

University General Education Council Meeting
K-State Student Union, Rm. 204
Minutes
March 18, 2004

Those Present:

Patricia Marsh (Assessment & Program Review)
Bronwyn Fees (Human Ecology)
Reg Pittman (Arts & Sciences/Chair)
Vicki Clegg (Center for the Advancement of Teaching & Learning)
Gretchen Esping (GTA, Center for the Advancement of Teaching & Learning)
Greg Davis (Agriculture)
Pat Pesci (Human Ecology)
Marv Willyard (Agriculture)
Sheri Smith (Architecture)
Regrets: Jim Goddard (Engineering)
Sally Yahnke (Education)
Bob Homolka (Technology & Aviation)
Kaleen Knopp (Technology & Aviation)
Marjorie Hancock (Education)
John Schlup (Engineering)
Lisa Harrison (Arts & Science)

Reading Teams 2003-2004

TEAM 1 Bronwyn Fees, Sheri Smith, Jim Goddard, & John Schulp
TEAM 2 Greg Davis, Sally Yahnke, Bob Homolka, & Pat Pesci
TEAM 3 Marjorie Hancock, Peter Mudrack, Reginald Pittman, & unknown
TEAM 4 Marv Willyard, Katleen Knopp, Lisa Harrington, & unknown

OLD BUSINESS:

Minutes approved as written

Proposals:

ENGL 525 and SOCIO 562 have been submitted to Academic Affairs. Questions about ANTH 505 remain. ANTH 505 was approved on first reading on March 4th, but before final approval by UGE, Reg will write one letter to all the professors involved so that there is one document that can be attached to the proposal that says, in effect, that by approving ANTH 505 the council is also approving automatically the following courses:

ECON 505
GEOG 505
HIST 505
POPLSC 505
SOCIO 505

NEW BUSINESS:

The Goddard Report: UGE Procedural Committee (See attached Letter & Recommendations)

Letter “B” was discussed at length.

- The recommended action would reduce the amount of writing a faculty member would have to do in order to introduce a UGE Course Proposal.
- Vicki sent out “form guidelines” by e-mail on March 17th. (See the attached two “form guidelines”) Vicki suggested that by having “links” attached to every piece of the proposal, it should reduce the amount the proposing professor will need to write.
- Reg also brought up the writing component in large classes as an issue that overwhelms most professors.
- Vicki reminded everyone that the writing component is not a part of the original 1994 UGE Proposal.
- Greg observed that we assess for writing in the assessment portion of UGE.
- Patricia agreed that the assessment does emphasize writing...”helping students to develop good writing skills” is the way it is listed on the assessment form. She continued by saying the survey answers can sometimes be “descriptive” of what happens in the classroom, BUT is not “evaluative” of the student learning.
- Sherí suggested that maybe the professors should develop their own evaluation form as a part of each proposal. It is difficult to have one evaluation tool to evaluate all disciplines.
- Vicki commented that it is really the “thinking about it” component that is the essence of the current template for UGE courses. It is a way to at least get the professor to think about portions of the structure of the course that she/he may not have considered.
- Vicki also stated that proposals MUST be submitted electronically, and to be sure that there is only ONE file submitted, and not many different pieces taken from several different places with the expectation that the GTA for UGE must try to put it together in an order that may or may not be the intention of the submitting course professor.
- Vicki offered to work on “the path” a proposal travels from the

submission of the proposal until it becomes a fully approved course.

The pathway is as follows:

1. An electronic version and a paper version of the UGE course proposal is submitted to the GTA at the Center for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning and launched on the UGE website.
2. A UGE Reading Team is assigned to read the proposal and to report back to the entire council with recommendations.
3. All UGE Council Members do a second reading, and action is taken.
4. Proposal put on the agenda of Academic Affairs Committee of Faculty Senate, and action taken.
5. Proposal put on the agenda of the Executive Committee of Faculty Affairs, and action take.
6. Proposal brought before the Faculty Senate, and action taken.
7. Proposal becomes a part of UGE Course Offerings.

An Introductory paragraph would include a rationale of why this course should be offered for UGE credit to non-majors. Sections 3, 4, 5, & 7 of the proposal would be included in the Syllabus; therefore, these parts do not need to be restated in the proposal application.

- The suggestion was made that the faculty member who made the proposal should be notified by e-mail or phone when the course proposal has been approved by UGE.
- Gretchen responded that she already does that just as a courtesy to the faculty member, but it should probably become a part of the proposal procedures for the next GTA who will work with UGE.
- Vicki suggested that a number could be assigned to the proposal so that the professor could track where the proposal is in the system. She will look into this possibility.
- Since so few persons attended this meeting, it was decided by consensus to wait until the next meeting before taking any action on this template so that all members could have time to review the template and ask any questions they may have.
- Very positive responses need to be conveyed from the UGE members who did attend today to those who are not present.
- This discussion will be taken up again at the April 1, 2004 meeting when there is a sample template in hand to work from.

Letter C:

- Reg will call Jan Wisman, and convey the UGE Council perspective on Letter C, which is as follows:
- It does not make a difference to the UGE Council if the course proposal originates within a college, a department, or from a course and curriculum committee. If some colleges prefer to have a course proposal go through their college before it is

introduced to the UGE Council, that is the choice of the college.

Letter D:

- IT is possible that a faculty member from another college could nominate a course from another college to become a UGE course.
- In such a case, a letter of recommendation stating that both professors are in agreement ...that the present course meets the UGE Guidelines and that they request such a designation...would need to be presented to the UGE Council and go through the UGE Course Proposal process.
- Vicki will draft a proposed "Routing" and make suggestions for the course proposal.
- University faculty members do not understand that just because a course is designated UGE, that it automatically becomes a huge, unmanageable course. Faculty members can "cap" their course, and this seems to be a possibility that faculty does not understand.
- No additional resources are needed (GTAs, etc.) because there is always the possibility to restrict enrollment so that their "own" students can be enrolled first, and then it is opened to "all others".

Additional discussion will be taken up at the next UGE meeting, April 1, 2004.

A vice-chair will be nominated at the April 1st meeting.

Meeting was adjourned at 9:35a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Gretchen Esping

2-2592 espingg@ksu.edu

December 5, 2003

Reginald L. Pittman, Chair, UGE Council

Gerald R. Reeck, Chair, Inter-College Coordination Panel

Campus

Dear Sirs:

As you know, several difficulties that have plagued the UGE processes are increasingly troublesome. In mid-October of 2003, Provost Coffman and Faculty Senate President Zabel charged the UGE Procedures Committee to propose immediate, workable solutions to identified problems. Most members of the committee serve or have served on the UGE Council or ICCP: Jim Goddard, Kevin Donnelly, Rich Gallagher, Lynn Ewanow, Bronwyn Fees, Betsy Cauble, Marlon Johnston, Ike Ehie, Jan Wissman, and David Stewart. Nancy Kiefer, Open Option Advisor, was also a member. Vicki Clegg, UGE Provost Designate, served as staff. The UGE Procedures Committee met several times beginning in October of 2003. It was not our charge to replace UGE at this juncture but to recommend whatever possible to make UGE processes more efficient and effective. We discussed many items at length. The discussion resulted in several items that are possible revisions

to improve the current UGE processes.

The UGE Procedures Committee was asked to forward our recommendations to the UGE Council and ICCP, who will be responsible for making final determinations about which recommendations to forward to Academic Affairs and Faculty Senate. The attached lists of items are the result of many varied viewpoints and are generally agreed upon as the items that can assist in improving the current system. Note that items A through F are action suggestions for the UGE Council and/or ICCP to undertake that would ease the process. Items One (1) through three (3) are suggestions that the Provost's Office or Administration could pursue to enhance and improve the UGE process.

Please review these items for possible actions by your Committee or Panel. If you have any questions, the UGE Procedures Committee could be available to meet with you. Thank you for your consideration of these items.

Respectfully,

James F. Goddard

Chair, UGE Procedures Committee

enclosures

cc: Provost James R. Coffman

Robert H. Zabel, President, Faculty Senate

Patricia E. Ackerman, Chair, Academic Affairs Committee

Recommendations to UGE Council and ICCP

A. Continue the practice of allowing the College Deans to grant exceptions for graduating seniors who, for valid extenuating circumstances, have not been able to meet their program's UGE requirements and whose graduation would be delayed by at least one semester if exceptions were not granted.

ACTION: This would require an approval policy statement from the Provost and approval of ICCP.

B. Simplify the submission/approval process through the revision of the UGE course proposal template to reduce the volume of required material, which is sometimes duplicative. Suggestions would be to require item 6 (the course syllabus, course outline and other supporting material) as the primary submittal, which should contain items 1, 3, 4, 5, & 7 on the template. Item 2 (the three major criteria for UGE courses) would be the second area. The responsible personnel for the course could be listed as the department head (see item number E on this list).

ACTION: Since this is entirely a UGE Council function, the Council could consider these revisions as possibilities to reduce the effort required by the proposing faculty, department head, or department faculty as a whole.

C. For existing catalog approved courses, simplify the time line for approval of UGE courses by allowing courses to be sent directly to the UGE Council, after approval of the department in which the course is taught, for review of UGE approved course status rather than having to send them through the individual college course and curriculum committees or the college faculty first. This would

shorten the time period required for the approval process.

ACTION: Approval by UGE Council, ICCP, Academic Affairs Committee, and Faculty Senate.

D. Broaden the selection process for possible UGE courses by allowing faculty, departments, or administration to nominate or suggest courses for UGE course approval that logically fit the criteria for UGE courses.

ACTION: This requires a modification of UGE Council policies. ICCP would be responsible to follow-up suggested (nominated) courses to highly encourage the responsible department to propose the course(s) for the approval process. This process may also be aided by revision of the UGE Council procedures to shorten the methods for approval (see C above).

E. Ask department heads to confirm in writing each semester or each year that the department's courses approved for UGE credit are continuing to be taught in the same manner as the UGE criteria regardless of who is currently teaching them.

ACTION: A letter from the provost (and perhaps the appropriate deans) to the department heads would be required indicating those responsibilities of the department heads. The UGE Council and ICCP would be responsible to follow-up each semester or each year. A report format similar to that used for the five (5) year UGE course reviews could be used possibly replacing the need for the five (5) year form.

F. Allow possible modifications of the UGE College Program Requirements to allow other options as UGE equivalents. One suggestion was to look at the requirements for capstone courses and writing across the curriculum. A possible revision might be the following:

Allow the inclusion of one (1) upper-division course specifically designed for majors as long as the course meets specific criteria such as:

A. The three (3) UGE benchmarks:

1. An active learning environment,
2. Experiential context for the matter to be studied, and
3. The opportunity for students to seek connections across knowledge, AND

B. Significant advanced writing experiences, assuring that students get adequate feedback not only on content, but also on expression, and are given opportunities for revision and further feedback.

ACTION: Approval by the UGE Council and Academic Affairs.

Additional recommended actions by the Provost's Office or University Administration as appropriate.

1. To improve record keeping for UGE actions, provide a Graduate Assistant to maintain the data. In addition, a faculty member could be appointed to facilitate the UGE process as a part of their appointment. This would improve the institutional memory for all UGE processes and records. Also, faculty could use this person to assist in the preparation of UGE course proposals. At this time, the KSU Undergraduate Honor System has a part-time director and a full-time associate

director. Since the UGE program that affects every student's graduation requirements is extremely important, this appointment would be a great benefit.

ACTION: The Provost's Office should provide positions to maintain the UGE process in a more efficient manner. Continuity of a standardized procedure would be assured.

2. Resources could be provided to support all faculty teaching UGE courses. Since all students are required to complete the UGE program, faculties endure increased enrollments in their UGE courses and more grading/organization responsibilities. These faculties do not enjoy additional benefits with these increased loads. Given the responsibilities placed on the offering department to provide instructors for the UGE courses, additional support could be given in the form of Graduate Assistants or part-time instructors to either teach some sections or to assist with grading.

ACTION: The Provost's Office should study this impact upon faculty. Many courses have not been proposed for UGE approval because faculties see approval as a sign that their course enrollments will increase significantly. Offering some support to those faculties would encourage the approval of more courses as UGE courses.

3. There have been major problems with course teaching methodologies when UGE courses are taught by Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTAs). They have not been trained or provided workshop opportunities to understand teaching methodologies appropriate for "active learning" methods, for application of "experiential context," or for "fostering connections across disciplines." While this has been discussed for a couple of years, it is necessary for action.

ACTION: The Provost's Office should initiate new policies for all GTAs. Preferably, all GTAs should be required to have participated in multiple teaching methodology workshops prior to being assigned to teach courses. The workshops would provide the necessary training for these new teachers thus improving course presentation and satisfying UGE requirements for those courses that have UGE approval. It would also serve to improve the quality of the courses taught by GTAs that are not UGE approved. While we know it may not be practical, it is preferable that GTAs not be allowed to teach during their first semester on campus to allow for attending these workshops prior to teaching courses.

Current (Feb. 2004) Template Checklist for University General Education Course Proposals

1) Introduction: General Introductory Paragraph. Why is this a general education course? Use this introduction to describe your basic reason(s) for suggesting this course/experience for general education. Tell why you think non-majors would benefit from this course. (See page 18 of the University General Education Proposal.)

- Active Learning : Three Major Criteria for Approval. Tell how the course/

experience will incorporate:

- Active Learning: Active learners are engaged in doing things and thinking about what they are doing. (See page 4.)
- Experiences: An Experiential Context for the Matter to be Studied: Base the content on experiences that students have already had or on direct experiences induced in the course and then move beyond that level. (See page 5.)

2) Connections: Foster Connections to Other Areas of Thought and Experience: Emphasize a whole rather than a part in order to challenge students to seek the connections across knowledge, to focus on the relationships among ideas. (See page 6.)

3) Performance : Identify Expected Student Performance. Will students write papers? Solve problems? Write essays on tests? What level of content mastery is expected? What level of analytical skill and connection making is expected? How will students display this? Indicate here whether you expect this course to be an upper- or lower-division course. (See page 18.)

4) Fit: Discuss the Fit Between the Course Content and the University General Education Plan. Emphasize the place of this course in the overall understanding of general education at Kansas State University. Is the content of intrinsic interest to a general audience? Is it interesting for its utility to such an audience? Is it interesting for the connections it makes with other disciplines or experience? (See pages 6-7 and 18.)

5) Format : Explain How the Course Content will be Covered. What would be the format of the course? How will you use lectures, demonstrations, laboratories, discussion sections, readings, films, etc.? What class size do you expect? (See page 7, "Format" and page 18.)

6) Syllabus: Provide a Syllabus, Course Outline or Other Supporting Material. Illustrate specifically how you plan to fulfill the aims in items 2, 3, and 4 above.

7) Personnel: List All Persons Identified to Teach the Course List persons identified to teach the course and a statement that each has agreed that the course proposal outlines his/her interest and commitment to the general education plan.

Vicki e-mailed two templates of "Guidelines". (See additional attachments)
PROPOSED TEMPLATE WRITTEN BY DR. VICTORIA CLEGG FOR THE
MARCH 18TH MEETING OF THE UGE COUNCIL:

GUIDELINES: SUBMITTING A UGE COURSE PROPOSAL

For Use by UGE Council

Date Received: _____ Date of Decision:

Recommendation: _____ Approved; Send to Academic Affairs

_____ Return to Department for Revision

----------*-----*-----*-----*-----*-----*-----*-----*-----*-----*
-----*-----*-----*-----*-----*-----*-----*

Submission process: The course proposal should be submitted electronically to

_____. Parts A and B may be completed and submitted as one file. The course syllabus should be submitted as a separate file.

Course Number: _____ Course Title:

UGE Course Proposals must be submitted with three sections:

(A) Expectations for Courses & Experiences Approved UGE Credit

(B) Personnel

(C) The Course Syllabus

(A) In this section, please describe how the proposed course meets the following four expectations for courses and experiences approved for UGE credit. [The links are to related sections of the May 10, 1994 proposal online that may be helpful in writing this section.]

(1) Designed with non-majors in mind. Explain why you think non-majors would benefit from this course. Emphasize the place of this course in the overall understanding of general education at Kansas State University. Is the content of intrinsic interest to all students? Is it interesting for its utility to all students? Is it interesting for the connections it makes with other disciplines or experience? [Link]

(2) An active learning environment. When designing an active learning environment for students, it is important to keep the focus on active learning, not on activity. It is possible for students to be active learners while sitting quietly in a lecture hall seat. It is also possible for students to be very involved in some sort of classroom activity without being active learners. [Link]

(3) An experiential context for the matter to be studied. What is taught in general education should begin with students' own experiences though not be limited to those experiences. The idea of experiential context is to base the content on experiences that students have already had or on direct experiences induced in the course, and then move beyond that level to exploring and perceiving general frameworks of understanding. [Link]

(4) An opportunity for students to connect ideas. UGE courses and experiences would emphasize a "whole" (rather than a "part") in order to challenge students to seek the connections across knowledge, to focus on the relationships among ideas. [Link]

(B) Personnel. List persons identified to teach the course and a statement that each has agreed that the course proposal outlines his/her interest and commitment to teaching the UGE course. Also include the signature of the department head, signifying responsibility to be sure that future teachers understand the commitment.

(C) The Course Syllabus. In this section provide the course syllabus. In addition to what you normally include in your syllabi, this syllabus should include the following:

(1) The focus and format of the course. More typical formats will include lectures, recitations, seminars, laboratories, and studios. Other possible formats could include internships, study abroad, and community service projects. Faculty members are encouraged to be innovative in the design of formats that promote the goals of

general education.

(2) Expected student performance. What level of content mastery is expected? What level of analytical skill and connection making is expected? How will students be asked to demonstrate their learning?

(3) UGE Statement: The following statement must be included in the syllabi for all UGE courses and experiences:

This course carries the designation of University General Education (UGE). Students' UGE experiences should inspire them to appreciate differing viewpoints, consider openly new and divergent thinking, weigh ideas with careful skepticism, challenge conventional wisdom, and explore accurate and more useful knowledge. UGE courses are to incorporate an active learning environment, an experiential context for whatever is studied, and an opportunity for students to connect ideas. The intent of the UGE program is to expand the students' breadth of education at KSU. [Links to checklists or helps on writing an effective course syllabus in higher education.]

**PROPOSED TEMPLATE WRITTEN BY DR. VICTORIA CLEGG FOR THE MARCH 18TH MEETING OF THE UGE COUNCIL:
SUBMITTING A UGE COURSE PROPOSAL**

For Use by UGE Council

Date Received: _____ Date of Decision:

Recommendation: _____ Approved; Send to Academic Affairs
_____ Return to Department for Revision

----------*-----*-----*=====*=*=====*=*=====*=*=====*=*=====*=*-----*
=====*=*=====*=*=====*=*-----*-----*-----*-----*

Submission process: The course proposal should be submitted electronically to _____. Parts A and B may be completed and submitted as one file. The course syllabus should be submitted as a separate file.

Course Number: _____ Course Title:

UGE Course Proposals must be submitted with three sections:

- (A) Expectations for Courses & Experiences Approved UGE Credit
- (B) Personnel
- (C) The Course Syllabus

(A) In this section, please describe how the proposed course meets the following four expectations for courses and experiences approved for UGE credit. [The links are to related sections of the May 10, 1994 proposal online that may be helpful in writing this section.]

(5) Designed with non-majors in mind. Explain why you think non-majors would benefit from this course. Emphasize the place of this course in the overall understanding of general education at Kansas State University. Is the content of intrinsic interest to all students? Is it interesting for its utility to all students? Is it

interesting for the connections it makes with other disciplines or experience? [Link]

(6) An active learning environment. When designing an active learning environment for students, it is important to keep the focus on active learning, not on activity. It is possible for students to be active learners while sitting quietly in a lecture hall seat. It is also possible for students to be very involved in some sort of classroom activity without being active learners. [Link]

(7) An experiential context for the matter to be studied. What is taught in general education should begin with students' own experiences though not be limited to those experiences. The idea of experiential context is to base the content on experiences that students have already had or on direct experiences induced in the course, and then move beyond that level to exploring and perceiving general frameworks of understanding. [Link]

(8) An opportunity for students to connect ideas. UGE courses and experiences would emphasize a "whole" (rather than a "part") in order to challenge students to seek the connections across knowledge, to focus on the relationships among ideas. [Link]

(B) Personnel. List persons identified to teach the course and a statement that each has agreed that the course proposal outlines his/her interest and commitment to teaching the UGE course. Also include the signature of the department head, signifying responsibility to be sure that future teachers understand the commitment.

(C) The Course Syllabus. In this section provide the course syllabus. In addition to what you normally include in your syllabi, this syllabus should include the following:

(4) The focus and format of the course. More typical formats will include lectures, recitations, seminars, laboratories, and studios. Other possible formats could include internships, study abroad, and community service projects. Faculty members are encouraged to be innovative in the design of formats that promote the goals of general education.

(5) Expected student performance. What level of content mastery is expected? What level of analytical skill and connection-making is expected? How will students be asked to demonstrate their learning?

(6) UGE Statement: The following statement must be included in the syllabi for all UGE courses and experiences:

This course carries the designation of University General Education (UGE). Students' UGE experiences should inspire them to appreciate differing viewpoints, consider openly new and divergent thinking, weigh ideas with careful skepticism, challenge conventional wisdom, and explore accurate and more useful knowledge. UGE courses are to incorporate an active learning environment, an experiential context for whatever is studied, and an opportunity for students to connect ideas. The intent of the UGE program is to expand the students' breadth of education at KSU.

[Links to checklists or helps on writing an effective course syllabus in higher

education.]