

## College Listening Meeting @ Salina Campus – Feb. 4, 12:30

16 – 20 people from the college attended representing faculty, staff (including advisors) and administrators from Eng Tech, Aviation, the Library, Arts/Sciences & Business, College Advancement and the Dean's Office.

Task Force members in attendance: Karen & Cia in person, Vicki & Greg E via telecom (but they could not be heard, therefore, they just listened)

Notes prepared by: Karen Myers-Bowman

Pedro began by going over the handouts he provided (copy of handout from 12/13, pp. 3, 4, 5 of working document, FAQ sheet, feedback form)

Karen provided a brief timeline overview.

The following questions and ideas were shared:

- What happened to the portfolio idea for assessing Gen Ed – was it abandoned?
  - ✓ Karen – no, a detailed assessment plan will not be able to be included until the GE program is approved
  - ✓ Les is working on a portfolio assessment project with a Big 12 Fellowship. He would be glad to share his ideas and suggestions as he moves forward.
- Les just returned from Switzerland. The proposed GE plan is very up-to-date and innovative. Several universities from around the world (e.g., Israel and Western Australia) want to learn from us – we are leading the world in Gen Ed reform.
- Cia asked Judy about using portfolios here on campus. Judy indicated that they are using them to assess the writing in Comp 101. Cia has reservations about using portfolios for GE, because of the magnitude of the assessment task. Pat asked: wouldn't portfolios help to decentralize the assessment? Cia answered – yes, but no. Difficult logistically.
- The writing center at Salina has begun to identify several ethical issues related to using portfolios. For example, archiving brings up intellectual property issues – who can see it? What can it be used for? Etc.
- What are the differences between the current UGE system and the new proposed system?
  - ✓ Cia – UGE – based on pedagogy, new system is based on breadth of knowledge
- Is it true that the foundation for breadth is being defined as 8 areas = 24 credits? If each course may have 2 tags, 30% in content each area: therefore, 60% of the course content would have to be about the 2 content areas?

- ✓ Karen – moving away from % as a defining GE criteria to other requirements (significant part of course – SLO/course description and assessed in course)
- Do we have all of the areas covered on this campus? History may be an issue, also aesthetic and interp understanding – especially beyond literature.
- Once this program would be up and running, how do you think the administration of it will compare to the current system?
  - ✓ Cia - Our intent is that it will be less onerous to run.
- Don – glad to see that we have moved from 30% of course content to the new suggestion of SLO/descript and assessment – easier to manage.
- As a satellite campus we have a major conflict of interest with courses taught in Manhattan. In English, it is not a problem because the faculty on both campuses have a good working relationship, very cooperative (also Physics, Chem, for example). However, we will need leadership for offering courses that are “owned” by departments that reside in Manhattan. (For example, a history course may be “dictated” by the Manhattan campus). Hiring a PhD-level faculty member (or more than one) may be required to cover all 8 areas in Salina, but would be expensive for our College. “It shouldn’t be that difficult, but historically, it has been difficult.” We currently have a faculty member traveling here from Philosophy to teach Business Ethics and it works well, but it doesn’t always. We try to follow the curriculum guidelines from the Manhattan campus, but don’t always feel involved or valued – especially when it comes time for assessment.
- Pedro asked each department to look at its curriculum and begin to try to tag courses to give the Task Force feedback about how well it may work and what extra resources may be needed to implement the proposed GE program.
- Don – GIS & other technology skills do not seem to be included in the proposal, yet have been stressed by central administration and distance education.
  - ✓ Karen – those issues may be seen more appropriately as skills/tools rather than content areas. May be related more closely to the areas of Communication and critical thinking.
  - ✓ Cia – competence in technology is assumed, like computer use; however, we need to state these things clearly rather than just assuming students have the skills. However, GE may not be the place for this.

Bill agreed that technological skills fit under critical thinking and communication – it is a tool for these, not a content area

- Dave – “campus bean counter” – how does this apply to the Associate degree program?
  - ✓ Karen – a detail to work out once the idea is approved.
  - ✓ Cia – how met now?

- ✓ Dave – 6 credits instead of 18
- Pat – If the goal is to encourage depth, we need to be careful about compromising too much regarding allowing credits within the major (moving to allowing 4 areas to be met within the major rather than the originally proposed 2).
- Don – In support of the 4 courses within the major, some departments are too scripted by outside entities and need flexibility.
- Has the Task Force considered transfer students?
  - ✓ Karen – yes, we have recommended a structure that will include accepting transfer credits which is more flexible than the UGE system.
- What will happen for students under current UGE?
  - ✓ Karen – Those students in the UGE system will be allowed to finish under that system.

Karen reminded the group that Faculty Senate is the decision-maker regarding GE, not the Task Force – please talk to your Senators and Academic Affairs rep.

Submitted by Karen Myers-Bowman