Present: Cole Davidson, Marion Harris, RaNelle Ingalls, Andrew Mara, Cynthia Naughton, Larry Peterson, Seth Rasmussen, Susan Ray-Degges, Amy Rupiper Taggart, Kent Sandstrom, and Carolyn Schnell

Recorder: Kelly Hoyt

Unable to attend: Rajesh Kavasseri, Lisa Nordick, Herbert Snyder, Beth Twomey, and Kevin Walsh.

1. The minutes from 04/15/14, emailed on 04/17/14, were approved with a correction of the date at the top of the first page.

2. We reviewed the bullet (“analyze how technology evolves and shapes human experience”) that we added to the Technology outcome on April 15.
   - Amy said it didn’t seem clear to her that this met the suggestion from some Faculty Senators that students should understand how to “get under the hood” of technology.
     - Larry summarized Rajesh’s observations from the last meeting that “analyzing components and dynamics of technology” was too complicated for a GE course. The bullet we came up with seemed to fit because it was something that might be feasible to do in a class that was aimed at non engineers.
   - Seth pointed out that bullets 3 and 5 for Technology seem very similar now.
     - Members suggested revising bullet 3 to just “analyze how technology evolves” or revising bullet 5 to incorporate the word “evolves.”
     - Andy worried that a course on just how technology evolves will be about the progress of inventions and not about how technology really works.
     - Marion feels that “analyze how technology evolves” does address how technology works. For scientists, understanding evolution requires understanding the mechanisms, the functions, and the structures.
   - Marion asked how specific the bullets need to be. When faculty submit a class for GE will there be more elaboration to guide them?
     - Larry noted we have problems with the existing GE sometimes because the elaboration is only on the GE Committee website.
   - RaNelle said that right now CSI 114 and 116 are the only GE technology courses we have. If we look at other courses that could be offered to satisfy this outcome, what is available to meet the requests/suggestions of the Senate?
     - Larry said he could see a web design or digital humanities course fitting.
     - RaNelle asked if we look at the courses that could be considered for this outcome, would that help shape what we can say about technology.
   - Larry suggested creating a subcommittee to look into the Technology outcome to present some possibilities for a bullet that would also satisfy what the Senate is looking for and would be realistic to actually teach as a GE course.
     - Larry suggested Rajesh, Andy and perhaps someone else should draft a revised bullet.

3. We reviewed Larry’s latest table summarizing the GE/BC model so far.
   - Communication:
     - Under the last Component, removed the word “Oral,” so it’s just “Applied” now
   - Revised the note for ENGL 110 to: “Most students get credit from a combination of an ACT Subscore and successful completion of ENGL 120 with a C or better.”
• Critical Thinking, Creative Thinking, and Problem Solving
  o Under Component First Year Experience + Critical Thinking, this note was changed to: “Met by two separate or one combined class addressing skills for academic success and critical thinking. CT class is owned by each college, but uses a common text on critical thinking in variety of disciplines.”
    ▪ Carolyn suggested that under First Year Experience and Critical Thinking we add “supported at an institutional level” after “each college.”
  o Under Component Quantitative Methods, this note was changed to: “Not tied to any particular department. Must meet bullet ‘apply quantitative and qualitative methods to collect and analyze data.’”
  o Under Component Critical Thinking, a zero was added to the Credits column and this note was changed to: “First Year CT is a pre-requisite. Met by second BC class meeting Critical Thinking outcome, by non-BC class or learning integrated into major.”

• Diversity and Global Perspectives
  o Under the CQ column, added WWC and changed the note to start with “BC course.”

• Personal and Social Responsibility
  o Added the note: “BC course designated by major, but must counterbalance learning emphasis of major.”

• Optional Minor (separated minor and certificate into two rows)
  o Added the note: “Foundation in BC for interdisciplinary options such Sustainability, Innovation, World Hunger, Great Books and Great Ideas. May be completed by non-BC courses.”

• Optional Certificate
  o Added the note: “Foundation in BC for interdisciplinary options such as Sustainable Design. May be completed by non-BC courses.”

4. We divided into the subgroups to flesh out and propose implementation details for the following:
   • BC Administrative Guidelines & Procedures (Cole, Larry, & RaNelle)
   • BC Course Approval and Coordination Process (Amy, Larry, & _____)
   • BC Minor/Certificate Coordination/Responsibility/Process (Lisa, RaNelle, & Marion)
   • Critical Thinking Two-Credit Class (Carolyn, Seth, & Herb)
   • Additional Critical Thinking Requirement (Beth, Cole, and Susan)
   • Applied Communication (Kent & Andy)
   • Capstone (Cynthia, Susan, and Carolyn)

5. We had a long discussion about the Additional Critical Thinking Requirement
   • RaNelle asked who was going to ensure that this is being met. Would the GE Committee review even non-GE/BC courses that met this requirement?
     o Larry said we are trying to hit on the critical thinking learning outcome because that and communication were highlighted as being the most important in our surveys.
     o If critical thinking isn’t embedded in a second level course then students would have to take a 3 credit course that includes critical thinking.
   • RaNelle asked who will be responsible to ensure that critical thinking is embedded in the courses that students are taking and are meeting this outcome.
     o Larry said there are two levels to this question.
       ▪ 1) The GE committee is one level. Under the new model, they would now presumably review capstone courses and make sure that critical thinking is included.
2) The student transcript is the second level. If students take two courses that meet the critical thinking learning outcome, then they have met it.
   - Larry thinks this will happen for most students.
   - Another option would be a specific course in critical thinking within the major (maybe a methods course).
   - The last and least common option would be that a student doesn’t do either of the above but the major provides a memo to the GE Committee about how critical thinking is integrated into the major.
   - RaNelle said what she is hearing is that if the program decides that to integrate critical thinking into our major, they have 36 GE credits. For programs that don’t integrate it and don’t provide a memo, then they have a 39 credit Gen Ed curriculum. She is concerned about having to tell a student that they haven’t met the requirements laid out in this model because their program doesn’t integrate critical thinking in their upper division courses and they need to now take another course that will satisfy this outcome. And she thinks the student will say show me where? I have 36 credits.
     - Larry asked if the model said 3 credits and also said that this could be a course that could be integrated into the major, would that still cause problems or would that work?
     - RaNelle said her concern was about a student having to take another course and pay for it to get the credits.
   - Seth said he interpreted the note to say that if it’s not being met in a course within the major, it can be met by another GE course that meets one of the other criteria. It’s like a double count.
   - Cynthia is concerned that by putting a 0 in the Credits column, we are not emphasizing the importance that critical thinking should have. She suggested removing ENGL 110 as a Gen Ed when you have to have it to take ENGL 120.
   - Larry asked if RaNelle and Cynthia’s concern could be addressed by the group working on the bullet.

6. Cynthia’s question about ENGL 110 triggered a promising discussion.
   - Amy and Andy thought state policy binds us to have ENGL 110 as a GE. English tried to eliminate it and they still would like to get rid of it, but they can’t because of state policy.
     - Amy mentioned that students who must take ENGL 110 (3 credits) must also take ENGL 100 (1 credit). They have a 4 credit requirement. (Students with an ACT subscore of 14-17 are required to take ENGL 110.)
   - Cynthia asked if we could petition the state.
     - Amy said it’s a fairly recent policy. It was about 3 years ago that it came into play. The goal was to prepare students before they got to college, but the result of it was that they added obstacles for students.
   - Cynthia asked if we could put an asterisk in the notes column then about students who have a low ACT and then move the 3 credits down to the critical thinking component in the next outcome.
   - Members suggested we might treat ENGL 110 as we do MATH 103 under the present system.
     - It would not be part of NDSU’s GE/BC requirement.
     - ENGL 110 or an acceptable ACT subscore would be pre-requisite for ENGL 120.
     - ENGL 110 would be accepted as a transfer course.
     - The new Applied Communication credits still give us 9 credits of Communication credits in lower division GE.
   - Cole will check with Lisa Johnson to see if ENGL 110 is actually required by the SBHE.

7. Kent reported on the Deans response to the model. Their feedback was:
   - They liked the outcomes.
• The model doesn’t look very different than what we currently have except that it’s more complicated.
  o Larry noted there are differences, such as the option of the interdisciplinary minors and certificates.
  o Kent said the deans were concerned that there will have to be committees for these. Who is going to be vetting these and making the decisions on what is in and what’s out?
• It looks boxy, like a model where you check off the boxes. Don’t we want to get away from that approach to GE? This completely reproduces that model.
  o Kent said he didn’t want to develop a grocery list model, but he doesn’t know how we could get away from having some sort of menu.
    ▪ Larry said we could have a required core. You wouldn’t have a menu then. But he can’t imagine that this campus would agree to that.
  o Amy said it sounds like they want something that is more open and has more flexibility but it’s hard to picture that.
• They suggested taking this to the departments and ask them in what part of their program will the outcomes be addressed.
  o Marion asked if they wanted us to go to the departments and show them the outcomes and tell them they need to revise their courses to conform to the new outcomes.
    ▪ Kent said no. He said they want us to build the model more inductively. We should show them what we have and ask them how they could build their GE courses around that.
  o Larry noted that we had met with as many departments that would meet with in 2010-12.
• They said we need to create a structure to promote the development of interdisciplinary courses.
  o Kent thought that we had tried to do that and stress that as one of our goals, but apparently it’s not being reflected in this model.
• The CSM Dean was troubled about the reduction of the number of credits in natural and physical worlds. Kent explained that they can take courses in technology or other areas. The Dean said the model would not fly with the CSM faculty because of the reduction in the number of credits in natural and physical worlds.
  o Cynthia said it sounds like Science and Math are concerned about not having enough GE courses.
    ▪ Seth said that was not a problem at all because so many programs require their courses anyway
  o Seth said that some faculty think that every student on campus should take x number of science courses. They also worry that reducing the number of science courses will not prepare our students for the future.
  o Seth thinks that he needs to educate his colleagues that what is actually taking place in this model is that we are trading science courses for critical thinking courses. Critical thinking is far more critical than a specific science course. Most of the science courses don’t teach the foundation of critical thinking. They are teaching a particular subject. When students leave college, they have a small understanding of a science topic, but they really don’t understand how that works or how that integrates into society. Seth thinks if he sits down with Scott Wood and explains our rationale for this model it will help him to see the benefits of this model.

8. We also discussed how we might respond to the feedback from the Deans.
• Kent said that the more he looks at this, it seems like it isn’t very innovative, it just seems more complicated.
Larry said part of the difficulty of any model is, how do we track students meeting the learning outcomes. This model is in part how we track it.

- Kent said he did bring this point up to the Deans but they didn’t have much sympathy for that.

- Marion said that there are a lot of constraints within the system. We haven’t been given the go ahead with money.
  - Kent said he addressed this too, that we have no funding. We would have loved to create a more intricate model.
  - The Deans said that funding is essential because we will need to pay people for course development.

- RaNelle said she would like to see an example of one program where you give it to the departments and they try to filter in the learning outcomes. It might look very nice. She’d like to see an example that hits all of our learning outcomes, tailors it to the major and then see what’s left that needs to be covered.

- Marion said she thinks the DQP Capstone project was an example of a similar process. Querying everyone about their capstones got them thinking about their capstone and then they made changes and they are still making changes. She thinks incremental change can be very effective.

- Kent thinks if we need an aesthetically different presentation which includes a narrative.
  - Larry agreed that the layout of the model is boxy. It was a "scorecard" for us to track our decisions. A CULE member with design skills should work with it.
    - Kent suggested not color coding what we have in this model to compare to what is presently being used because it won’t show much change.
  - Susan offered to help Andy come up with something. It might be based on the four-year “bubble” graphic Andy created last fall for the GE model he developed with RaNelle and Larry.
  - Andy said that Michael Strand has some folks that do animated info graphics.

- Marion suggested doing a PowerPoint presentation that explains what we have done to come up with this model. It should include the information from the meetings, the surveys, and the OIRA analysis to show how we are incorporating that information into the model.

- Cynthia said she thinks we need to delineate the constraints of the system too.
  - Kent agreed that we need to do this up front and explain that there are structural parameters.

- Cynthia thinks the Deans don’t recognize by looking at this model, the thought process that went into this. It’s all in presentation, like food preparation

- Larry said that we should wait and not try to meet with the Deans until after we have a presentation done, and we know who the new provost is. We may not be able to have a very constructive meeting with them until the fall. We do need to have a more aesthetically pleasing model.

Next meeting is Tuesday, May 6th at 9 am in Peace Garden