Rhode Island College Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

Minutes for the meeting of 22 March 2024

2.00pm-4.00pm, by Zoom

**Present**: Sue Abbotson (Chair), Suchandra Basu, Wendy Becker, Todd Borgerding, John Burke, Carol Cummings, Seth Dixon, Natasha Feinberg, Anthony Galvez, Annette Griffin, Quenby Hughes, Carolynn Masters, Soumyadeep Mukherjee, Glenn Rawson, Kemal Saatcioglu, Traci Weinstein

**Absent**: Cat Nobre

**Excused**: Qian Liu, Cara McDermott-Fasy,

**Guests**: Lisa Bain, Eliani Basile, Michael Casey, Lisa Connelly, Joan Dagle, Andrea DelVecchio, Justin DiLibero, Justin Feeney, Cheryl Hersperger, Donna Huntley-Newby, Robyn Linde, Linda Mendonca, Elisa Miller, Bethany Petronio-DeFanti, David Ramirez, Sankeerth Rampa, Dianne Reilly, Alison Shonkwiler

1. Call to order at 2:05

2. **Motion to Approve** the Minutes of 22 March 2024, as corrected to spell "Saatcioglu" correctly (Griffin/Hughes)

***Action:*** *Approved (13 in favor, 2 abstaining)*

3. Report of the Chair

* Notification has been sent to the Chair of the Elections committee, Mark Medwid for nominations for the following seats: Arts, Humanities, Science, Social Science, Business, Nursing and Social Work, and he has sent out requests to departments—not had much response beyond a single nominee for each seat so unlikely to be any need for elections. I asked Val about student members, and she was going to ask the President of SCG. Waiting to hear back
* Any new members will be eligible to be nominated for the Executive UCC, alongside any continuing members (who currently appear to be happy to continue but if anyone else wants a shot—send me your nominations for the Executive UCC so we will know what the voting slate will be for the first May meeting (we do two meetings in May—the first to greet new members and elect officers; the second to complete this year’s business with this year’s committee—you need only attend the later meeting if you will not be on next year’s committee).
* NOTE: May meeting is now scheduled for 10th May as the 17 May date is post-commencement; to avoid clashing with Council and COGE, we shall have to meet in the late morning at 11am-1pm.
* The May meeting is a split one, with the first 15 minutes for just next year’s UCC committee to briefly convene to welcome any new members and do elections for the Executive UCC. The regular meeting with this year’s UCC and any proposers or reporters will begin at 11.15am, and new members may leave or stay as they wish. It will begin with Annual reports from Student Designed Majors, Honors College, COGE, Transfer Minors and the Writing Board.

1. Monthly Reports

* COGE report: *COGE Chair Suchandra Basu reported that on April 5th COGE approved the proposal for revisions to General Education (12 in favor), and that since then they have been working with Philosophy and Modern Languages to offer courses in the proposed new History/Philosophy and Literature/Language Distribution categories. Proposals to include PHIL 100 and PHIL 206 in that HIST/PHIL category, and a proposal to include ENGL 220 in the proposed Elective Distribution category, were approved at COGE this morning. A new fully online RN to BSN program was also approved at COGE this morning.*
* ***Discussion****: none*

1. New Business

***Motion to Approve #070*** *(Cummings/Saatcioglu)*

* 23-24-070 Approve the revision of the HCA major to reduce it by 12 credits, from 82-88 to 70-76 by removing MATH 177 as a requirement and moving MGT 322 and COMM 230/336 to electives as opposed to requirements—it is felt these changes will not affect the rigor of the program but will make it more manageable for students.
* ***Discussion****: Proposer Sankeerth Rampa summarized the changes listed above, noting that they are in line with some other programs in the region.*
* ***Action****: Unanimously approved.*

***Motion to Approve #071*** *(Becker/Feinberg)*

* 23-24-071 Approve the creation of a new early spring 4-credit online course POL 349 Environmental Policy and Law, that can be used as an elective for Political Science, Public Administration, and INGOs (CUS and minor) and as a depth course for Environmental Studies (Major and minor).
* ***Discussion****: Proposer Robyn Linde noted that this proposal fills a topical deficit in the program, and that this course is included in the proposal for a new Public Policy program that is also on today's agenda.*
* ***Action****: Unanimously approved.*

***Motion to Approve #072*** *(Weinstein/Becker)*

* 23-24-072 Approve the revision of ART 221 Metalsmithing: Fabrication and Forming and ART 223: Metalsmithing and Jewelry: Casting/Duplication Processes to delete the current prerequisites to allow non-art majors to more readily take the courses. As 200-level courses they are foundational and need no prerequisite.
* ***Discussion****: none*
* ***Action****: Unanimously approved.*

***Motion to Bundle and Approve #073 through #078*** *(Griffin/Galvez)*

* 23-24-073 Approve the creation of a new 4-credit NURS 208W Scholarly Inquiry and Practice in Nursing for use in the new online RN to BSN program. NURS 207 Baccalaureate Education for Nursing will also be deleted as no longer needed.
* 23-24-074 Approve the creation of a new 4-credit NURS 317 Quality, Economics, Equity and Health Financing for use in the new online RN to BSN program.
* 23-24-075 Approve the creation of a new 4-credit NURS 318 Person-Centered Physical and Health Assessment for use in the new online RN to BSN program.
* 23-24-076 Approve the creation of a new 4-credit NURS 371 Global, Community and Public Policy for use in the new online RN to BSN program.
* 23-24-077 Approve the creation of a new 4-credit NURS 377 Contemporary Nursing: Issues, Innovation, and Transformation for use in the new online RN to BSN program.
* 23-24-078 Approve the creation of a new 2-credit course NURS 378 Capstone for use in the new online RN to BSN program.
* ***Discussion****: Proposer Donna Huntley-Newby explained that this set of proposals meets the latest accreditation requirements and responds to a need in RI healthcare workforce to have more nurses with a Bachelor's degree.*
* ***Action****: Unanimously approved.*

***Motion to Approve #079*** *(Mukherjee/Griffin)*

* 23-24-079 Approve the creation of a new fully Online RN to BSN program for 22 nursing credits alongside 8 additional Gen.Ed/elective credits, which incorporates the BPS model of Gen Ed. Students in this program transfer in 90 credits and will only be required to complete 30 credits at RIC rather than 45.
* ***Discussion****: In response to questions, proposer Donna Huntley-Newby explained that students in the current in-person program will be taught out by spring 2025. Then proposer, UCC Chair Sue Abbotson, COGE Chair Suchandra Basu and FAS Dean Quenby Hughes together amended the version of the proposal posted on the UCC website to be in accordance with the version approved at COGE this morning: (a) the provision in A.4 for use of BPS courses is removed, and (b) the reference in F.5 to the "College Math and Writing Requirements" is clarified as the Math Milestone and the First Year Writing course requirement. This will offer prospective BN candidates a much-needed online program rather than an in-person.*
* ***Action****: Unanimously approved as amended.*

***Motion to Bundle and Approve #080 through #093*** *(Griffin/Feinberg)*

* 23-24-080 Approve the creation of a new 2-credit course NURS 100 Healthcare Careers: Foundations for Success for use in a new BSN program. IM Nursing students will take this course instead of RIC 100. Graded S/U.
* 23-24-081 Approve the creation of a new 3-credit course NURS 230 Health Promotion and Disease Prevention for use in a new BSN program.
* 23-24-082 Approve the creation of a new 4-credit course NURS 231 Pathopharmacology for use in a new BSN program.
* 23-24-083 Approve the creation of a new 3-credit course NURS 232 Health Assessment of Diverse Populations for use in a new BSN program.
* 23-24-084 Approve the creation of a new 6-credit course NURS 233 Essentials of Nursing Knowledge and Practice for use in a new BSN program.
* 23-24-085 Approve the creation of a new 3-credit course NURS 234W Scholarly Inquiry and Informatics for use in a new BSN program. This will be a WID course.
* 23-24-086 Approve the creation of a new 6-credit course NURS 351 Adult Nursing Care of Common Conditions for use in a new BSN program.
* 23-24-087 Approve the creation of a new 6-credit course NURS 352 Person-Centered Psychiatric/Mental Health Nursing for use in a new BSN program.
* 23-24-088 Approve the creation of a new 6-credit course NURS 353 Adult Nursing Care of Complex Conditions for use in a new BSN program.
* 23-24-089 Approve the creation of a new 3-credit course NURS 354 Innovative Leadership for use in a new BSN program.
* 23-24-090 Approve the creation of a new 6-credit course NURS 381 Family-Centered Pediatric Nursing for use in a new BSN program.
* 23-24-091 Approve the creation of a new 6-credit course NURS 382 Maternal Newborn Nursing for use in a new BSN program.
* 23-24-092 Approve the creation of a new 6-credit course NURS 383 Global, Community and Public Policy for use in a new BSN program.
* 23-24-093 Approve the creation of a new 6-credit course NURS 384 Nursing Practice Synthesis for use in a new BSN program.
* ***Discussion****: Proposer Bethany Petronio-DeFanti explained that this set of proposals is designed to meet latest accreditation standards that include more experiential coursework. Dean Justin DiLibero and UCC Chair clarified that for students who later change majors from Nursing to some other RIC program, NURS 100 will satisfy the RIC 100 graduation requirement. Conversely, if a student who has already taken RIC 100 but decided later to join the Nursing program, they will have the NURS 100 waived.*
* ***Action****: Unanimously approved.*

***Motion to Approve #094*** *(Griffin/Cummings)*

* 23-24-094 Approve a new more contemporary Nursing BSN program that will be offered in the Fall. Current Nursing students will be able to continue to follow the program for which they signed up and the courses they need will be phased out once they are done. It will be 90 credits, and the old one was listed as 80—but it had 12 hidden prerequisites and would take 125 credits to complete. The new program has no hidden prerequisites, and will have 12 credits that can double count as Gen Eds. This means it can be completed in 118 credits (as long as the second language requirement has been deleted). The proposal is also revising the admission requirements for those aiming to get the Second Bachelor Degree BSN, and making a slight revision to the prerequisite of NURS 220 Foundations of Therapeutic Interventions to accommodate people who may be unable to take the BIOL 335.
* ***Discussion****: none*
* ***Action****: Unanimously approved.*

***Motion to Bundle and Approve #095 and #096*** *(Dixon/Weinstein)*

* 23-24-095 Approve the removal of all prerequisites from the following 200-level HIST courses: HIST 201 United States History: 1400 to 1800; HIST 202 United States History: 1800 to 1920; HIST 203 United States History: 1920 to the Present; HIST 204 Global History Since 1600; HIST 209 The American Revolution; HIST 217 American Gender & Women’s History; HIST 218 American Foreign Policy: The Cold War & Beyond; HIST 219 Popular Culture in 20th Century America; HIST 220 Ancient Greece; HIST 221 The Roman Republic; HIST 222 The Roman Empire; HIST 223 Medieval Europe; HIST 224 Modern Europe; HIST 234 Challenges and Confrontations: Women in Europe; HIST 235 Voices of the Great War; HIST 236 Post-Independence Africa; HIST 238 Early Imperial China; HIST 239 Japanese History through Art and Literature; HIST 241 Colonial & Neocolonial Latin American History; HIST 242 Modern Latin America; and HIST 243 Latino Peoples and US History. Previously they used any HIST Gen.Ed. course but given these are foundational courses that is not really needed and this will offer students more options. Several programs use these courses and they have been notified to be able to update Rhode Maps.
* 23-24-096 Approve the revision of all prerequisites from the following 300-level HIST courses (to become 30 completed college credits or consent of department chair): HIST 306 Protestant Reformation and Catholic Renewal; HIST 307 Europe in the Age of Enlightenment; HIST 308 Europe in the Age of Revolution, 1789-1850; HIST 309 Europe in the Age of Nationalism, 1850-1914; HIST 310 Twentieth-Century Europe; HIST 311 The Origins of Russia to 1700; HIST 312 Russia from Peter to Lenin; HIST 313 The Soviet Union and After; HIST 318 Tudor-Stuart England; HIST 320 American Colonial History; HIST 322 The Early American Republic; HIST 323 The Gilded Age and the Progressive Era; HIST 324 Crises of American Modernity, 1914-1945; HIST 325 Superpower America 1945-1990; HIST 328 History of the American West; HIST 329Civil War and Reconstruction; HIST 330 History of American Immigration; HIST 331 Rhode Island History; HIST 332 The American Presidency; HIST 334 African American History; HIST 336 The United States and the Emerging World; HIST 340 The Muslim World in the Age of Muhammad to 1800; HIST 341 The Muslim World in Modern Times, 1800 to the Present; HIST 342 Islam and Politics in Modern History; HIST 345 Conflict, Globalization, and Modern East Asia; HIST 348 Africa under Colonial Rule; HIST 354 Nationalism and National Identities; HIST 355 Everyday Life History; and HIST 357 Public History Experiences. Previously they used any HIST Gen. Ed. course but just some college experience should be sufficient and so they will switch to using 30 completed credits as their prerequisite, and this will offer students even more options. Several programs use these courses and they have been notified to be able to update Rhode Maps. there is a note regarding hist prerequisites at the end of the global studies major program that will need to be deleted.
* ***Discussion****: Proposer Elisa Miller explained that these proposals are motivated by the expected revision to General Education, which will no longer include a universal requirement of a 100-level History course; and that the new prerequisite to 300-level courses is similar to the ones in History at URI and in Philosophy at RIC.*
* ***Action****: Unanimously approved.*

***Motion to Approve #097*** *(Griffin/Galvez)*

* 23-24-097 Approve the switching of WID course designations for ART programs, removing the “W” from ART 231W and 232W but adding it to ART 331, 332, 333, 334, 336, 337. Students in all programs currently take at least one of the 300-level courses and they are a more appropriate place to teach writing in the discipline as many non-art majors take 231 and 232. Some ART and ARTE courses use 231 and 232 as prerequisites, and those will remain as 231 or 231W and 232 or 232W for students who have already taken them.
* ***Discussion****: none*
* ***Action****: Unanimously approved.*

***Motion to Approve #098*** *(Becker/Hughes)*

* 23-24-098 Approve the addition of recently developed courses PHIL 207 Technology and the Future of Humanity to the Minor in Principles of Knowledge and Reality, and both PHIL 207 and 208 Introduction to Theories of Justice to the Minor in Logical and Ethical Reasoning to allow students more choice in these minors, without affecting any totals.
* ***Discussion****: Proposer Glenn Rawson briefly discussed the points listed above.*
* ***Action****: Unanimously approved.*

***Motion to Approve #099*** *(Dixon/Burke)*

* 23-24-099 Approve the revision of the BM in Music Education to remove a restricted elective from the program that required either SPED 433 Special Education: Best Practices and Applications or TESL 402 Applications of Second Language Application. The program includes SPED 333 Introduction to Special Education: Policies/Practices and TESL 401 Introduction to Teaching Bilinguals and is not required by RIDE to do more than these. This will decrease the program total from 98 to 95 total credits.
* ***Discussion****: Proposer Todd Borgerding and FSEHD Dean Carol Cummings explained that this proposal was worked out with FSEHD; that the Music Education RhodeMap will include the point that students should still take SPED 433 or TESL if they seek the relevant RIDE "Endorsement" in either of those subjects; and that a similar note will be included in the College Catalog.*
* ***Action****: Unanimously approved.*

***Motion to Approve #100*** *(Griffin/Feinberg)*

* 23-24-100 Approve the creation of a new 20 CUS in Cybersecurity that will focus on non-traditional students and working professionals looking to gain additional education and skills in cybersecurity.
* ***Discussion****: Proposer Lisa Bain explained that this opens a new pathway for adult learners, nontraditional students and working professionals; and that it meets needs in the Cybersecurity Institute and satisfies a project goal for the Langevin Grant for the Workforce Development Hub.*
* ***Action****: Unanimously approved.*

***Motion to Approve #101*** *(Hughes/Weinstein)*

* 23-24-101 Approve the revision of the prerequisites of FIN 301 and rather than require MATH 177, give students other options that will be sufficient for success in the course.
* ***Discussion****: Proposer Kemal Saatcioglu noted that this proposal brings program requirements into line with current practice that the department has been managing with course substitution forms.*
* ***Action****: Unanimously approved.*

***Motion to Bundle and Approve #102 and #103*** *(Hughes/Becker)*

* 23-24-102 Approve the revision of the cognates for all of the Management programs, to delete the requirement of MATH 177 and MATH 248 and replace with the option of MATH 240 or MATH 248. This will reduce the concentrations by 4 credits from 76 to 72.
* 23-24-103 Approve the revision of the cognates for the Marketing program, to delete the requirement of MATH 177 and MATH 248 and replace with the option of MATH 240 or MATH 248. This will reduce the program by 4 credits from 76 to 72.
* ***Discussion****: Proposer Justin Feeney noted that this proposal streamlines the program, aligns the Math requirement with industry needs, and removes a "hidden prerequisite" in the calculation of program credit hours.*
* ***Action****: Unanimously approved.*
* ***Motion to Approve #104*** *(Burke/Cummings)*
* 23-24-104 Approve the initial plan for a new General Education program that removes the secondary language requirement and ensures the program can be completed in 40 credits. RIC 100 will become a college requirement (such as the Math milestone), and Connections courses will have a new prerequisite and be allowed to count in programs. Science will no longer require a lab and the AQSR courses will go into a new “elective” category to which additional non-science-based courses can be added, as well as the chance to take a second Connections course. The Literature category will merge with Language, and the History merge with Philosophy. Math will be moved into a first-year experience category.
* ***Discussion****: Many questions were answered as follows, mostly by COGE Chair Suchandra Basu (= SB), FAS Dean and member of COGE Executive Quenby Hughes (= QH), FAS Associate Dean Joan Dagle = (JD), and UCC Chair Sue Abbotson (= SA). Traci Weinstein: Question: How will Modern Languages courses at levels 101 and 102 fit into the new program, and how will they serve students this summer? SB: Graduating seniors who are finishing coursework in summer and still need to satisfy their Second Language Milestone can do so in summer. Other students will be automatically switched to the new Gen Ed curriculum, and so they can choose whether to take those courses or not. COGE is working with Modern Languages to get some courses into the proposed Literature/Language Distribution category. Question: Can students who want to take language courses at levels 101, 102, 115 get these courses to count in the new Gen Ed program? SB: 101 may get counted in the Elective category, 102 may be in Literature/Language, and 115 will be in the Literature/Language category because it is already a Gen Ed Literature course. Question: Why are all students being automatically migrated to the new Gen Ed program rather than just new students, with continuing students having the option to opt in? QH: Unlike previous revisions to Gen Ed, this proposed revision is so compatible with work done for the current program that the opting-out plan will work better this time. Glenn Rawson: Question: What will the mechanism be for opting out? QH: Through the academic advisor; but we can't think of any case where a student will actually be worse off in the revised program. JD: If there should be any such students, the mechanism would be that the student discusses it with their academic advisor or with Records, then requests the change from me as FAS Associate Dean. I review for consequences the student may not have recognized, and if the student confirms that opting out is in their best interest, I authorize it for Records. Todd Borgerding: Question: If a student takes any 3-credit course to satisfy a Gen Ed requirement in the new program, how likely is it that they could end up satisfying all their Gen Ed requirements without having to exceed the minimum 40 credits of Gen Ed? SB: 40 credits is the NECHE minimum, and since this proposal reduces the RIC minimum from 49 to 40, then students who choose some 3-credit course, and so need to go on to somewhat more than 40 to satisfy all their Gen Ed requirements, will probably still be doing fewer Gen Ed credits than in the current program. QH: Being able to do more than the minimum 40 credits in Gen Ed is not necessarily a detriment and allowing for 3-credit courses that otherwise could not be in Gen Ed is also a benefit. Glenn Rawson: This matter is a concern for Philosophy, as we have just now hurried to propose some of our 3-credit courses for the prospective HIST/PHIL category. Since all the HIST courses there are 4 credits, students may well be disincentivized to take a 3-credit PHIL course that interests them. Todd Borgerding: Question: Was Foreign Languages part of Gen Ed? SB: Yes, through the Second Language requirement. SA: It wasn't officially included in the credit count because students could test out, but this was a bit of a run-around or gray area. Question: The proposal allows programs to tailor RIC 100 to the needs of their students. What would be an example of that, and what is happening to the college-wide RIC 100 administration? SA: RIC 100 will continue, and courses like the NURS 100 that we just approved today can substitute for it; but only intended nursing majors can take that, and if they later switch majors it still counts for their RIC 100 requirement. School of Business is working on something similar. And there is precedent for this, as there are currently some courses that can substitute for RIC 100. Question: The language about DEIA being central to Gen Ed and so distributed throughout it seems odd here. Isn't it central to the whole College? Why is it expressed that way here? QH: That language came from the Task Force proposal, and yes it is central to the whole College, and is about to be included in the new College Mission. Question: Should we trust that DEIA will in fact be worked into all Learning Outcomes, which are to be revised in the coming year, after we vote on this proposal and it becomes active? I'm uncomfortable with voting on this proposal while some distribution categories, like Arts, don't even have any learning outcomes assigned to them. QH: All categories do have learning outcomes assigned. For now, Learning Outcomes are being transferred from current distribution categories to corresponding proposed categories, including in the case of Arts. SA: And in the case of the proposed Elective category, courses must satisfy at least one of the existing Learning Outcomes. When the Learning Outcomes are revised in the coming year, all Gen Ed courses will have to be re-certified as satisfying those outcomes. Deep Mukherjee: Question: Will all AARs be automatically updated over summer to reflect the new program? SB: Good question! Todd Borgerding: Question: Will the various courses in the Math category all be 4 credits? Could there be 6-credit courses, as with the FYW 100-plus courses? John Burke: Math will reach out to all programs for versions of the Math requirement that suit them well, and I suppose 3-credit options could be a possibility for discussion. Question: What about prerequisites for courses in the proposed Gen Ed program? Could they have prereqs that are not Gen Ed courses? SA: Yes, and that is already possible. Question: Isn't that a way for programs to shut non-majors out of some Gen Ed offerings that are really designed to be part of a major? QH: Gen Ed offerings have to be directed at a general audience and so not be professional courses. For example, any courses that require a secondary admissions process could not be Gen Ed courses. But something like an advanced Math class with several prereqs could in principle be included. SB: COGE is revising its forms to clarify that Gen Ed courses must be sufficiently general and attractive to students across campus. The Learning Outcomes revision process in the coming year will include Learning Objectives for each Outcome that courses will have to satisfy. Response: Many have expressed concern that the proposed program is motivated by high-credit majors trying to reduce curricular pressures on their students by getting required professional courses to double-count with Gen Ed. This is troubling because there don't seem to be sufficient safeguards in place to prevent this. Question: Can we have assurances that if a student registers for a Gen Ed class in fall, nothing we do today in this vote can prevent that class from counting in Gen Ed? QH: All courses currently in Gen Ed have a place in the new Gen Ed. The only cases where current Gen Ed courses selected for the coming summer or fall might end up not satisfying any of a student's Gen Ed requirements would be language courses selected to satisfy the current Second Language Requirement, and then only if the student both has already satisfied their Literature requirement and has already taken a course that will satisfy the Elective category, because then there would be no place for that language course in that particular student's progress through the new Gen Ed curriculum. AQSR courses too will count in the Elective category. Seth Dixon: Question: Why was the AQSR requirement sacrificed in this proposal? SB: The idea was to keep those AQSR courses in the new program (they will be options in the Elective category) but make the whole program more inclusive and flexible with a place for professional schools to include appropriate courses that all students can sample in Gen Ed. Response: I've heard many are worried that many of these AQSR courses just won't be taken now, with no Gen Ed incentive to do so. SA: It was a result of all-around compromises. Hopefully good advising will help students to choose these courses when it's a good fit. SB: Students could take them to fill out their 40 credits in Gen Ed when they have taken a 3-credit course for one of the categories. Kemal Saatcioglu: Question: Will it be difficult for faculty advisors to recognize retroactively whether a student would have been better staying with the current Gen Ed program rather than being automatically migrated to the new one? SA: As Quenby mentioned earlier, the only place where we see the possibility for confusion or loss of credits here is with language courses, and we think that in most cases the language course selected for the current program will still find a place in the new program. In the rare possible case that it doesn't, learning some of that language is still also a benefit. QH: We believe that probably all students will benefit by being migrated to the new, more flexible program. SB: Most of the revisions involve making the Gen Ed program more inclusive and flexible; and then there is the revising of the Learning Outcomes, which for the time being does not create any problems for what you're asking about. David Ramirez: Question: If a student has already satisfied their language requirement, or if they take a language course this summer, then would that satisfy the proposed Literature/Language requirement? SA: Yes, so long as it's one of the language courses that will be approved for that category. Wendy Becker: Question: Can a CLEP exam for a language course count for the proposed Literature/Language course? SA, QH, JD: Yes, just as students can currently "CLEP out" of various Gen Ed requirements. Question: What about students who are unable to do their Math course requirement in the first year, or those for whom doing it in the first year is too daunting. SA: It's not a requirement but a recommendation. John Burke: That's correct, and recent educational research indicates that early completion of such requirements is generally better for students than later. John Burke: Question: There is a plan to have FNED 246 count in the Connections category. Will that be approved before the end of this semester, and if not, will it satisfy the Connections category retroactively? Generally, can a course satisfy a Gen Ed category only if it is taken after it was approved for that category? And can the computer system recognize that? QH: If a course must be changed in order to qualify for that Gen Ed category, then a version of the course taken before those changes should not count for that category. Carol Cummings: We will be making changes to that course, and I would not approve of it counting retroactively. Kemal Saatcioglu: Our computer system cannot recognize whether a course was taken before or after it was changed and approved for a Gen Ed category. SA: If a course needs substantial changes to qualify for Gen Ed, then it needs a new number to distinguish it. QH: A working idea for that FNED 246 is to broaden the course by giving assignments that would be answered in one kind of way by students planning to be teachers, and in another kind of way by students not planning to be teachers. In that sort of case, maybe a course could be "grandfathered in." But it's not clear-cut, and it would depend on how different the course ends up from how it has been up to now. Glenn Rawson: That seems a troubling example of attempting to have a professional preparation course count as a Gen Ed course. QH: That's an important line, and it puts a lot of pressure on COGE to make sure that line is respected. Deep Mukherjee: Question: What is the status of the Learning Outcomes, and why were the Task Force recommendations on Learning Outcomes not included in this proposal? SA: We ran out of time but wanted to move ahead with the other revisions. When the Learning Outcomes are revised as provided for in this proposal, all current Gen Ed courses will have to be recertified against those. Carol Cummings: Addressing what Glenn said, FSEHD is not looking to move professional courses into Gen Ed. I understand the purposes of Gen Ed and believe in Gen Ed. That particular course (FNED 246) is an early-level course that potentially provides students with a good fit for Connections, but if it doesn't fit well, we won't propose it. Todd Borgerding: Question: Is it true that any current Gen Ed course will remain a Gen Ed course, but some will need to find new homes? And if they need to find new homes then they need to go through COGE? SB: Yes. Question: So, the earlier answer about prior language courses counting in Gen Ed depends on the versions of those courses that end up approved for those categories? QH: Yes. Question: How different will Gen Ed versions of those language courses be from current or standard versions? SA: We'll have to see what gets approved through COGE. Question: How can we tell if passing the CLEP exam satisfies those outcomes? QH: This is similar to transfer articulations, when we decide based on the course content rather than the learning outcomes. JD: That's correct. And the college accepts a variety of CLEP exams for course credit, Gen Ed and otherwise. Colleges get to decide which exams they'll accept and how they'll award corresponding course credit (e.g., as elective credit or as specific courses). Similarly with AP credits. In none of those cases have those decisions been based on learning outcomes; they are based instead on course content. David Ramirez: Question: And those policies can be modified, right? And Modern Languages won't have to demonstrate (for inclusion in the proposed Language/Literature Distribution category) that a language course is a literature course, right? So, they shouldn't have to demonstrate that our proposed language courses meet the current learning outcomes for the current Literature category, right? Glenn Rawson: When Philosophy recently proposed some courses for the proposed History/Philosophy category, nobody expected those PHIL courses to be HIST courses; rather, they were expected to satisfy the Learning Outcomes for the HIST/PHIL category (which for now have just been transferred from the current HIST category, but will soon get revised).*
* ***Action****: Approved (14 in favor, 1 opposed)*

1. Any Other Business

* ***Meeting Adjourned*** *at 4:00.*

*Respectfully submitted by Glenn Rawson*