THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT GREENSBORO
GENERAL EDUCATION COUNCIL

-DRAFT-
Meeting Minutes
Friday, February 10, 2017
2:00 – 3:30 PM • 1607 Moore Humanities and Research Administration Building

Members Present:  Bender, Bolte (for Ali), Brumfield, Carlone, Cassidy, Henline, Lennartson, McCall, Newman, Pettazzoni, Schunk, Stephens, Terranova, Vines, and Yasaki

Guests: Dr. Dana Dunn, Provost

AGENDA ITEMS:

I. Approval of Minutes from December 9, 2016 and January 27, 2017.
Motion to approve Minutes from December 9, 2016 (Vines, Terranova) – Approved.
Motion to approve Minutes from January 27, 2017 (Vines, Harris Houk) Approved.

Chair advised Chris Cassidy will represent the College of Visual and Performing Arts.

II. Recertification
GHP remaining courses:
  • FMS 150, 151, 152, 160, 161, 162
    FMS 150, 151, 152 - Motion to Approve (Terranova, Vines) Pending clarification of SLOs and revision of links between assignments/activities to reflect GHP SLOs. GHP SLOs should be included verbatim on syllabus. Motion approved.
    FMS 160, 161, 162 – Motion to Approve (Bender, Terranova) Pending clarification of SLOs and revision of links between assignments/activities to reflect GHP SLOs. GHP SLOs should be included verbatim on syllabus. Motion approved.

  • HSS 101, 102, 112, 121, 201, 202, 212, 221, 222
    Motion to Approve HSS 101, 102, 112, 131, 201, 202, 221 (Terranova, Vines) Approved.
    Motion to Approve HSS 222 pending clarification – use of sub-Saharan Africa in weekly writing assignments (Terranova, Vines) Approved.

  • RCO 211 & 212 – Motion to Approve Recertification (Vines, McCall). Approved.
III. **Course Proposals**  
REL 101: Introduction to Religion, GL marker request approved pending revision to SLO-Assignment links. Motion to Approve GL marker for REL 101 (Terranova, Vines). Motion approved.  
ARH 110: Survey of Western Art: Prehistory—Renaissance, GL request Motion to Approve pending revision of SLOs, including linking assignments to SLOs (Vines, Newman) Motion approved.  
ARH 111: Survey of Western Art: Renaissance—Contemporary, GL request Motion to Approve pending revision of SLOs, including linking assignments to SLOs (Vines, Newman) Motion approved.

IV. **Review of General Education: Discussion with Provost Dunn**  
Provost Dunn thanked members of Council for all of the work already done. Provost Dunn has followed the emerging best practices of general education over the past two years, it is clear that this Council is very attune to these issues. If we go forward with the review, we will collaboratively develop a charge. Provost Dunn shared her thinking about this process and responded to questions.  
1. Why do you believe we should conduct a review now? The core reason is that is incumbent upon any institution of higher education to review periodically its curriculum and to revise it as is needed to ensure that the needs of our students/graduates are being served. UNCG has a real balance between a commitment to our teaching mission and our scholarly mission, this is a distinguishing feature of our institution. Our general education curriculum is an essential piece of what we do to carry out UNCG’s mission. It’s been ten years since the last general education review, there has been a lot of change in the knowledge landscape over the last decade. It is incumbent upon us to look at this and see if there are areas where we can and should improve. Increasingly, we understand the importance of the ease of transfer for students who come to UNCG from other institutions. It would be valuable to look at our gen ed curriculum through the lens of transfer. Through interactions with students, they feel that our gen ed curriculum is confusing and complex. We need to look carefully at what it is we want our students to come away with. Clear paths, maybe less choice, there is a lot of data that shows there is a clear relationship between complexity of gen ed curriculum in terms of course choice available to students, loss of students and an inability to satisfy students. The key driver is that there’s been a lot of change. Question regarding the image of choice for courses. This is probably not the right place to be today. There will still be choice, it’s more a matter of degree of choice.
2. What do you envision for a review process? A Task Force that has broad-based university representation is key. There are units that have not participated as actively want to. The role between the task force and Council is important, potentially overlapping membership, a dotted line relationship. Possibly have a Provost Faculty Fellow (1/2 time) take leadership of this initiative.
   Timeframe – this is a lengthy process, there is a sense of urgency. It is critically important to allow the time needed. Suggest maybe a two year time, if a review results in recommendation for revision. It would be great to do the review, get recommendations and get them vetted in a year. Get the committee together this spring. The second year would be implementation, curriculum development, design new courses, etc. We have to start this process by asking what we want our students to learn. We need to look at this very carefully, there have been developments tied to diversity inclusion.

3. How will you help obtain the data necessary to conduct a review? Data and evidence, we would engage our Library staff and others (OAA, OIR). The issue is our gaps, what do we not have information on. Do we need to engage in focus group discussions, survey students? In the past, we’ve had some real data challenges. We’ve done a lot of clean up over the last two years. Gen ed review is very different from the previous program review.

4. Are there any near-term accreditation review or concerns that intersect a review? The 5 year SACSCOC review is 2020 and our 10 year review will have a strong new gen ed curriculum that was developed through a collaborative data informed process.

5. How can you help ensure that a gen ed review does not encounter some of the problems of the Academic Program Review (e.g. lack of transparency, top-down process, unreliable data)? This has to be a totally open and transparent open process. Nothing top-down about it, this will not be an administrator driven decision, it must be a faculty driven process.

6. What might come of a review? What would ensure follow up after a review? We would have a changed gen ed curriculum, hopefully improved learning, student retention and success. Question regarding idea of territoriality in general education, how can we help start the dialogue that gen ed is owned by the entire campus? Start with a charge/insistence that these are the rules. Look at best practices, help everybody understand why this is in everyone’s best interest. Insist that this is for the students and about the students.

7. Will a review receive adequate support, followed by support for any recommendations? This council can propose a budget for the review process, it should be specific. We will provide support for the chair of the task force, it
would be difficult to provide course releases for the entire task force. Summer stipends are possible, funding to help faculty support their scholarly work. If we go with a two-year model, we could provide money to support some course redesign (50/50 model) half of the course redesign done in load the other half (intensive) could be incentivized. Graduate students can help in the process.
Do you envision we will need outside resources? We can bring resources to campus, AAC&U conferences are an excellent resource.

8. How are departments and programs evaluated and funded? Many faculty believe funding is tied to SCH production. Is this the case? If not, what is the funding formula? Many faculty worry that a gen ed review (and revision) would harm some and help others. Refer to Budget Process and Instructions (sent to Deans, Dept. Heads and Chairs). Units have a set of metrics, rationale for new resources is built by the units, there are multiple ways to support new resources. If recommendation is to cut departments from gen ed, we will find ways to redirect the faculty. Our responsibility is to serve our students. This will be a gen ed review and possible revision. It’s an issue of how much revision, balanced with how much time our faculty can invest in a revision, resources available, etc. Question to Council – what is your greatest fear? Workload. If done well, over time, there could be improved workload for faculty. We need broad-based participation. We need to get people excited about this.
Student dissatisfaction with gen ed – the complexity of the gen ed curriculum has come up. For example, difficulty of getting courses, slowing time to degree. Do we have a gen ed curriculum that does justice to information literacy? There are so many creative things we could do and create – diversity and inclusion. There is exciting work tied to math gen ed. It’s not a matter of no choice, it’s a matter of how much choice. Concerning students, it is difficult for them to find the time to sit on committees, might be better served to have focus groups, open forums.

Meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.
Next meeting is March 10, 2017 at 2:00 p.m. in 1607 MHRA