AGENDA ITEMS:

I. Approval of Minutes from August 28, 2015. Motion to approve August 28, 2015 as written (Terranova, Vines). Motion approved

II. New Course Proposal
CHI 220 Modern Chinese Literature and Culture – requesting GLT category designation

Sub Committee recommends approval of GLT category designation, pending submission of a revised proposal which emphasizes updated GLT SLOs. (Vines, Rychtar) Motion approved.

Chair advised September 25 meeting will be the final meeting to approve courses for Spring 2016.

III. New Business
Appeal of decision approving KIN 220 as GNS category designation

Chair asked Liam Duffy to briefly highlight the KIN 220 appeal and Aaron Terranova to offer a response. Liam provided a history of general education curriculum, Council and UCC relationship, and recertification process of General Education courses. Liam continued to explain the concerns of the College scientists. Prior to the recent GNS recertification, there were five GNS SLOs, which were streamlined down to three. There are many courses on campuses in the Social Sciences that use all of the Natural Science SLOs but we wouldn’t call them Natural Science courses. SLOs do not define what a Natural Science is, first it has to be a Natural Science course and all Natural Science courses must have those SLOs, but you don’t look at SLOs to define a Natural Science course. The sponsors of the appeal feel that the syllabus submitted contains none of the science outcomes, nothing in the course title or description that suggests that any science outcomes provided in the KIN 220 rationale will take
place, students taking this course will have no idea they are about to take a rigorous science course. A course with a large science content doesn’t make it a Natural Science course. This course appears to be about improving your own physical fitness, not focusing on the science, the science is a sideline. For example, Kinesiology teaches a very rigorous course in physiology which focuses on the science of physiology, and sponsors of the appeal would not object to that course carrying a GNS. A consultation with the sciences should’ve been sought.

Aaron Terranova provided a response, by formally objecting to this appeal, quoting Right of Appeal concerning sponsor language. Problem with the appeal letter is that most of the content has no relevancy for GEC. Our charge as a Council is to determine if the course meets the SLOs. Nowhere in the application does it require the course title or course description to match any GEC stipulations. The application is very straight forward, three SLOs, open to everybody. To apply new criteria after the application has been submitted, is unfair to the sponsor. We would never ask a student to read chapter one and go back and test them on chapter two. It is unfair to the process or part of our charge. UCC no longer requires a syllabus, for this very reason. We should be looking at all of these courses through different lenses, alternate perspectives. This course is a Natural Science from an alternate perspective, not redefining anything. The professor of KIN 292, (course Liam mentioned as a possible Natural Science) Dr. Starnes is now the coordinator for KIN 220 courses. We now have a rigorous physiologist overseeing the course content. Council is not in charge of judging rigor. Aaron read from the Report of the External Reviewers on General Education at the UNCG, the number one recommendation: It does not require specific subject matter expertise to determine if a course is appropriate for general education or not, it does require a deep understanding of general education roles and a serious commitment to them. The departments proposing the courses should already have certified the disciplinary competence of the courses. The General Education Council’s task is to decide whether the stated goals of the course and the kinds of tests, papers and other graded work students produce reflect the purposes of a general education course. No one department owns the GEC, everybody owns GEC. There are eleven departments teaching GHP. This course was approved in March, it is now September, and a lot of time has been spent on this.

Floor was opened for questions and or comments. Stephanie Kurtts advised the group of the Gen Ed mission and goals, and the mandate to foster an educated person belongs to the entire university, not to a single department, unit or co-curricular program. The Gen Ed program provides foundations and alternative perspectives for the more specialized knowledge gained in the major. We should have a broader vision. Council does not currently require course consults, a course like KIN220 is trying to follow the mission of the general education program. We are trying to develop this educated person that belongs to the entire university. Discussion continued, Jan Rychtar stated what Aaron is suggesting, could sound like getting rid of this council and replace with computers – computers check SLOs very quickly, this is why we are here as humans. Last year the course was not truly approved, as there was so much discussion and upheaval. This is an important discussion that needs to continue, this situation is much more complicated than just asking if it is a natural science course. Joe Starnes advised KIN 220 is a better general education class than the KIN 292 course (refer to appeal letter). Principles of health and fitness require knowledge of scientific principles/knowledge. Omar Ali posed the question to Liam - What would be your solution to this situation? Liam
advised that there is no way that this course would be a natural science with the way the syllabus is written, the proposed course is a fitness course. Discussion continued with the suggestion to create a Fitness / Wellness category, as this is an important subject. We only have two natural science courses students are required to take. Ian Beatty continued the discussion, SLOs do not determine if a course is a natural science, they determine which of the natural science courses are appropriate for general education. Whose job is it to decide if the course meets the intent of the GEC markers, as that is the complaint, this course does not meet the intent of the GEC markers. Pam Brown advised the recertification process would allow the courses to be reviewed after the original marker or category designation is applied and taught for three or five years. KIN has also looked at the Scientific Reasoning test that has been used to judge these courses in the past and feel that KIN 220 students could meet those objectives. The syllabus was created by various faculty in the department. One of the two natural sciences courses required must have a lab, so these students will take another natural science course. Jerry Walsh stated that the course contains a significant amount of physiology, but there seems to be a disconnect between the proposal and the syllabus and the concept of science. Struggled as a scientist looking at SLO 2, demonstrate knowledge of basic scientific principles; don’t see scientific principle when reading through the syllabus, calendar and course description. No perception that they address fundamental science principles of chemistry, physics, biology. Aaron responded, students are given the foundational science and then they apply it to their bodies, provided examples of recent class lectures and notes. You don’t get fitness until you understand how the body works to begin with – there is science behind it. The science is there. Discussion continued, do the markers define the SLOs? The SLOs are crucial. Council’s sole purpose isn’t to just put SLOs on courses. There should be some type of vehicle to look at SLOs. We need an inclusive approach to general education. We are operating on the procedures and policies that are in place right now. Are courses driven by the SLOs? Seems that this course has a focus on fitness rather than science. Faculty should have faith in their colleagues; take a course and look at it through a different lens. At some point, these category designations and markers must mean something. Why do we not have some type of Lifestyle/Fitness marker? Aaron advised, according to Paul Davis, this was actually proposed several years ago, and was shut down, not sure of the reason. If we are at the point that Council wants to look at another marker again, that’s fine, but that is another conversation. It seems that the distinction we should be making is between using science in a course and learning to do the science in a course. It looks like there is a lot of science in the course, it’s not about learning to do the science, it is using the results to learn about fitness. Donna Duffy continued the discussion, does this have to do with professional knowledge and applied professional knowledge? The application of fitness and fitness principles (from various standpoints) is science. If you put “Fitness” in a bowl, the things that would go underneath that are biology, chemistry, biomechanics, and physics. All of those sciences fill up that fitness bowl. We are thinking of these things in different ways, as faculty, we are responsible for making sure our students are well grounded in theory and knowledge and application. We have to use biology, physics, etc. to help our students apply this knowledge. Who makes the decision about what a GNS course is? Not sure that this is the time to have this conversation. This course was approved last semester. Why would an appeals process exist for something that is approved? Seems counterintuitive and counterproductive.
Liam stated the appeal mechanism does exist and was put in place last semester. Discussion continued concerning specific language of appeal procedure. Chair advised there will be no vote today, as Jan had to leave early and there is no longer a quorum.

Amy Vines advised General Education is organized around five Learning Goals, each of those Learning Goals carries different categories and markers, these definitions and descriptions are in the UNCG Bulletin. Council should think about what the charge is, especially if courses are submitted without syllabi.

Chair advised this will be continued on the September 25 agenda. Liam requested Council create a subcommittee to look at national trends, has a Fitness for Life course been considered a Natural Science? Chair advised appeal process is in the Curriculum Guide, and as there is no quorum, no motion/vote can happen. Discussion continued concerning the six month time limit in the appeal process. Liam advised this was discussed at the first Council meeting of the semester. Ian Beatty advised that ultimately the Faculty Senate has jurisdiction over the curriculum. If the College Science departments feel that the details of Council’s process have not permitted a fair resolution of the issue, we will take this to Faculty Senate.

IV. Old Business – GPR SLOs

Chair advised GPR ad hoc committee provided additional clarification regarding the revised SLOs. There was no intent to use the same two theories or traditions throughout. Council requested a slight revision in the wording, to clarify intent.

Motion to adjourn (Terranova, Vines).
Meeting adjourned at 3:30 pm

Next meeting is September 25, 2015 at 2:00 PM in 1607 MHRA