

General Education Committee  
WH D-442  
Monday, Sept 26, 2011  
10:00am – 12pm  
Minutes

1. Call to order: 10:18am
2. Introduction by lfitzsimmmons
3. Approval of Agenda: lskiffer/cdales- msp- approved
4. Approval of Minutes
  1. Absent list- remove m. carrier. Not a GE member.
  2. M.suchenek-
  3. Msuchenk-elena- msp as amended
5. New Business

HIS 120 hybrid proposal-  
-want as hybrid. Existing course. Syllabus doesn't have the requirements for a hybrid by Senate. Online communication; attendance; minimum hardware/software requirements; how's the academic integ  
Epc eo 902- check the asenate page for the info.  
The syllabus does not reflect the hybrid stuff but the justification does- c. dales.  
-msuenek- premature to discuss. Need to indicate what's missing. Ask the dept to resubmit a syllabus that address these.  
Elena- everything else is clear. The lectures are online.  
MS- give his extract of the policy to dept. for their resubmit.  
EPC E902-  
Lskiffer- schedule- doesn't mention when online or inclass.  
Lfitz- discussion board is usually expected. Not reflected. Not consistent w/ previous recommendations. Discussion board should be on syllabus.  
Cdales- says this in the justification tht lectures in class. Lfistz- require opportunity to discuss  
-they're not clear what's going on online vs. inclass.  
-magruder-some compontent to verify that online lecture reviewed

-elena- percentage of online vs. in class is not stated

-lfit- can't be more than 2/3 according to senate

-msuchenek- hesitant that discussion all in class. Seems online dissemination of materials online- shouldn't count as 1 hour of class time.

-lskiffer- re-exams/essays all online.

-check the justification. There's concern about academic dishonesty. Should be more interaction online- ms.

-there's ways to manage online participation.

-hybrid between 1 and 2/3

-lskiffer, marek, ken ganezer, magruder, c.dales, Elena kulikov, merry, Sheela, lorna. She has proxy for dana.

-meyman- clarify how many hours/weeks will be online.

-cdales- work some language from the justification into the syllabus to clarify.

-section in the syllabus to explain when/what's online- lskiffer.

-ms- make sure it follows unive policy. One of our duties to make sure.

-me- if senate says want 1-2 thirds. Scheduling issues.

-don't want to define as 100 percent on or off campus. Reason for percentage for scheduling and to accommodate a regular class.

-kganezer- it has to be clarified several times the mode of instruction. Danger w/ online classes that they're passively administered. Students need to be motivated to fulfill the requirements. Have to tell students what's expected. Very clear, several times so students know. For clarification to avoid misconceptions of the students.

-msu- measure standards. Request they follow the university policy for hybrid course. From history.

-elena- relatively easy.....

-cdales- the workflow clearly explains it.

-macgruder- students are different- some think it's easier- online classes. Concerned about the SLO's. need to improve show what they've learned- communicating what they've learned orally or written. Articulate how the 2 portions are going to be integrated.

-ms- specify how students will interact example of syllabus.

-kganezer- smt 312 require 1 day every 2 weeks students come in.

-spawar- this is a 100 level course. The more directions the better in the syllabus better for the students and professor. Schedule needs clarification- "meeting date" for class is not clear. Just add the word 'meeting'

-monitor of who view lecture on bboard- he should tell them that it will be monitored

-SP- Say more how lectures are gonna work- be tracked; if they'll be tracked; how they'll be tracked.

-l.fitzsimmons- conference call w/ jim Jeffers to discuss HIS 120.

-he presented an overview of the course. Offer different modalities. Hybrid and online. Hybrid is presented. He prepared video lectures for the course. The online had some issues regarding academic integrity and tracking. The hybrid addresses those issues. Put all the lectures on black board for students to access. The oncampus time is set for discussion of the video lectures. Focus on small and large group discussion of online lectures. Testing is also done in class.

-l.fitzsimmons- commentary. Some concerns re; the guidelines following epc e902. Recommend he look at that document and try to bring the syllabus more into line w/ some of the items on the document.

The justification explains but not in the syllabus. More specificity on minimum requirements for computer, percentage of class online; communication w/ students online. Facilitate a discussion board- it could be considered restricting communication of students. Trying to be consistent w/ guidelines.

-jjeffers- students have not been restricted from outside discussion.

-lf- syll be more specifics of requirements.

-jj- exams cover lecture material online only- info not in textbooks. They're tested on their knowledge of lecture and text. He can make it more clear that it will be required.

-consider issues of not restricting communication- LF. Online discussion to contribute to participation grade. (hmmmm).

-lskiffer- suggestion is discussion board- open a dboard, make it an informal component. Make it available opportunity to students, not a requirement. There's opportunities to facilitate communication. He can address in class.

-lf- requesting jj resubmit w/ their recommendations. Send him a summary/documentation of recommendations and senate docs.

-minimum computer requirements

- clarification specific percentate
- non restriction of communication. Facilitate communication. Discussion board.
- lfitz- she'll do a draft of suggestions
- MS/magruder- motion to do that.
- MS- review on their own and send recommendations.

### GE Area Review

- assessment of all the ge areas. Will be starting again. Modifying schedule of assessment. Suggestion to follow program review schedule and include an area w/ programs under review.
- Start w/ area A this year. All programs under this area- submit their ge documents. More efficient way of proceeding.
- C. Jacobs will come in to review 'assessment'. Assessment of learning outcomes. They don't have to do them all. Identify which lo's they're talking about.
- meyman- we only have to review their lo's that are inline w/ GE. Not all the course/program outcomes.
- LF- are we gonna give them flexibility of reviewing some or all of the outcomes.
- SP- one of the issues- in last cycles of review- all lo's pertaining to ge were asked to review them. We're trying to streamline and not overburden dept chairs and coordinators. For Preview- only 1-2 are requested.
- We can request only ge lead outcomes or different one. Trying to build a culture of assessment so they get into a habit of continuous assessment of course outcomes. We can ask them to do certain ones or they pick which ones.
- lf- request an initial plan of assessment; then ask for different ones if ge wants something more broad. MEyman's idea. Lf agrees.
- deadline- responding by end of October? Give them 2 weeks to tell us what they're gonna measure. October deadline to request their plan. Reasonable deadline.

Lf- proposing as a motion to proceed w/ area reviews determining those units under rev this yr plus area a for this yr minus those not involved in ge and those that have been reviewed in the past 5 years. that are or in. submit by feb. 13. First submit plan what they plan to assess this cycle. Conditional list that will be assessed by GE. Submit by feb. 13

Provide portfolios and assmnet

By send by february. Plan of what's gonna be submitted by ge by end of October.

Sp

By end of October which of their objectives they plan to review. Turn in portfolio by feb. 13<sup>th</sup>. w/ promise they'll review others in the next cycle.

Lfitzsimmons made the motion- lskiffer second the motion.

MSP- approved

Discussion- no discussion

6. Announcements
7. There's a GE symposium
- 8.