

Listening session  
College of Human Ecology  
2-15-2008

Notes prepared by: Greg Zolnerowich

8 people from CHE attended  
Melody, Judy, Vicki, Karen, Greg from the task force attended  
Karen gave an overview

1. Does the proposal eliminate the need for upper division (300, 400 level courses) UGE courses?

Yes, the focus is on content areas.

2. Will there be a list of gen ed courses available?

Yes, ISIS would handle that.

3. Would courses that have prerequisites be tagged and part of gen ed?

Yes, especially in the major.

4. Question about the 30% language to tag a content area.

Dropping the "30%" idea and discussing/redefining to whether a content area is in the course description, is an SLO, or is assessed. Seeking to make the process operational. Tagging should be done at dept. level, hopefully by the instructor for that course. Some courses could be hard to tag, and some could not be tagged, such as bowling.

5. Can a dept. untag a course?

Yes. The course content might change. But continual tagging and untagging would be chaotic.

6. Can ISIS handle changes if a course changes tags or loses tags?

Don't want too much change regarding tags. Courses, not sections, will be tagged, so courses with multiple sections taught by multiple instructors would need some coordination to make sure the content area(s) are met in all sections.

7. Does this add another layer for the students to take?

No. How many content areas could be taken in the major is under discussion.

8. What about distance courses and then transfer into KSU?

Under discussion.

9. Who will decide what courses can transfer and if they will count toward gen ed credit?

Articulated agreements should cover transfers for those institutions that have agreements with KSU. A more difficult question for those without an agreement.

10. What is the accountability for tagging a course correctly?

It will be up to the dept. to correctly tag courses. Some oversight person/body to coordinate/troubleshoot is to be determined.

11. The current system has a feedback system from students—UGE assessment, TEVALs, etc. Will the new system have student feedback?  
Assessment is being discussed.

12. Can a course have more than 1 tag?  
At the moment, courses may have 1 or 2 tags.

13. If a course is tagged for 2 content areas, can a student get credit for 2 content areas when taking that course?  
The original idea was “no”, but it’s under discussion.

14. Has the task force thought about the overall impact on the campus, especially for large service courses like Math 101? Courses like that may fall by the wayside if an easier course fulfills a quantitative need.  
We don’t know. It’s still a faculty/advisor/student decision about what courses a student needs for his/her education.

15. Students who transfer in as a junior don’t have room to take 4 content areas on campus.  
Under discussion for options.

16. What is the timeline for the proposal?  
March 1 is the provost’s target date to get a proposal to the Faculty Senate. That will not happen. The task force is taking input from listening sessions. There are a number of details, scenarios, and operational aspects that need to be worked out. The goal is to put together a robust proposal and then seek faculty/staff/campus input again, and then take it to Faculty Senate.

17. Lots of people don’t think about the proposal at this stage. When the proposal goes to the Academic Affairs committee in the Faculty Senate, that’s when it’ll hit the fan and people will react and speak up.

18. Do we have a model to show how any particular curriculum would be affected? Are there any examples of a program with tagged courses and how that might change, or how students would benefit?  
Not really.

19. Task force should add more definition to the content areas or give examples of courses that would fit within the content areas. Rubrics or more guidance.  
That would be useful, but might have to come from departments, and could depend on what the primary emphasis of the course is.

20. It takes a 3-hour course or equivalent to satisfy a content area? Example was given of a current 2-hour UGE course.  
That’s the original idea, but options are being discussed.

21. Question about communication/critical thinking/writing.

Those are skills students should pick up across their education. Those will be assessed.

22. Communication/critical thinking—how to judge if students get those and are competent?

Assumption that they pick it up in all classes, those will be assessed, and those are part of university SLOs.

23. How were the 8 content areas arrived at? Can some be combined?

Looked at what students needed independent of courses. Looked at what employers are seeking in graduates. Areas like “Human Diversity in US” and “Global Community” are often separate at other institutions. Looked at other universities.

24. Do we envision each curriculum saying only certain content areas can be filled in that program?

That could depend on each academic department or unit, they could be free to do that if they thought that was best. Seeking a system that maintains flexibility.

25. This could be an advising nightmare depending on the tags and how that course info and tags are presented to advisors and students.

ISIS should be able to handle this, some system to flag courses for particular content areas would be used, like the diamonds for current UGE courses.

26. Will this replace the current UGE system?

Yes, but that’s all.

There was discussion about general college requirements and how those are not necessarily general ed items.

27. Do we anticipate requiring certain course levels, 100, 200, 300, 400, etc.?

No, the emphasis is on content areas.

28. Should have depts. tag courses. Some content areas could have many many courses that meet those areas, but some content areas could have relatively few courses that fill them.