

General Studies Council: Notes from Special Meeting  
February 27, 2020 – 3:30 p.m.  
Warner Hall, 2147

**Present:** Julie Agard, Sylvia Asay, Joan Blauwkamp, Debbie Bridges, Greg Brown, Joel Cardenas, Jeremy Dillon, Mark Ellis, Tim Farrell, Beth Hinga, Lisa Neal, Sri Seshadri, Doug Tillman, Rebecca Umland, Ron Wirtz, Aaron Estes

**Absent:** Scott Darveau, Michelle Fleig-Palmer, Jeff Wells

**Guests:** Katherine Kime (Math & Statistics), Derek Boeckner (Mathematics & Statistics)

Bridges called meeting called to order at 3:30.

Bridges reminded Council that syllabi reviews due April 2.

Bridges outlined the goals for today's meeting: finalizing language for learning outcomes and determining criteria (number of learning outcomes a course must meet) for courses to be included in each category. Overall goal is to have a finalized proposal ready by the end of our first meeting in March which can be sent out to campus for review. After review period, the proposal will then go to campus for a vote. Bridges suggested going through each LOPER in order and addressing Program Level Outcomes last. Council consented.

LOPER 1, First-year Seminar

Bridges requested LOPER 1 to be taken up later to allow Aaron Estes to speak about his proposal. Council consented.

LOPER 2, Writing Skills.

Umland: Since English 101 has been arbitrarily decided to be the minimum, this means some of the proposed outcomes don't apply. Either we need to re-institute a WI if we need to meet these goals, emphasizing revision and specifying a number of pages, etc. Either modify to be 1 course writing skills, 1 course WI across the curriculum to take seriously what we want students to do. 101 not an argument-based course. We need some sort of revision. Blauwkamp: Which don't meet? Umland: Form and support a coherent position on an issue. 102 does that. If we want to emphasize writing as an important component of a liberal arts education we need to have some substantive, sustained writing activities. Blauwkamp: So we need to write the outcomes as expectations of what they will get out of 101? Umland: Not the only thing I'm saying. Brown: Part of why WI went away is that it was happening throughout campus in academic programs. Umland: WI could easily be instituted, and we would have to keep track. Bridges: How would we need to change the objectives to reflect what is in 101? Umland: Just strike d (Form and support a coherent position on an issue.)

Umland: Motion to put a line through d. Dillon seconds. Motion carries.

Motion to meet all outcomes: Brown/Blauwkamp. Motion carries.

LOPER 3. Oral communication skills.

No feedback sent to Bridges regarding outcomes. Pretty much same as we have in current program.

Motion to accept as currently written: Brown/Blauwkamp. Motion carries.

Motion to accept must meet all outcomes in category. Blauwkamp/Seshadri. Motion carries.

LOPER 4. Numeracy and quantitative reasoning skills.

Darveau proposes to replace proposed name with Mathematics, Statistics, and Analytical and Quantitative Thought.

Kime and Boeckner requested to speak to Council about their response to Darveau's proposal for LOPER 4. MATH proposes renaming LOPER 4 to Mathematics, Statistics, and Quantitative Reasoning. Rationale based

on the following: analytical thought should be incorporated into every course; many courses (in current A&Q Thought category) they feel do not fit, other courses that should fit that weren't included; software programming should be included. Requirements being met by certain standardized test scores okay, but taking a course in category still important. Analytical and Quantitative thought too broad, would change to quantitative reasoning. Deleted and/or because they were too broad. If we want to maintain the idea that students need to take a math/statistics/programming course. Blauwkamp: Instead of just adding "or software programming" to D as well would be appropriate? Problem is that if we want to include Cybersystems classes, need to include in D and A so those courses can meet all outcomes. Bridges: Are mathematicians okay with Council altering their proposed outcomes so Cybersystems courses will fit and meet all outcomes? Mathematicians: Yes, within reason. Bridges: Determine name of LOPER 4 first, then learning outcomes. Mathematicians: We believe that math, statistics, and programming courses fit in this category and others do not.

Move to make the title of LOPER 4 "Mathematics, Statistics, and Quantitative Reasoning."  
Blauwkamp/Seshadri. Motion carries.

Blauwkamp: Not sure of distinction in math proposal's C and E are different. Do we need both? Seshadri: Different because one involves "data crunching" and the other is more visual (graphical) information. Discussion.

Motion: Strike C from MATH's proposed learning outcomes. Blauwkamp/Asay. Motion carries.

Bridges: We have A, B, D, and E; how do we incorporate software programming?

Motion: A. Can describe problems using mathematical, statistical, or programming language.  
Blauwkamp/Brown. Motion carries.

Motion: B. Can solve problems using mathematical, statistical, or programming techniques. Seshadri/Wirtz.  
Motion carries.

Motion: D. Can construct logical arguments using mathematical, statistical, or programming concepts.  
Brown/Blauwkamp. Motion carries.

Motion: E. Can interpret and express numerical data or graphical information using mathematical, statistical, or programming concepts and methods. Blauwkamp/Seshadri. Motion carries.

Regarding LOPER 4: What has to be met? What is the minimum for the university? Some stats courses have ACT minimum to test into, then can count as GS math course? Keep current policy about students testing out of courses? If current policy stays in place, it will allow for students to test out of a course and take something else in the category. All students will be required to take a minimum of 3 hours in this category. Minimum is MATH 102.

Motion: Course must meet all outcomes to be in this category. Blauwkamp/Brown. Motion carries.

Bridges: Ultimately, some A&Q Thought classes will not come back in, but we don't know which courses since they have not yet applied.

LOPERs 5 – 8: consideration of language proposed "in a discipline" versus "of a discipline" (proposed by Brown). Discussion. Ellis: Dr. Bicak's feeling (and HLC requirements) state that an instructor has a master's and 18 hours in a field. Brown: Looking at two things, course content and qualifications of instructor. Bridges: If we narrowly define we run the risk of excluding.

Motion: Change language in LOPER 5, 6, 7, and 8 from “in a discipline” to “of a discipline.” Asay/Seshadri. Yea – 5, No – 5.

Noting that several Council members were absent, Bridges requested postponing the vote until March 5 to ensure the vote was determined by the Council.

Motion: Postpone vote on this until March 5 meeting to break tie. Dillon/Seshadri. Motion carries.

LOPERs 5 – 8: Individual learning outcomes.

Under current program, courses have to meet majority of outcomes in a category. Is that along the same lines that we want for new program, or something different? (Majority would be 3 of the 4.)

Motion: Courses must meet all learning outcomes in LOPERS 5, 6, 7, and 8. Blauwkamp/Brown. Motion carries.

Motion: Accept LOPER 5, 6, 7, and 8 as is. Brown/Seshadri.

Discussion. Umland: Don’t like d. How do you evaluate the significance of the arts? Farrell: D is the main thing we do. Can make and support an argument. Umland. Replace evaluate with articulate.

Motion to change D on LOPER 5, 6, 7, and 8 from evaluate to articulate. Umland/Wirtz. Motion carries.

LOPER 5: Visual or Performing Arts

Motion: Accept A, B, C, for LOPER 5 as is. Blauwkamp/Brown. Motion carries.

Next meeting is Thursday, March 5 at 3:30 p.m. in Warner Conference Room. Plan is to pick up where we left off today – individual learning outcomes for LOPERs 6 – 11, LOPER 1, and Program Level outcomes.

Meeting adjourned at 5:00pm.