

**General Studies Council Minutes**  
**September 3, 2020 @ 3:30 p.m.**  
**Via Zoom**  
**\*\*Approved via Email\*\***

**Present:** Sri Seshadri, Sherri Harms, Jeong Hoon Choi, Michelle McKelvey, Nita Unruh, Doug Tillman, Tim Farrell, Rebecca Umland, Jeff Wells, Joan Blauwkamp, Jeremy Dillon, Joel Berrier, Rochelle Reeves, Lisa Neal, Amy Rundstrom, Aaron Estes, Beth Hinga, Jessie Bialas, Joel Cardenas

**Absent:** Mark Ellis

**Guests:** Ralph Hanson, Michelle Beissel Heath, Alyssa Wyant, Jane Ziebarth-Bovill, Dave Luker, Ryan Schmidt

**I. Call to Order:**

Blauwkamp called the meeting to order. New Council members were introduced. Blauwkamp gave Ellis's update on the Director search – the search process is moving quickly and a new Director will be named very shortly.

1. **Approve Agenda:** Tillman/McKelvey moved to approve the agenda. **Motion carried.**
2. **Minutes from the April 30, 2020 meeting were approved via email.**

**II. Ongoing Business: Transition to LOPERs GS Program**

**1. Review and final approval for provisionally-approved courses (Syllabi of record)**

The following provisionally approved syllabi were submitted to the council for final approval.

**BIOL 103**

Seshadri/Reeves moved to give final approval for BIOL 103 to meet LOPER 8

Unruh stated that the department assurance is not in the syllabus that was submitted for approval. She stated that it is a requirement for the syllabus of record. Blauwkamp stated that is not in the syllabus but the Director could follow up on it. Wells asked how long can the old GS program language be used in the syllabi? Blauwkamp stated that it should not be in syllabi of record that are submitted for final approval. Dillon stated that the new syllabi should not be approved with the old program language as the Council approving courses for inclusion in the new LOPERs GS program.

Wells moved to approve the syllabus with the old language removed from the syllabus. Blauwkamp stated this syllabus does not explain how it meets the LOPER 8 requirements. Unruh stated the Council needs to decide if all courses must explain how they will meet the requirements. Blauwkamp stated that out of all the syllabi submitted this course is the only one that does not explain how it will meet the requirements. Neal suggested that they take out all the old GS program language, but include a link to older

catalogs to allow students who are completing the old GS program to find their learning outcomes. Blauwkamp asked Seshadri if he would rescind his motion to give final approval to BIOL 103.

Seshadri agreed to rescind his motion.

Unruh/Tillman moved to have the syllabus revised and resubmitted before final approval is granted. The syllabus must remove the old purpose statement and program and category learning outcomes, add an explanation of how the course meets the learning outcomes for LOPER 8, and include the department assurance statements. **Yes-12 /No-0 Motion Carried**

### **BIOL 215**

Blauwkamp stated that the department assurance statements were not provided, but the syllabus includes the program objective, learning outcomes, and explanation of how the outcomes will be met for LOPER 8.

Wells/Farrell moved to grant final approval to BIOL 215 to meet LOPER 8, pending receipt of the department assurance statement. **Yes-10/No-1/Abstain-1 Motion Carried**

### **ENG 101**

Blauwkamp stated that the department assurance came via email, and the syllabus has the program objective, learning outcomes for LOPER 2, and explanation of how the course meets those outcomes. Neal asked if it has the purpose statement. Blauwkamp stated that there is not a revised purpose statement written yet.

Wells/Seshadri moved to grant final approval for ENG 101 to meet LOPER 2. **Yes-12/No-0 Motion Carried**

### **ENG 102**

Blauwkamp stated that the department assurance came via email and the syllabus has the program objective, learning outcomes for LOPER 2, and explanation of how the course meets those outcomes. Unruh asked if it is required to take only one English course in new LOPERs GS program? Blauwkamp stated that was correct

Seshadri/Tillman moved to grant final approval for ENG 102 to meet LOPER 2. **Yes-12/No-0 Motion Carried**

### **PSCI 110**

Blauwkamp stated that the syllabus has the department assurance, and it includes the program objective, learning outcomes for LOPER 7, and explanation of how the course meets those outcomes. Umland asked if the Council will be asking for one syllabus or two for those courses that want to apply to count for more than one LOPER? Blauwkamp stated the Council would only ask for one syllabus that demonstrates how the course meets both sets of learning outcomes.

Seshadri/Reeves moved to grant final approval to PSCI 110 to meet LOPER 7. **Yes-12/No-0 Motion Carried**

Blauwkamp stated that syllabi for provisionally approved courses should slowly trickle in throughout the year. If the provisionally approved courses have not been granted final approval by the end of the year, the provisional approval will expire.

## 2. Revision of GS documents: course submission instructions and syllabus guidelines

Blauwkamp stated that the Council needs to get the course submission instructions out to campus as soon as possible, so departments know what is needed to apply for new courses to be approved in the LOPERs Program. The drafted instructions are similar to the instructions that were in place for the old program. The new sections are: Part 2 Section B (page 3), with the department assurance statements; Part 2 Section C (pages 3 & 4), the suitability for the GS program, which lists the categories for the new LOPERs Program; and two of the Evaluation Criteria (page 5) that address disciplinary expertise and appropriate courses for non-majors or new learners.

There was discussion about changing the language in the Evaluation Criteria section regarding the bullet point (3) “*Is the course being proposed from a qualified academic discipline for that LOPER category?*”. Blauwkamp asked if there is motion to revise the Evaluation Criteria?

Seshadri/Umland moved to change the language to “*Is the course being proposed from a ~~qualified~~ **an appropriate** academic discipline for that LOPER category?*”

Farrell stated that Dr. Bicak should be consulted if the language is changed, as he approved the program with the “in a discipline” requirement. Wells agreed. Umland stated that the outcomes under LOPER 5, for example, might apply to courses outside of the arts disciplines. She stated faculty can apply if their course meet the relevant outcomes and that it is possible that someone in English could be qualified to teach courses for LOPER 5 (example: teaching a film studies or Shakespeare on the stage course.) Umland also stated that she agrees with changing “qualified to “appropriate.” Dillon stated that he feels it is opening the floodgates for faculty to claim they can teach courses in any category.

The motion to change the evaluation criterion from “a qualified” to “an appropriate” academic discipline: **Yes-7/No-5 Motion Carried**

Blauwkamp asked if there is anything else that needs to be changed in the Course Submission Instructions. Umland asked what was going to happen with the First Year Seminar. Blauwkamp stated that if it is a new course it will need to go through the Academic Affairs approval process and that “First Year Seminar” must be in the title. Unruh stated that she thinks that the course number should be the same across every department on campus. Neal will look for suitable numbers that can be used for the purpose (not -188). Umland asked if the course could be submitted to GS Council at the same time it is submitted to Academic Affairs. Blauwkamp stated that there would need to be documentation that the course was going through the Academic Affairs process, but the two processes could be simultaneous. The Council will not vote final approve for a new course to be included in General Studies until the FS Academic Affairs Committee has approved its creation. Wells asked if the Council should have guidelines in place

with deadlines for course submissions to avoid a rush in the spring. Unruh agreed that it would streamline the process. Blauwkamp asked if the Council could finalize the Course Submission Instructions then decide on a schedule. Wells agreed.

Seshadri/Farrell moved to approve the Course Submission Instructions with the approved change. **Yes:9/No: 3 Motion Carried**

Blauwkamp asked if the Guidelines for GS Course Syllabi could be approved. They duplicate Part 3 of the course submission instructions that were just approved.

Berrier/Seshadri moved to approve the Guidelines for GS Course Syllabi.  
**Yes:12/No:0 Motion Carried**

Wells suggested the following:

“These proposed deadlines are when the departments would be required to submit the syllabi to the GSC. This would allow us to go through the usual approval process and timeline and have the courses approved by the end of April 2021. It would also give us time to help refine expectations for LOPER 1.

October: LOPER 2, LOPER 3, and LOPER 4

November: LOPER 5 and LOPER 6

December: LOPER 7 and LOPER 8

January: LOPER 9, LOPER 10, and LOPER 11\*

February: LOPER 1

March: Last-chance submissions (or resubmittals)

\* This is for courses applying for only LOPER 9, 10, or 11 designation. Proposals for courses to satisfy both a foundational academic skills or a broad knowledge area and a dispositional area should be submitted according to the schedule.”

Umland stated that this should be a suggestion so departments can still submit after the dates in the schedule. Unruh stated that courses should also be allowed to be submitted early but that she does like the timeline. Seshadri stated that he does not like the word “deadline” and that it should be sent out as a “suggested timeline.”

Wells/Seshadri moved to approve the suggested timeline for course submissions.  
**Yes: 11/No: 1 Motion Carried**

Items 3 and 4 and the rest of the agenda were not addressed due to time constraints.

### **3. Updating the GS Governance document (due to CAS merger and other changes)**

**4. Assessment of General Studies**

**III. New Business:**

- 1. New course proposals: (Nothing submitted)**

**IV. Other Business:**

**V. Adjournment: 5:02 pm**