

**University General Education Council  
Meeting Minutes  
Rm. 204, Student Union  
October 2, 2003**

**Those Present:** Greg Davis (Agriculture)  
Pat Pesci (Human Ecology)  
Patricia Marsh (Assessment & Program Review)  
Sheri Smith (Architecture)  
Reg Pittman (Arts & Sciences/Chair)  
Marjorie Hancock (Education)  
Bronwyn Fees (Human Ecology)  
Peter Mudrack (Business)  
Gretchen Esping (GTA)

**Those Absent:** Bob Homolka (Technology & Aviation)  
Marv Willyard (Agriculture)  
Kaleen Knopp (Technology & Aviation)  
James Goddard (Engineering)  
John Schlup (Engineering)  
Sally Yahnke (Education)

**New Teams for 2003-2004 (Tentative)**

**TEAM 1** Bronwyn Fees, Sheri Smith, Jim Goddard, and John Schulp

**TEAM 2** Greg Davis, Sally Yahnke, Bob Homolka, and Pat Pesci

**TEAM 3** Marjorie Hancock, Peter Mudrack, Reginald Pittman, and unknown

**TEAM 4** Marv Willyard, Katleen Knopp, unknown, and unknown

## Old Business:

There are seven courses that are "in limbo" following the UGE Review Surveys.

**ACCTG 231** – This course has been surveyed twice. Patricia passed out the results of the survey to everyone. There still needs to be a follow-up review, perhaps a visit by UGE members with just a one-page review to see how UGE suggestions have been implemented in the course. Such a visit may be very helpful at this point in the process.

**BIOL 198** – Pat and Greg met with Department Head Brian Spooner and faculty members David Rintue and Beth \_\_\_\_\_. When Pat and Greg arrived they described the situation, as "they were loaded for bear". Instead, Pat and Greg were able to diffuse the situation by explaining that there seems to be a communication problem somewhere. Pat and Greg were then taken step by step through the course BIOL 198, and were shown the computer modules and explained how they work and fit in with the learning. Pat and Greg concluded that this is probably the least understood course on campus.

All faculty and GTAs are required to teach this class one semester. The course was designed to be a sophomore level course, but 62% of the students are freshmen this semester. 58-65% of the students are doing A/B work, and there are 14% who are failing.

After a 45-minute visit, Greg and Pat feel very positive about this course, and have concluded that it does indeed meet UGE goals.

Pat moved approval of BIOL 198 as meeting the UGE goals. Passed by consensus. Pat also added that UGE Council has really received a "black eye" over this course in the Biology Department.

**CHEM 110 & CHEM 210** – It was approved "with reservations" at the Sept 18, 2003 meeting. Marjorie & Reg will follow-up with a visit with the faculty in the spring of 2004 to determine if the changes recommended at the last visit have been implemented.

**ECON 120** – Patricia was contacted by the faculty of this course and asked to have the Spring 2003 Survey Review moved to the fall of 2003. She was told that Team 3 needs to visit with the faculty of ECON 120.

Pat & Marjorie DID visit with ECON 120's department head a year ago, Fall 2002. At that time, they wrote a letter to the department head and made suggestions on how the course could better fit the UGE goals. Patricia will write back to the faculty and the department head and relay this information.

**STATS 320 & STATS 330** – Reg has sent a letter to the faculty of these two courses suggesting that there will be a "follow-up" review...(i.e. Team 1) from UGE Council that will meet again with the faculty of this course in spring of 2004 to once again discuss UGE concerns.

**SPEECH 470** – An electronic vote needs to be taken on this course by the next meeting.

A lengthy discussion ensued about documentation of actions taken after the first survey of a course, when said course is in question. The conclusion was that there should be two forms designed to aid both the faculty and the UGE Team when discussing UGE goals and adherence to these goals.

### A) Interview Page:

- Used after the results of the Phase II (survey) are made known, but before a second survey is taken.
  - A very simple, one-page form that a Team could fill out while they are meeting with a faculty group.
  - Includes...
    - i. Discussion of the students' responses to the survey
    - ii. Illustrations of active learning taking place in the course
- Explanations of how GTAs are prepared to teach a UGE course
- Documentation for plans for the future

### B) "Follow-Up" Review

- This review would take place after two surveys have been given, and the results of both surveys reveal continuing problems
  - A one-page form that asks three questions:
    - A) What changes have you made in your course in response to UGE goals? (How have you responded to UGE suggestions?)
    - B) How do you prepare your GTAs to teach a UGE course so that they can be accountable for meeting UGE goals?
    - C) What remaining issues do you see as a challenge to meeting UGE goals?

### New Business:

**HIST 577** - Proposal has been posed on the UGE website (administration). TEAM 3 (Marjorie and Reg) has completed a first reading of this course. The proposal includes lecturing and simulations, small group activities, and writing skills. Multiple-choice testing will not be used to assess student learning, but rather the instructor will use short answer and essay questions. The proposal does address the question of the different levels of student understanding between a student majoring in history and the non-major. One of the more outstanding features is that a good job is done of relating history to the real world, and applying history to the student's environment. Marjorie moved to approve this proposal and that it should go up for a second reading of the entire council.

Greg seconded this motion. Approved by consensus. HIST 577 will be listed for second reading at the UGE website. All UGE Council members will please read this proposal and be ready to vote on it at the November 13<sup>th</sup> meeting.

**IAR 730** - Team 1 has conducted the first reading of IAR 730. Brownynne has not heard anything from Jim or John, the other two members of Team 1. Team 1 was impressed with the "good faith" effort made in this proposal. Sheri` was concerned that the architecture student majors would have an advantage over the non-majors. Bronwyn suggested that perhaps there should be a prerequisite for this course. Peter, who has also read the proposal, did not believe it was necessary to have a prerequisite since every one has experienced space and we've all sat in chairs. It was decided that Sheri` should contact Carolyn Thompson to get a clarification, and then e-mail the rest of the Team 1 with the response she gets. Greg asked if this is really a UGE question? Vote will be delayed until Carolyn addresses the concern expressed by Team 1.

Marjorie will watch the minutes of the Academic Affairs Committee and the Faculty Forum in order to inform the UGE GA about questions or approvals of courses presented to AAC and FS for approval.

There is still the question of representatives from each college to the UGE Council.

There was some discussion about how representatives for the UGE Council are appointed or picked. There seems to be a different process in each college. The following information is taken from the UGE web site: 1994 Proposal:

### **The Faculty: The General Education Implementation Task Force**

We propose that the Academic Affairs Committee of Faculty Senate charge a General Education Implementation Task Force, which would function at least during the first few years of implementing the University-wide plan of general education. Members of the task force would be faculty members. Each undergraduate college would be represented. During the review in the year 2000, Academic Affairs would make a decision about whether this task force should continue.

The General Education Implementation Task Force would have the following responsibilities: work with the Inter-College Coordination Panel and the provost's office to formulate policy related to general education and to monitor the quality of the University-wide plan, review and recommend courses/experiences for general education credit and all general education programs before they are sent to the Academic Affairs Committee of Faculty Senate.

[Top](#)

## **The Colleges: The Inter-College Coordination Panel**

We propose that a panel of associate deans be responsible for inter-college communication concerning the following general education matters: course/experience development and assessment, program development and assessment, resource allocation, and course scheduling. Panel membership would be composed of those associate deans whose normal responsibilities include assisting the dean with the administration of the undergraduate programs of the College. This Inter-College Coordination Panel would be convened by a non-voting delegate of the provost.

While the approval of general education programs and courses/experiences would remain within established faculty channels, the Inter-College Coordination Panel would work with the General Education Implementation Task Force and the provost's office during the start-up phase. Thereafter, the Inter-College Coordination Panel would continue as the network for inter-college communication about University General Education.

[Top](#)

## **The University: The Provost's Office**

We recommend that the provost delegate central administration leadership and advocacy for the general education plan within his current staff. Accepting this responsibility is one way that central administration can show its support for the general education plan. The provost's designee would coordinate activities with the General Education Implementation Task Force and the Inter-College Coordination Panel. The Office of Educational Advancement would continue to conduct the program assessment of general education that has been mandated by the Kansas Board of Regents.

Gretchen will send e-mails to the UGE Council members and ask them to please read and then vote on HIST 577. Also...please read SPEECH 470 and vote on that proposal as well. In addition, please read IAR 730 and be prepared to discuss it at the Nov. 13<sup>th</sup> meeting. If possible, a vote will be taken on that proposal on the 13<sup>th</sup>. You may register your vote by e-mailing Gretchen with your decision.

Gretchen will put together a flowchart a proposal takes through the UGE Council. She will also make a flowchart of the Phase II (survey) evaluation of UGE courses, design an Interview Page, and a "Follow-Up" Interview Page.

Patricia asked if she might use other assessment methods for other assessment projects while working with the UGE Council? The consensus was "yes".

Respectfully submitted,

Gretchen Esping  
Graduate Assistant for UGE Council  
Center for the Advancement of  
Teaching and Learning  
[espingg@ksu.edu](mailto:espingg@ksu.edu)  
2-2592 or 2-2878