

**ICCP (Inter-College Coordination Panel) Meeting**  
**313 Calvin Hall**  
**12 Noon, Wednesday**  
**February 11, 2004**

**Those present:** Betty Stevens (Division of Continuing Education)  
Karen Pence (Human Ecology)  
Nancy Mosier (Technology & Aviation, K-State-Salina)  
Lynn Ewanow (Architecture/Planning/Design)  
Vicki Clegg (Center For the Advancement of Teaching & Learning)  
Gerald Reeck (Arts & Sciences)  
Ike Ehie (Business)  
Jan Wissman (Education)  
Kevin Donnelly (Agriculture)  
Rich Gallagher (Engineering)  
Gretchen Esping (GTA, Center For the Advancement of Teaching & Learning)

Chair Reeck immediately introduced the new Chair of ICCP, Wissman, who opened the meeting.

Chair Wissman was approved by consensus for a five-year term.

Wissman asked Reeck to present the letter and three pages of suggestions sent to ICCP by Prof. James F. Goddard, Chair of the UGE Procedures Committee.

Reeck made it clear that there are actually two committees working on the improvement of UGE: 1) the UGE Procedures Committee chaired by Goddard; 2) a committee looking at the overall future of UGE chaired by Reeck.

Reeck recognized Clegg for bringing the problems of UGE to the forefront.

**Future of UGE:**

A discussion followed in which Reeck shared the following points in regard to the future of UGE:

1. The committee will reach out to the entire campus to discuss what the objectives are of University General Education, which in turn will determine the future of UGE.
2. Four – six broad options will be determined by the feedback from the campus, and these options will be presented to the Provost.
3. It is hoped to present the above information to both Provost Coffman and to the new incoming provost.
4. One of the four-six broad options is that the UGE Council will continue to function as it does today.

5. The question was asked: Is it possible that the committee will go back to 1994 and scrap all the work done this past decade, in essence, “start over again from scratch”? The response was: maybe yes, and maybe no.
6. The learning objectives of UGE courses need to be assessed and then evaluated. The objectives have “been on the books for years”, but are the objectives being fulfilled?
7. There are six university-wide SLO’s (student learning objectives). Some colleges believe that content only should be taught in the course, and not values.
8. The comment was made that programs, courses, and SLO’s that are tied to national accreditation organizations and issues are the most successful in defining and meeting objectives.
9. End of discussion.

### **Recommendations to UGE Council and ICCP: (see attached pages 1 & 2)**

#### *Recommendation A.*

§ ICCP approved this recommendation.

§ A letter will be sent to this effect to the Provost and to Goddard’s UGE Procedures Committee

#### *Recommendation B.*

§ ICCP supports the recommended action suggested by the Goddard Committee

#### *Recommendation C.*

- Discussion:
  - If ICCP approves this recommendation now, some of the authority and power of the faculty and of the Committee on Course and Curriculum in each college will be taken away
  - It would cut at least a month off the average length of time it takes for a course to go through the UGE approval process
  - This is not a college level decision...but it has become a college level discussion!
  - *Recommendation C* applies to already existing courses
- Ewanow moved that Recommendation C be tabled until each member of ICCP has had the opportunity to discuss this action with his or her respective college. Donnelly seconded. Passed by voice vote. Recommendation C is tabled until the next meeting of ICCP.

#### *Recommendation D.*

Approved by voice vote.

#### *Recommendation E.*

Approved by voice vote.

*Recommendation F.*

This recommendation has been brought to ICCP before, and was positively received at that time.

- Discussion:
  - *Recommendation F* might present some problems in regard to the writing component
  - Leadership from the Department of English has been requested in the past in regard to the writing component.
  - At what point does a course become approved for UGE? It would still have to go through the UGE process.
  - The course would also have to go through Faculty Senate

ICCP generally supports *Recommendation F*, but takes no action.

**Three additional actions have been recommended to the Provost's Office and/or University Administration: (see attached pages 2 & 3)**

The three additional actions of Goddard's Committee on UGE Procedures Committee are supported by ICCP. A letter from ICCP to that effect will be written to the Provost.

Next meeting will be the 2<sup>nd</sup> Wednesday of March, the 10<sup>th</sup>, noon until 1:00p.m. in Room 301 of Calvin Hall.

Respectfully submitted,

Gretchen Esping

GTA Center For the Advancement of Teaching & Learning, 215 Fairchild, 2-2592 (d) or 2-7828 (o), [espingg@ksu.edu](mailto:espingg@ksu.edu)