxton reported on the courses submitted to the Writing panel. The Committee discussed the difference between a course on the teaching of writing and a writing-intensive course.

Dean Richmond reported on courses submitted to the Communicate Effectively panel. Professor Maier-Speredelozzi reported on courses submitted to the Mathematical, Statistical, or Computational Competency panel. The Committee discussed the degree to which rubric elements were expected to be addressed or cited in the syllabus. Chairperson Kinnie reported on courses submitted to the Information Literacy panel. Ms. Boyd-Colvin reported on the courses submitted to the Civic Knowledge and Responsibilities panel. Professor Echevarria reported on the process used by the Global Responsibilities panel. Director Derbyshire indicated that the Cultural Competency panel would be meeting within the week. Vice Provost Beauvais reported that her panel had rejected a course submitted as a Grand Challenge course because it was a survey course and not applicable to the Grand Challenge criteria.

- b.** The Committee approved the list of panel-approved courses dated 10-30-15 (attached) and requested that they be moved forward to the Curricular Affairs Committee or the Senate, as applicable. Discussion followed about standardizing the panel approval process. The Committee approved a motion that, once a course is approved by its two associated Student Learning Outcome panels, and Grand Challenge panel as applicable, that course shall be considered fully approved by the General Education Committee. The Committee approved the following practices for approval panels:

When reviewing a course, the “first” Student Learning Outcome panel shall forward to the “second” Student Learning Outcome panel, and the Grand Challenge panel as applicable, any and all information about requests, replies, or materials from the faculty proposer of that course by that first panel. The first panel is responsible for describing its review of the course, and any changes it requested, to the second panel. Both panels are responsible for communicating their reviews to the Grand Challenge panel. As is already the practice, the second panel is responsible for forwarding any revised materials to the Senate Office (facsen@etal.uri.edu) along with the signed approval form.

A course proposal that is submitted to qualify as a Grand Challenge course will be forwarded, by the Senate Office, to the “first” Student Learning Outcome panel and simultaneously to the Grand Challenge panel. The Grand Challenge panel shall forward to both Student Learning Outcome panels any and all information about requests, replies, or materials from the faculty proposer of that course and shall copy facsen@etal.uri.edu.

Regarding syllabi, the second panel should be judicious in its requests for revisions, being mindful of the fact that the syllabus has been approved by one set of panelists. Syllabi should conform, within reason, to the recommended template used by the Curricular Affairs Committee. Full Student Learning Outcomes should be stated but rubric elements are not necessary. Partial Student Learning Outcomes should not be listed on syllabi.

The Faculty Senate Office facsen@etal.uri.edu shall be notified as approved courses are forwarded by the “first” Student Learning Outcome panel to the “second” Student Learning Outcome panel, by the Grand Challenge panel to both Student Learning Outcome panels, and by the “second” Student Learning Outcome panel to the Senate Office. Student Learning Outcome panels shall be judicious in their requests of faculty proposers for supplementary materials (if assignment details can be found in the rubric template, it is not necessary to request that they be duplicated on the syllabus).

- c. The Committee discussed the concerns expressed by the College of Engineering about the limit on the number of courses permitted in the same disciplinary code (to count toward the total 40 credits of general education courses). The course code restriction proposed in May 2015 had been amended at the August 31, 2015 GEC meeting and had been approved by the Faculty Senate on September 17, 2015. It was subsequently determined that the wording of this requirement restricts the program in unintended ways. Many Lecture/Lab courses require that students register concurrently for the Lecture course and the Lab course separately; e.g., enrollment in Elementary Physics would consume two of the 3 allowed courses in the PHY disciplinary code, PHY 203 and PHY 273. Also, in disciplines with many 1-credit courses such as Music, the 3-course limit is prohibitive in unintended ways. Discussion ensued. An amendment was moved and approved:

Of the courses taken to complete General Education requirements, only ~~three (3) courses, or up to 12 credits not exceeding three (3) courses,~~ may share the same disciplinary code. An exception to the limit is allowed for the HPR (Honors Program topic) course code.

- d. Professor Echevarria asked the Committee to review the proposal for the Foreign Language Overlay (FLO) that had been proposed and approved at the August 31 GEC meeting and amended at the October 1 GEC meeting. The intent of the Committee, with the consent of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, had been to present the FLO proposal at the November 19 Faculty Senate meeting for approval. Subsequently, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee had directed the GEC not to propose additional structural changes to the General Education Program. Discussion ensued. A request to present the proposal for the FLO at the November 19 Faculty Senate meeting was moved and seconded but failed to pass.
- e. Director Derbyshire, Chair of the Cultural Competency panel, discussed the latest revision to the Cultural Competence rubric. Committee members reiterated the need to consider changing the name of the outcome to Diversity and Inclusion.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:20 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Nancy Neff