

Amended  
UGEC Meeting  
Thursday, November 4, 2010

In attendance: Rich Bullock, Mindy Diesslin, Jean Edwards, Carole Endres, David Reynolds, Kim Stewart, Jeanne Fraker, Joe Law, Emily Jaudon, alternate for Rayne Bozeman, student government representative

Emily Jaudon (alternate for Rayne Bozeman, student government representative) was introduced.

BIO 3450

Returned with comments. All agreed to approve if changes were made.

Semester Core courses are typically at the 1000 or 2000 level. Can BIO 3450 be taught as a 2000 level course? Are there accreditation issues that dictate the course level?

A Core course should have a broad focus characteristic of general education courses and be open to all students. Please remove the restriction to majors in Early Childhood Education or Middle Childhood Education Programs. To ensure adequate spaces for those students, each semester the Department can request the Registrar reserve a percentage of the seats in the course for them. Offering the course with 3.5 semester credit hours may result in some students lacking the required 8 semester credit hour in Element 6 natural science. UGEC requests the course carry 4 semester credit hours.

Should this be an Ohio Transfer Module course? If so, that must be listed in the characteristics of the course in the workflow.

The syllabus lists the course as integrated writing. If that is correct, it must be one of the characteristics listed in the work flow.

Delete from the syllabus under III, Other: "Need Biological Sciences Department's signature". CHM 2450, listed as the semester prerequisite, has not been reviewed by UGEC and is not currently in the Workflow.

Send suggestions for proposing Core courses prepared by Henry Limouze.

CHM 1210

Rejected with comments.

Sent suggestions for proposing Core courses prepared by Henry Limouze.

Revise the course characteristics and the prerequisites listed in the workflow and on the syllabus to be consistent.

In response to Question 1 on the Core proposal form, each course must address one University learning objective and may address more. Identify each University learning objective the course meets and briefly show how each is addressed in the lectures, labs, readings or other assignments in the course.

In response to Question 2, briefly indicate how every Element learning outcome is addressed in lectures, labs, readings, discussions, or other assignments.

In response to Question 4 answer parts a, b, and c focusing on assessing how well the course is achieving the student learning outcomes. Part a focuses on assessing students' perceptions of the degree to which the course provides opportunities to achieve the learning outcomes. The revised WSU GE Student Learning Outcomes Evaluation Form could be used. Part b focuses on directly measuring student learning using tests, lab reports, presentations, etc. which faculty have agreed measure the Element learning outcomes. Part c focuses on how and by whom the data from both Part a and Part b are analyzed and reported to those responsible for course improvement and to UGEC annually.

Identify the course as an Element 6 Core course and quote the learning outcomes on the syllabus.

### CHM 1210L

Rejected with comments.

Revise the course characteristics and the prerequisites listed in the workflow and on the syllabus to be consistent.

In response to Question 1 on the Core proposal form, each course must address one University learning objective and may address more. Identify the each University learning object the course meets and how each is address in the lectures, readings or other assignments in the course.

In response to Question 2, indicate how each Element learning outcome is addressed in labs, reading, discussions, or other assignments.

In response to Question 4 answer each part a, b, and c focusing on assessing how well the course is achieving the learning outcomes. Part a focuses on assessing students' perceptions of the degree to which the course provides opportunities to achieve the learning outcomes. The revised WSU GE Student Learning Outcomes Evaluation Form could be used. Part b focuses on directly measuring student learning using tests, lab reports, presentations, etc. which faculty have agreed measure the Element learning outcomes. Part c focuses on how and by whom the data from both Part a and Part b are analyzed and reported to those responsible for course improvement and to UGEC annually.

Identify the course as an Element 6 Core course and quote the learning outcomes on the syllabus.

### CHM 1220L

Rejected with comments.

Revise the course characteristics and the prerequisites listed in the workflow and on the syllabus to be consistent.

In response to Question 1 on the Core proposal form, each course must address one University learning objective and may address more. Identify each University learning objective the course meets and how each is addressed in the labs, readings or other assignments in the course.

In response to Question 2, indicate how each Element learning outcome is address in labs, readings, discussions, or other assignments.

In response to Question 4 answer parts a, b, and c focusing on assessing how well the course is achieving the learning outcomes. Part a focuses on assessing students' perceptions of the degree to which the course provides opportunities to achieve the learning outcomes. The revised WSU GE Student Learning Outcomes Evaluation Form could be used. Part b focuses on directly measuring student learning using tests, lab reports, presentations, etc. which faculty have agreed measure the Element learning outcomes. Part c focuses on how and by whom the data from both Part a and Part b are analyzed and reported to those responsible for course improvement and to UGEC annually.

Identify the course as an Element 6 Core course and quote the learning outcomes on the syllabus. CHM 1220, the corequisite for this lab, was not in UGEC's worklist and therefore has not been reviewed as a Core course.

### EC 2600

Return with comments. This will come back to the committee.

The blank line in the title suggests this is a variable title course, but variable title is not checked in the workflow document. Revise course name and delete the blank line. Check variable title course in the workflow document.

The response to Question 2 Element 5 learning outcome b focuses on applying economic analysis. Please clearly indicate how the course also will address explaining and critiquing the methods of inquiry. This should also be addressed in the syllabus.

In response to Question 4 b indicate how the assessment is related to the learning outcomes, for example faculty may develop marker questions or grading rubrics aligned with the Element learning outcomes.

In response to Question 5 provide more information on potential teachers, for example tenure-track department members, or instructors, lecturers or adjuncts with specific academic credentials.

### EES 1050

Returned with comments. All agreed to approve if changes are made.

If this course will be an OTM course, it must be indicated on the workflow document.

In response to Question 1, a Core course must address at least one University Learning Objective, but is not required to address all University Learning Objectives. University Learning Objective c, “evaluate arguments and evidence critically”, was not addressed. Was this an oversight? University Learning Objective e focuses on multicultural competence both within this country and globally. Will EES 1050 address multicultural competence? If not, delete University Learning Objective e.

In response to Question 4 c indicate the reports of the findings will be submitted to UGEC annually.

On the syllabus indicate that EES 1050 is an Element 6 Core course.

### EES 1070

Returned with comments. All agreed to approve if changes are made.

If this course will be an OTM course, it must be indicated on the workflow document.

In response to Question 1, a course must address at least one University Learning Objective, but is not required to address all University Learning Objectives. University Learning Objective c, “evaluate arguments and evidence critically”, was not addressed. Was this an oversight? University Learning Objective e focuses on multicultural competence both within this country and globally. Will EES 1070 address multicultural competence? If not, delete this University Learning Objective.

In response to Question 4 c indicate the reports of the findings will be submitted to UGEC annually.

On the syllabus indicate that EES 1070 is an Element 6 Core course and quote the learning outcomes. Replace syllabus with final copy (deleting editorial comments).

### PHY 2450

Core courses must be open to any student and not restricted to those in a specific college or major. Please remove the restriction on this course in the workflow and on the syllabus. To ensure adequate spaces for Early Childhood Education Teacher Education students, the department can request the Registrar reserve a percentage of the seats in each section for those students.

Revise title in workflow, Core proposal and syllabus to indicate the course is most appropriate for early childhood education majors. Delete the second sentence in the course description.

Offering the course with 3.5 semester credit hours may result in some students lacking the required 8 semester credit hour in Element 6 natural science lab courses. UGEC requests the course carry 4 semester credit hours.

On the Core proposal form the response to Question 3 regarding prerequisites was “none”; this does not agree with the information provided in the workflow document. Please revise.

Revise the response to 4 c to indicate that the findings from both the assessment of students’

perceptions and the direct assessment of student learning will be communicated to faculty teaching the course and to UGEC annually.

Delete the editing comment in the margin.

In response to Question 6 correct the spelling of Physics.

On the syllabus, change the credit hours to 4.

The prerequisites listed in the syllabus do not agree with either the workflow or the Core proposal form. Please revise so that all are consistent.

In the syllabus Section IV indicate this is an Element 6 Core course and quote the Element 6 learning outcomes.

All agreed to approve if changes are made.

### PHY 2460

Core courses must be open to any student and not restricted to those in a specific college or major. Please remove the restriction on this course in the workflow and on the syllabus. To ensure adequate spaces for Middle Childhood Education Teacher Education students, the Department can request the Registrar reserve a percentage of the seats in each section for those students.

Revise title in workflow, Core proposal and syllabus to indicate intended student audience.

Delete the second sentence in the course description.

Offering the course with 3.5 semester credit hours may result in some students lacking the required 8 semester credit hours in Element 6 natural science lab courses. UGEC requests the course carry 4 semester credit hours.

On page 2 of the Core proposal form under University Learning Outcomes e change “none” to “not applicable”.

On the Core proposal form the response to Question 3 regarding prerequisites was “none”; this does not agree with the information provided in the workflow document. Please revise.

Revise the response to 4 c to indicate that the findings from both the assessment of students’ perceptions and the direct assessment of student learning will be communicated to faculty teaching the course and to UGEC annually.

In response to Question 6 correct the spelling of Physics.

On the syllabus, change the credit hours to 4.

The prerequisites listed in the syllabus do not agree with either the workflow or the Core proposal form. Please revise so that all are consistent.

Response to section IV in the syllabus must indicate this is an Element 6 Core course and quote the Element 6 learning outcomes.

Agreed to approve if changes are made.

Friday’s November 5 UGEC meeting is cancelled.

Meeting adjourned at 10:50 a.m.

UGEC Meeting  
Friday, November 12, 2010

In attendance: Mark Cubberley (via telephone), Mindy Diesslin, Jean Edwards, Carole Endres, Charles Funderburk, Doris Johnson, David Reynolds, Jeanne Fraker, Joe Law, Susan Carrafiello, Bill Wood (guest from Semester Conversion Committee) Rayne Bozeman (student government representative)

The minutes from October 29 and November 4 were distributed. The minutes from October 29 were approved. The committee questioned the comments on BIO 3450 recorded in the November 4 minutes. It was agreed to amend the November 4 minutes by deleting the following, "The syllabus states Biological Sciences Department's signature is needed for course registration. If this is correct, it must be included in work flow document." The following sentence was added to the minutes: "Also delete from the syllabus under III, Other: 'Need Biological Sciences Department's signature'." (These changes will be reflected in the comments provided to the course originator.) The November 4 minutes were approved as amended.

FIN 2050

The revised proposal was reviewed. The discussion focused on the response to Element 5 learning outcome b "Explain and critique the methods of inquiry of social science disciplines." After discussion, the vote was called. Six members voted to approve the course for Element 5 and one member abstained.

Restrictions on course enrollment

The chair reported Edgar Rutter, the undergraduate coordinator between the College of Education and Human Services and the College of Science and Mathematics, requested a meeting to discuss BIO 3450. She summarized their meeting for the committee. Dr. Rutter specifically objected to three of the UGEC's requests for revisions to the BIO 3450 proposal: (1) removal of enrollment restrictions; (2) changing the course credit hours from 3.5 to 4.00, and (2) changing the level at which the course is offered from 3000 to 2000 level. Dr. Rutter stated that all Early and Middle Childhood majors must take four science education courses: BIO 3450, CHM 2450, PHY 2450 or PHY 2460 AND EES 3450. (1) Dr. Rutter stated all seats in the quarter equivalent courses are filled by education majors whose programs require specific science education courses; restricting enrollment to these majors is the only way to assure they will be able to take the course in a timely fashion; he does not agree that reserving a portion of the seats would be adequate. (2) Dr. Rutter indicated that it is not possible to increase each course to four credit hours; since these majors are required to take four science education courses the hours would increase from 14 to 16. In addition such a change could impact faculty workload. (3) Dr. Rutter stated the course is offered at the 3000 level to aid students and advisors in course sequencing; however, he indicated it may be possible to change to a high 2000 number.

After discussion of this report, the committee was agreeable to allowing the BIO 3450 course number. It also considered the 3.5 credit hours for the course; however, before this decision can be made additional information is needed regarding the impact on students who change majors. The committee was firm in requesting no restrictions on enrollment.

The committee considered the implications of the above discussion for their request that EGR 3350 be taught at a 2000 level. After additional discussion the committee agreed to allow that course to be proposed as a 3000 level course and requested the Chair to inform the course originator.

The proposed draft transition from quarters to semesters form was distributed. Please email Jean Edwards with any suggestions for this form.

All agreed to have a meeting Friday, November 19 which is during exam week.

Meeting adjourned at 3:10 p.m.

UGEC Meeting  
Friday, November 19, 2010

In attendance: Mindy Diesslin, Jean Edwards, Carole Endres, Charles Funderburk, David Reynolds, Kim Stewart, Susan Carrafiello, Jeanne Fraker, Joe Law, Bill Wood (guest from Semester Conversion Committee) Rayne Bozeman, student government representative

The minutes from November 12, were distributed and approved.

CS 1150

This course was proposed as an Element 6 Natural Science course. Questions were raised if it was an introduction to “the scientific understanding of physical and biological phenomena”. Questions were raised on whether the focus was on technology rather than scientific investigation of physical and biological phenomena. After a discussion, the committee concluded the proposed course did not match the focus and learning outcomes of Element 6 Natural Science – Introductions to the scientific understanding of physical and biological phenomena. The committee voted 5 to reject and 1 to approve CS 1150 as an Element 6 Natural Science Core Course.

EC 1050

The course was proposed for Element 2 Mathematics. The committee agreed to return to the originator with the following comments and requests for additional information. The committee raised concerns that the course description, Core proposal and syllabus suggest this course significantly overlaps with MTH 228 Calculus for Management, Life, and Social Science, a MTH substitution course in the current GE program (MTH 2280 Business Calculus approved for the Core). The committee also learned that the Department of Mathematics and Statistics and its chair have voiced concerns regarding the degree of overlap between these courses. The committee requested that the originator describe how this course would differ in the way the Element 2 learning outcomes would be addressed and in the students who would benefit from this course. The committee suggested that further discussions between the Department of Economics and the Department of Mathematics and Statistics might be beneficial.

Under additional information and in response to question 3, the proposal states that the Wright State University college preparatory curriculum policy should be sufficient preparation for student success in the course, that is, three units of high school math including Algebra I and II (equivalent to passing MTH 126/MTH 127). The proposal states, however, that some students should consider taking MTH 128 before EC 1050. Math expressed concern regarding the prerequisites students would need for the material outlined in the course description. The committee suggested a math placement test score would provide useful guidance for students.

In response to question 4 the proposal raises questions regarding the “frequency of the course offering”. The committee requested information on how frequently the course would be offered.

BIO 3450

A memo from Edgar Rutter was distributed which further explained the annual enrollments and need for restrictions.

### FIN 2050

The course description on the core course proposal is different than the workflow and syllabus. The course originator (B. Wood) was requested to copy and paste the correct course description on the core proposal form.

### OTHER BUSINESS

The chair asked if the committee could evaluate courses by email and meet one time during the holiday break or vote via email. There are still 22 courses in workflow to be revised. The committee agreed to this request.

Carole Endres stated she would not be available until December 20.

Jean Edwards will not be available from December 8 through December 16.

Meeting adjourned at 2:40 p.m.