

University General Education Committee Meeting Minutes
February 13, 2019
4 p.m.
HCC 111

Present: Nicole Crowder (CAS; chair), Brooke DiLauro (CAS), Lance Gentry (CoB), Chris Musina (CAS; secretary), Kelly Perkins (CAS), Farhang Rouhani (CAS), Marie Sheckels (CoE), Tim O'Donnell (ex officio), Debra Schleef (ex officio), Rita Dunston (ex officio), John Morello (ex officio), Rosemary Arneson (guest)

Absent: Brian Ogle (ex officio)

Meeting Began: 4:03 pm

1. Minutes from January 23, 2019

Approved as amended.

2. Courses for re-evaluation for general education credit
 - a. ALPP - at equivalency checking service.
 - b. GI - Student has already received credit for this Gen Ed.
3. Courses for Community Engagement designation
 - a. Patterson GEOG 365A - Approved
 - b. Rettinger IDIS 350V - Approved
 - c. Hydorn STAT 180 - Approved
4. Discussion of information literacy and digital fluency – Rosemary Arneson, guest

Rosemary Arneson spoke to the committee about the Library, literacy and digital fluency.

Rosemary and Jeff McClurken have differences of opinion on what digital literacy and digital fluency are. In her view what we are doing as educators is helping our students learn the language and tools of scholarship. How the student uses those and becomes fluent in the discipline is not dependent on whether something is digital or not digital, but on how the student finds and uses the information, and makes it into something of his or her own. She stated that Jeff McClurken feels that Fluency and Literacy are different and she feels that they are the same.

Part of her issue with the digital liberal arts is that, in her view, 10 years from now digital will be obsolete. She feels that rather than working with students on how you use the tool, we should be working with them on why. She feels that there is an issue with digital fluency being seen only as the province of DTLT, and that the library's

voice in this conversation is getting lost. She shared a document with the committee on the information on the literacy information movement in libraries.

She feels that the Gen Ed is a place where we can integrate this process. The library builds on the FSEM foundation of digital literacy concepts. The tools of scholarship in their field. As far as how this relates to the Gen Ed requirements - she would ask that when we think about Digital Intensive we think beyond what DTLT can do for the students and faculty. Rosemary plans to have a one page doc. to share at the UFC meeting in March.

The committee agreed that the D.I. requirement should be broad and take this information into consideration.

5. Discussion of a Gen Ed Fora

The committee then went on to look at where the last Gen Ed process was at the same time in their revision, seeing that we are fairly on track, if not ahead.

The committee felt that we need to get more data out there, and there needs to be more conversation on the financial state of the university. The urgency in this matter is why we should not delay. The urgency is now. Our understanding of this urgency has evolved over the course of our work.

When we looked at this information, we still went with what we feel the students need, while considering the financial aspect, and the strategic vision. Our Gen Eds are also too big to put something in without taking something away. We discussed the actual size of our Gen Ed, knowing that in the best of circumstances it may be about 34 credits, in the worst probably over 61, the average being around 48/50.

We may not have made the case that students are not coming here because of the Gen Eds. We talked about the data that was collected on this, and it was noted that while it was not anecdotal, it was also not methodical. However, language is the largest hurdle.

Where are the students going? The committee looked at the differences in what different schools accept. This led into further discussion on the second language, and the committee returned to the possibility to model different paths. This could be put out to the faculty. They would have to be equivalent.

6. Further Discussion of Revision Options.

The committee further discussed second language options, including how High School credits transfer in, how it has worked at UMW in the past, and how it works at other programs.

The committee also discussed how the SI could work in our models, specifically how we could fulfill a lower level SI course, looking to existing courses, and considering we may need greater supply, and that some students bring in credit. This may be a place for a possible Sophomore Seminar to step in.

We also discussed a couple more models as per Jackie's request. The smallest possible version, WI and SI would have to be standalone. 30 credits. as well as moving the current Gen Ed into our categories.

They have been given to Jackie and Anand - the committee does not endorse these as proposals.

The committee looked at more data surrounding the quantity of language credit hours taken by students, with about 55% taking 12 credit hours, as well as looking to the history of the Natural Science sequence, which came in with the last revision.

7. Discussion of Faculty Survey

The committee discussed questions to be posed in an upcoming faculty survey, responding to the feedback we have received in both the open fora and the online responses. We discussed the need for clarifications as a part of the survey as well.

The committee then discussed future fora, the option of a student forum, and added a Gen Ed Committee meeting on Feb 20th.

Meeting Adjourned: 6:36 pm