

General Education Committee Meeting Agenda for February 25, 2019

Present: Shirlene Small (SS), Linnea GlenMaye (LGM), Sally Fiscus (SF), Roy Myose (RM), Kim Sandlin (KS), Rannfrid Thelle (RT), Kathy Delker (KD), Becky Nordyke (BN), Aaron Rife (AR), Steve Oare (SO), Amy Drassen-Ham (ADH)

Guests: Carolyn Shaw (CS), Wendy Hanes (WH), Robert Bubp (RB)

- Welcome by the committee chair – Shirlene Small
- Approval of minutes from 2-11-19 meeting and revised minutes from 1-28-19
 - Moved and seconded, motion carries (both sets of minutes)
- Review, discuss and vote on the First Year Seminar (FYS) program design.
 - KD: The original document stated (pg 7) that instructors would be paid \$2,500 each time they teach the class—this does not make that clear. Consensus to clarify in language that instructors get paid each time they teach the course.
 - RM: Again, what is the process? CS: Goes to Faculty Senate for approval. Thinking about assigning faculty member to faculty role/head of FYS—perhaps we roll out for 2021 in order to get faculty member trained, sent to conference in Spring 2020. RM: But still going forward? CS: Yes, with the idea that all freshmen enroll in a FYS in 2021. LGM: So, we have been doing this on a two year pilot, so 2021 matches? Some discussion of timing, CS: I would caution using the term “pilot.” LGM: The recommendation stays with the two-year pilot frame, right? CS: Yes.
 - KD: Library was curious, page 5, under Information literacy—change the language from instructors to library resources? CS: We had language in place so professors/instructors can provide the instruction on information literacy themselves if they like. SS: That would be getting too specific, if we say “library” then many will feel that that is the route they will have to go. KD: suggest change word “module” with “instruction.” RT: I think we need to be sure the language we are using is clear. ADH: Are we trying to stay consistent across documents? KD: Can we use the language from the 2015 sample syllabus? General consensus, that would work.
 - CS: About writing assessment requirement—was done out of convenience, will add language that it will be employed but go under review.
 - RM: Move to pass with suggested changes—KD: second
 - Passed.
- Curriculum change forms:
 - BFA Art Studio—with guests Wendy Hanes (WH) and Robert Bubp (RB)
 - KD: Did you get an exemption for going over 120 hours from KBOR? SF: There are four or five programs on campus who have exemptions. Small discussion about exemptions.
 - SF: one statement I would like to clarify—states Business uses ECON and ENTRE as gen ed courses, they do not. RB: I tried to communicate that in the statement, they are not using the same courses, but the point is that those areas are as differentiated as Studio Art and Art History are.

For example, KU has Art History in Liberal Arts, because it is very much a history/geopolitics course, typically art history not taught in studio art classes.

- RM: What happens when the course is cross-listed? Concern over using cross-listing to satisfy gen ed. SF: This does not happen. We have subject codes for different art courses—currently we restrict all of those codes from art majors using the classes as gen eds. RB: business has different departments, but art does not, but courses are in different fields.
- RB: Per changes with KBOR and 120 credit ceiling, we moved Art History to gen ed, as it is a humanities course more than a fine arts course.
- RM: So Art History should be humanities? RB: Yes, but it is in fine arts, even if it was in humanities, we could not count it, because of classification/department.
- SO: In Music Ed, we have History of Music as a gen ed.
- SF: So want to use Art-H or Art-G to satisfy gen ed. Discussion that difference with business is that they are in different departments. Art wants same consideration as business, regardless of departments.
- RT: Is Art History required in program? RB: Yes—they are also gen ed courses. RT: If Art History was not a requirement for major, would it still be an issue? SF: Yes, because of coding.
- Discussion of use of coding in Health Professions. Why not change the code, if it is more of a humanities course, maybe it should be moved to History, and not counted as a fine arts credit.
- SF: History of this is that gen ed revisions from years ago require 1 fine arts. Also, if allow students to take Art-H as gen ed, why stop and not allow other coding? RB: KU's breakdown of Art History versus BFA degrees.
- RM: Art History should be categorized as A2, then less of a problem. Discussion of programs on campus that have required classes that are also gen ed courses. Back to A2, classification issue
- RT: Issue with cutting hours, gen-ed classifications, and feeling pressure in program. RB: Yes, have students who don't have to take a history class—I got lost here in the explanation, sorry)
- LGM: Per transfer equivalency, there are a number of courses that serve as equivalents to Art History gen ed—are these courses required as majors? RB: Those are outdated courses, should be inactive. SF: We count transfers as fine arts gen ed, do not allow to count if part of their major, just like Art History.
- Discussion of Art History equivalency and how it works, issues historically and presently.
- RT: Isn't the proposal asking for an exception from the gen ed requirements? WH: Asking to differentiate Art History as a separate departmental course. RT: Considering changes coming to gen ed across university, is this something that has to happen now or can it wait for revisions? RB: Part of plan to get to 120 hours, been working on this since 2017, other option to cut 6 hours of applied learning experience. We did not want to cut those courses, per value of the experience. Faculty felt moving Art History in gen ed is the best way to go forward.
- SF: Is this asking exception, or correcting a wrong of subject codes? WH: History of subject coding and issue of Art History.

- RM: Example, we have a department in A and B categories (Engineering)—need to change classification of the course. RM: Can we hold on this? RB: We can hold, but what does the Board of Regents want?
 - KD: Can we make an exception that H category would work, can we limit, without going to other classifications? SF: Yes. Discussion of ceramics course.
 - SS: Our decision today should be focused on Art History.
 - RT: Sympathetic, and you are trying to accommodate, but the thing we have to think about in the committee is that this proposal, how it will effect other programs, the precedent set. RM: This is probably only for a year. SF: Roy and I will take this to the next meeting. RT: I worry about this, with so much explanation, the more we accommodate, the more complicated this is going to get in general.
 - RM: We don't know how the gen ed revisions are going to go.
 - Discussion of trying to change/tweak gen ed structure in our role as gen ed committee
 - SF: There is a coding issue—discussion of difficulty with some majors and their relations with gen ed.
 - Discussion over A1/A2 status—problems with proposal
 - KD: Propose to end discussion and vote—seconded and approved
 - SO: Move to approve the plan, KD seconded. 1 vote for approval, Studio Art proposal denied.
- PHIL 530-AR moved for approval, RT seconded, approved.
 - WOMS 365—KD moved to approve, AR seconded--approved
 - WOMS 380G—SF: Special Courses cannot be gen ed, need to change course number, remove similarity. RM move to deny, SO seconded, denied per changes not made after previous suggestions.
 - WOMS 389—RT moved to approve, ADH seconded--approved
- Set next meeting dates – Mar. 25, per spring break
 - Adjourn