

General Studies Council Minutes
February 5, 2015 – 3:30 p.m.
Founders Hall, Warner Conference Room
***** Approved via email February 10, 2015 *****

Present: Debbie Bridges, Greg Brown, Derrick Burbul, Paul Burger, Ralph Hanson, Laura Jensen, Daryl Kelley, Katherine Kime, Kristi Milks, Martha Kruse, Tami Moore, Donna Montgomery, Kim Schipporeit, Kenya Taylor, Ross Taylor, Ron Wirtz

Absent: Kay Hodge, Jan Moore, Amy Rundstrom, Daren Snider

Guest: Gene Fendt

I. Call to Order:

Kelley/Brown moved to approve the agenda moving PHIL 388 to the top of the agenda to accommodate the guest. Motion carried.

1. Approve Agenda:

Debbie Bridges called the meeting to order.

2. Minutes from December 5 meeting were approved via email.

II. Old Business (Open Items):

1. Course Proposals (Review to Approve):

a. PHIL 388 – Pleasure, Beauty, Goodness and the Sublime (Department: Philosophy; Instructor: Gene Fendt):

The Council requested Dr. Fendt make a couple of minor changes in the syllabus to help with clarification of the final project and expectations of students. Once the changes are made the syllabi should be submitted to the Director for approval. The course will then be sent to campus for review and comment.

Hanson/Burger moved to approve sending the course to campus for review and comment after the above changes are made. Motion carried.

b. SCM 188 – Dare to be Different: Building Career Capital for a Global Market (previous title: *Professional Preparation Meets Global Career Opportunity*) (Department: Marketing; Instructor: Greg Benson) – course had been delayed at the College level Academic Affairs Committee; the issue has been resolved and the course has been approved by both the CBT and FS Academic Affairs.

Hanson/Wirtz moved to approve sending the course to campus for review and comment. Motion carried.

III. New Business:

1. Course Proposals (New):

a. GEOG 188 – Introduction to Geography (Department: Geography and Earth Sciences; Instructor: Jason Combs)

Brown/T. Moore moved to discuss the course. Motion carried.

After considerable discussion the Council determined the course is more of an introduction course and does not meet the portal course criteria.

Hanson/Brown moved to return the course for reconceptualization. Motion carried.

2. Submission Procedures for Capstone Course – Proposed Revision of Language:

Brown provided the Council with a copy of proposed changes to the language for the documents outlining the submission process for GS courses available on the website. After limited discussion, the Council suggested changing the word “valid” to “recognized” in the language.

Burger/Wirtz moved to approve the word change. Motion carried.

The following statement will be added in the appropriate place on all forms requiring the submission of a syllabus (new language in bold):

*Attach a copy of the syllabus for the proposed course. **Submitted syllabi should be as complete as possible, much like the syllabus the instructor is using in their existing classes.***

For the document outlining the development of and submission of a new Capstone course, the following language will be used (new language in bold):

*The Capstone is an interdisciplinary experience that culminates the students General Studies experience. In this course, learners apply all the knowledge, cognitive abilities, and communication skills they have gained from General Studies in designing and completing an original project or paper. A Capstone course integrates **at least two different** academic disciplines – that of the instructor plus **at least one** other not closely related discipline. **The disciplines do not need to represent existing majors, minors, or programs of study currently offered at UNK as long as the disciplines are recognized disciplines.***

3. Assessment and GS Program:

a. Democracy Instrument and Rubric:

Kelley discussed with the Council a proposed change in the current instrument used to assess Democracy in Perspective courses. Kelley noted that the current instrument is difficult to use when measuring Learning Outcome #2; as a result, Kelley introduced an alternative instrument to be considered.

Wirtz/Kruse moved to approve adding Kelley’s suggested assessment. Motion carried with one abstention.

Democracy Assessment (Learning Outcomes 1 and 2)

Democracy is a beautiful idea—government by and for the people. Democracy promises us the freedom to exercise our highest capacities while it protects us from our own worst tendencies. In democracy as it ought to be, all adults are free to chime in, to join the conversation on how they should arrange their life together. And no one is left free to enjoy the unchecked power that leads to arrogance and abuse. (Paul Woodruff, 2005, First Democracy, p. 3)

Democracy is a principle, a process, and a structure. Democracy is an unfolding process in which citizens collectively face challenges whereby democracy can improve or regress. Since change is a central characteristic of democracy, it varies by time and place.

From your course material you are to analyze a challenge, issue or crisis in democracy. Your analysis must discuss the mobilization or engagement of citizens in regards to your case. If you are examining an historical case discuss how the outcome effected democracy. If your case is ongoing what is the promise or challenge to democracy? Describe the primary actors in your case. What do they want or what do they hope to change?

b. Oral Communication – Learning Outcome 5:

Hanson introduced and discussed with the Council a new method for assessing the Oral Communication learning outcome #5 – which states that “*Students can assess oral argumentation as a critical consumer*”. The current instruments and rubrics for Oral Communication are not capable of measuring this outcome as the outcome requires students not only assess oral argumentation but that the quality of their judgment be assessed. A Committee (R. Hanson, G. Lawson, and A. Messersmith) suggests that the following procedure be followed to assess Outcome #5:

1. *A text is prepared that contains specific and identifiable flaws in oral argumentation. A trained speaker (likely our UNK forensics coach) will record the speech and will include both the argumentation flaws as well some clearly defined speaking flaws.*
2. *Students in oral communication classes will view the recording of the speech and will fill complete an assessment of the speech.*
3. *The assessment will have a series of approximately 10 items that list flaws that a speaker could make in oral argumentation. Students will be asked to identify which of these flaws appeared in the speech.*
4. *A score is computed by counting the number of correct answers on the assessment.*
5. *We will need to establish a baseline score of what would constitute Advanced, Proficient, Developing, Beginning.*
6. *This assessment would require an updated text each year it is delivered in order to provide for things such as current citations.*

Kelley/Burger moved to approve. Motion carried.

IV. Other:

V. Adjournment:

Burger/Brown moved to adjourn at 5:10 p.m. Motion carried.

NEXT REGULAR MEETING: Thursday, March 5, 2015, at 3:30 p.m., Warner Conference Room.