

GE Faculty Meeting
9.19.19

Call to Order

11:32 a.m.

Opening Remarks from the President and/or Provost

Pres. David Anderson – away on college business. Not in attendance.

Dean Marci Sortor Remarks:

- Reminder that the Board of Regents is part of the GE revision process (see college by laws)
- Over the summer Marci and David met with the incoming and outgoing chairs of the board and chairs of the academic affairs committee. Summer conversations have given a sense of how other members of the board are likely to respond to areas of the proposed revision of the GE.
- At the BOR October meeting, the GE Taskforce will update the entire board on progress since May 2019. They will want to know how the GE taskforce will work with faculty **on the vote of the five** questions to the shape of the new proposed GE.
- Some questions we can expect the BOR to ask are: (1) is our process a good process that allows for and responds to feedback. (2) does the new GE meaningfully support the college's mission (3) are we focused on what is best for our students.
- Faculty are encouraged to focus on the five questions before focusing on how departments and programs can support the proposed GE.
- There is no plan to further reduce the size of the faculty. There may be shifts in where the admin sees faculty resources.

II. Opening Remarks from the GE Task Force -

Shelly Dickinson, Reporter GE Task Force (Psychology)

- Reminder #1: The Ole Core is a de-siloed collection of courses in the liberal context.
- We are following the guiding principles that were voted on last year as well as the three Ole questions. These are informing us as a task force.
- Reminder #2: There will be a plan for the review of GE every 10 years.
- Calendar: Oct. 3, 2019 – voting on the five questions, Oct 9-11 visit with the BOR, Oct. 10 – GE Faculty Meeting. – discussion on what will be the Ole Core resolution. Mid to late Oct. will go to the curriculum committee and discuss a resolution or set of resolutions on GE. Nov. 7 meeting will be the vote.
- Want to get through the questions so please be brief in remarks.

III. Five Questions

Question #1:

Should the natural science requirement (name to be determined) require an experiential component?

Mary Walczak, Assoc. Dean Natural Sciences and Math

- Results of discussion q#1 with Natural Science/Math faculty - 40 percent of faculty in attendance. Informal vote q#1 – 75 percent yes and 25 percent no.
- Discussion of what experiential component might look like: NS/M faculty are looking for flexibility and broader explanation of what experiential is.
- Discussion: should there be a required number of hours for experiential component for students? Or should the number of hours be unspecified? 57 percent (majority) should be unspecified.

Paul Jackson, Chemistry & Environmental Studies

- “experiential” in q#1 is a different context than the “experiential learning and context” piece that is part of the other GE. This is broader and relates to practice.

GE Taskforce Follow-up Comment

- They have addressed term “experiential” and come up with new name for this.

Corliss G Swain, Philosophy

- Question: What were the reasons for favoring the experiential component?

Follow-up: Mary Walczak, Assoc. Dean Natural Sciences and Math

- Important for students to experience what it means to be a scientist and how scientist do things. The idea of formulating a question and looking at evidence of the questions. Want students to experience the scientific process.

Question #2

Should students be allowed to choose either linked or unlinked versions of “First-Year Seminar” and “Writing and Rhetoric”?

Jeanine Grenberg, Philosophy

- Question: What do you mean by linked?
- GE Taskforce Follow-up Comment – Linked could mean course taught by two faculty members that visit each other’s classes. Could be linked by a common curricular topic, cohorts.

Shelly Dickenson, Psychology

- Foresee problems with the cohort model where you stay with cohort.

Ryan Shepard, Sociology & Anthropology

- Example of high-impact learning. Strong data exists that students benefit from participating in learning communities. If we consider the linked option, this ensures that all first years will have some learning community type experience and the intended benefits.

Becca Richards, English and Women and Gender Studies

- Strongly favor option a (either/or). Linked classes present a “one-size fits all” experience and that may not be represented among diverse population of students. Not all students benefit from high impact classes. Some examples are Title IX cases.

Jo Beld, Professor of Political Science, Vice President for Mission

- Question: Registrar, please comment on outcomes for linked/unlinked courses?

Follow-up Response - Ericka Peterson, College Registrar

- There are complications for students and registrar office when students need to drop out for a number of reasons.

Karen Cherewatuk, English

- Could previous proposal of this same question be considered at another time?

Beth Abdella, Chemistry

- Worried about linking without flexibility. Complicated with linked courses such as CHBI with the offering of certain courses and trouble with students that can't get out of linked courses. In favor of most situations to be linked courses but also options for students to unlink if it was a necessity.

Ashley Hodgson, Economics

- What would this question look like if the option was “no linked” courses?
- GE Taskforce Follow-up Comment – reminder that our main goal with this question is should q#3 be a requirement for students or should we develop ideas that are allowed to be linked.

Kiara Jorgenson, Religion and Environmental Studies

- On the taskforce that helped develop question#3. A team met with Karil Kucera in Art and Art History and Asian Studies (GE Taskforce member). Look at the GE Taskforce website for more information about this question. We developed this idea back in May 2019 and thought about four different models that could work for linked courses.

Arthur Cunningham, Philosophy

- This question about linked or not linked has become ambiguous. Linked could be more topical. We should sharpen the question of “linked” before we put it to a vote.

Question 3:

Should the GE Task Force propose “Ethics in the Major” or a revised ethics requirement that is part of the core curriculum?

Beth Abdella, Chemistry

- Faculty in Chemistry have questions about how much ethics is “ethics”? If we were going to spread ethics in the chemistry major we would need to consider the practicality of it in terms of teaching hours would be expected. This is not in the current language.

Kari Lie Dorer (Russian, Norwegian, and Language Studies)

- As the rep from three small programs, staffing is very difficult and finding someone who can teach an ethics course in our major is not always an option.

Christopher Chiappari, Sociology & Anthropology

- Does the ethics course have to be in the major? Can students take their “ethics” requirement outside the major?
- GE Taskforce Follow-up Comment: The majors would decide how the ethics course would work in their major, not the Ole Core.
- Chiappari Follow-up response: Does this mean that departments wouldn’t have to come up with their own ethics courses?
- GE Taskforce Follow-up Comment: Correct. They would not.

Karen Marsalek, English

- I really like the flexibility of ethics being in the major where departments are not required to create courses to satisfy this requirement. However, this adds a course to a department’s major and can create staffing difficulties. This is something that should be considered before we vote on this.

Mary Walczak, Chemistry

- Where is the option C that was on the earlier draft of the Ole Core?
- GE Taskforce Follow-up Comment - Jon Naito (English)
 - This question is revised and is based on faculty who would like to teach ethics in other departments and have EIN requirement available to do this. The concern that came with the original question was that departments felt forced to choose with what the GE Taskforce proposed or nothing/no ethics. We made the adjustment to the question: (1) should there be ethics in the major – a GE Taskforce proposition. Or (2) an ethics GE requirement.
- Walczak Follow-up: Why is the faculty not being asked to discussion whether or not there should be no ethic GE requirement?

Anthony Becker, Economics

The implications for option A (The GE Task Force should propose “Ethics in the Major”) is that every single major would have to be green sheeted through the curriculum committee and approved by the BOR.

- GE Taskforce Follow-up Comment – Shelly Dickenson, Psychology
 - This will not be the case if they already have completed their EIN.
- Becker Follow-up: If this this option becomes a requirement then the green sheet will still be necessary.

Meredith Holgerson, Biology

- What would happen if you are a double major?

Michael Fuerstein, Philosophy

- Two concerns: #1 – There is value of bringing together students from various disciplines together in courses. #2 – the added restrictions that go with packing ethics into a major. If it were a GE requirement, then all majors would be free to design their own curriculum.

Susan L Huehn, Nursing

- What does a revised option C look like?
- GE Taskforce Follow-up Comment – Shelly Dickenson, Psychology
 - We don't know either. We haven't proposed it yet. It would be an ethics part of the core but it would not be an EIN because our current curriculum would be gone. The ethics requirement would be something else.

Laura Listenberger, Biology and Chemistry

- Wording currently states “should propose a revised ethics requirement” does this mean that we would be voting again on this revised ethics requirement? If we vote “B” would be have another opportunity to vote again?
- GE Taskforce Follow-up Comment - Jon Naito, English
 - On Nov. 7, we are going to bring the faculty a resolution or a set of resolutions. One way this could be presented is to send out as a GE requirement. Because of the concern surrounding it, we can present that as a separate free standing resolution.

Charles Umbanhowar Jr., Biology

- Need further clarification about the order of resolutions and impending amendments. What is the order for which we vote on resolutions or vote on amendments?

Matt Richey, Mathematics, Statistics, and Computer Science

- Would option A allow for a distributed model? Math doesn't naturally support a course in ethics, whereas a model of potential courses were we begin to spread the seeds of ethics. Is this possible under option A?

Corliss G Swain, Philosophy

- Option A is good because each major would have to think of how ethics fits in their major.
- In Philosophy they offer EIN courses but do not require that majors take those course.

Question #4:

Should the GE Task Force propose the development of “Writing in the Major”?

Jeanne DeLaney, History and Latin American Studies

- Will this replace the WRI if we go for Option A?
- GE Taskforce Follow-up Comment - Jon Naito (English)
 - Writing in the Major is a three course load (writing in rhetoric, writing across the curriculum, and the third is writing in the major).

Jeanine Grenberg, Philosophy

- could there be options for reconsideration if option A or B are not desirable? If we vote B: are we saying that we should have two requirements?

Becca Richards, English

- Advocates for writing in the major and this approach is in line with best practices for teaching writing in higher ed.

Diane LeBlanc, Writing and English

- Advocates for writing in the major. Need more intentional about a kind of writing.

Question #5:

Should all students be required to complete a portfolio as outlined?

David Booth, Religion

- Will vote that there should be a portfolio requirement. The proposal is intriguing and promising.

Hilary J Bouxsein, Classics

- How will the advising context work with the GE? Specifically for NTT faculty.

Kris Thalhammer, Political Science

- Staffing concerns. How will review the portfolios?

Irve Dell, Art

- If we do portfolio, there should be other means for putting it together than digital.

Olaf Hall-Holt, Mathematics, Statistics, and Computer Science

Do we need some other formal assessment process in addition to the assessment that we already do now? What if there was a way for more student work to be visible?

Mary Carlsen, Social work and Family Studies

Has there been any interest from students about a portfolio requirement?

Karil Kucera, Art and Art History and Asian Studies

- Love the idea that it is piloted but not support for the requirement.

Discussion

Tony Becker, Economics

- Resolution that set the 16 course limit. This is a limit of what the GE Taskforce can present in their limit. This is not a binding limit on the size of the GE requirement.

Jeanine Grenberg, Philosophy

- Revise the ethics question to be “yes – ethics” or “no – ethics”.
If this passes, then have a second resolution of “”ethics in the major” or “no”.

Dan Hofrenning, Political Science and Environmental Studies

- Would like to propose more discussion on how to better involved nature and the environment in the proposed GE curriculum.

Jeanine Grenberg, Philosophy

- Are there other questions that as a faculty we need to ask so that we feel like we have some ownership over the proposed Ole Core?

Heather J Klopchin, Dance

- Proposing an addition to the Ole Core “The Active Body” Will be circulated soon.

Mary Trull, English

Are courses about literary and artistic analysis count toward the creativity requirement?

Mary Walczak, Chemistry

- Let’s be more intentional about keeping the GE smaller at 16 while also thinking about the number of required classes that some students are required to take for their major.

Therees Hibbard, Music

- Fully support for “The Active Body” as part of the Ole Core

Anne Walter, Biology

- Consider voting on one container at a time of the Ole Core rather than as a whole.

James Demas, Pysics and Biology

What writing is? In Pysics and Biology, writing it is graphical. Are we talking about writing for communication or is it purley lexical?

IV. Adjourn

Respectfully submitted by Michelle Gibbs