





Listed below are comments on the Step 5a, GEP Course Criteria Proposal provided to the committee by email or through the committee's website.

Posted: 5/4/2010 3:36 PM		View Properties  Reply
 Williams, Patricia	<p>I have deep concerns about "non-instructional academic staff" as teachers in 3 credit courses. Perhaps this would work in a one credit course where study skills are the emphasis, but a 3 credit course is another matter.</p> <p>Show Quoted Messages</p>	
Posted: 5/10/2010 1:03 PM		View Properties  Reply
 Bowman, Mary	<p>There's a lot that's good here, but I have two big concerns and a few little things:</p> <p>Big Concern #1: In the committee's zeal to disconnect the Gen Ed program from "ownership" by departments, the proposed course approval system will create a lot of work and paperwork for departments and the Gen Ed Committee, unnecessary work in my opinion. The guidelines call for the course portfolio to include a c.v. with "the instructor's" qualifications (singular), but how many Gen Ed courses will have only one instructor? Take just one course in my department as an example. During the current year, five different people have taught sections of English 200. Almost every member of the department could be called upon to teach it if an additional section were needed, a scheduled instructor became seriously ill, etc. Under this proposal, when English 200 is submitted for approval as a Humanities course, we will need not only to describe how the course meets the learning outcomes but also to submit at least five instructor c.v.s. Whenever there is a change in staffing, we would (I take it) need to get approval for the newly assigned instructor. And what happens if an unapproved instructor teaches the course? Will there be some sections that are Gen Ed approved and some that aren't, comparable to the current way WE is handled (which will be a nightmare for the registrar's office)? Many of the courses currently offered for Humanities, Social Science, and Natural Science GDRs present similar situations.</p> <p>I suggest that we designate certain departments—basically, the departments here identified as the Consulting Departments for the Investigations categories—for a simplified approval process, in which only the course needs to be approved. I think we can safely</p>	

trust the English Department not to assign English 200 (or any other lit. course) to someone who is not competent to teach it, and ditto for all of the other “standard” departments. I really don’t think it’s a problem, conceptually or for the HLC, if we acknowledge the fact that most or even all of the Humanities courses will be in humanities departments, Science courses in science departments, etc. It’s good to have a mechanism for courses not in “standard” departments to be considered (and in those cases we should review the instructor qualifications), but to require that of even the most obvious courses in those categories is, well, silly.

Diversity, Environment—those categories are another story, and considering instructor qualifications for each course is more appropriate there.

One thought on the Consulting Departments. With all due respect for my colleagues in Political Science and Philosophy, I don’t think those departments should be on the lists for Humanities and for Social Science, respectively. Obviously the anthropologists are social scientists, and there are individuals in Political Science with humanist credentials, but that does not mean that those departments as a whole have that expertise. Perhaps specify fields within those departments if you don’t want to exclude them.

Big Concern #2. I’ve been worried all along that moving communication beyond the Foundation level into majors may mean that it falls between the cracks. I know that this is only a partial draft, but there is nothing here that allays my concerns. I strongly urge the committee to include in the next, fuller, draft, some general guidelines for Communication in the Major programs and a procedure for review at least, if not approval, of programs by the Gen Ed Committee. I will also here repeat points I have made at previous stages in this process: 1) We should have a phase-in period for Communication in the Major comparable to the phase-in that has already been approved for the FYS, with an alternate requirement for those students whose majors do not yet have CitM programs established. 2) We need to have CAESE workshops and/or other support for departments that need it as they develop their programs, as well as ongoing support for programs and instructors in the form of a CitM Coordinator or Team. And I’ll add one more: 3) We need to make sure that CitM is included in the assessment of the Gen Ed program. Without all of these, we are just paying lip service to the

importance of communication skills.

Small things under the Written Communication section:

--We don't know yet what the number for the sophomore course will be, but I doubt it will be English 201.

--I'd feel better if the last line read "English 101, . . . will have an enrollment cap not higher than 23 students." The English Department harbors dreams of someday lowering that cap; let's not have the Gen Ed program set it in stone.

[Show Quoted Messages](#)

Posted: 5/14/2010 9:38 AM

[View Properties](#) [Reply](#)



LoPatin-Lummis, Nancy

[Contents of attachment are copied at the end of the document]

From: Summers, Greg

Posted: Tuesday, May 04, 2010 9:33 AM

Subject: Comment on Step 5a Proposal

Please use this space to offer comments and suggestions regarding the Step 5a, Course Criteria Proposal. To begin, click the "**Reply**" button to the right. (If you don't see this button, click the "**Sign In**" icon in the upper right corner of the screen.) You may respond directly to this message or to any posted below.

Posted: 5/17/2010 10:35 AM

[View Properties](#) [Reply](#)



Guay, Don

On p. 4: Please add the phrases in yellow to ensure that people know Math 90 competency, not the actual course is required.

Quantitative Literacy

- The **minimum** prerequisite to all Quantitative Literacy courses is Math 90, **or appropriate placement**.

I think this minimum prerequisite really should be Math 100, with Math 105 changed to have a Math 100 prerequisite.

Please write "mathematics", not "math" everywhere, just like you would "psychology", and not "psych".

Quantitative Literacy

The committee seeks to maintain essentially the same standard of proficiency in **mathematics** skills as exists in the current General Degree Requirements. In the process, however, we hope to

broaden the definition of quantitative literacy to include a greater variety of competencies, including applied mathematical skills. These skills might be taught in courses such as statistics, personal finance, business math, probability theory, consumer economics, etc. In 2009, 11% of UWSP's incoming students scored a **UWSP Math Placement Code 1 on the UW-System mathematics** placement exam, which placed them into beginning algebra (currently offered as Math 90). Under the new program these students would need to take Math 90 prior to enrolling in a Quantitative Literacy course. The remaining 89% of UWSP's incoming students in 2009 scored high enough on the **mathematics** placement exam to fulfill the proposed prerequisite to a General Education Quantitative Literacy course. Consequently, these students would simply need to complete one three-credit Quantitative Literacy course under the new GEP.

To my knowledge, all of the potential courses, actually these are topics, you list (statistics, personal finance, business math, probability theory, consumer economics), are currently either implemented as courses with Math 100, not Math 90 as a prerequisite, or are courses with no prerequisites which I would not uniformly agree satisfy the intent of the QL requirement.

Dale M. Rohm, Ph.D.
Professor and Chair

[Show Quoted Messages](#)

Posted: 5/17/2010 1:41 PM

[View Properties](#) [Reply](#)



Guay, Don

Required 3 credit Communications COM 101 Course

I would like a fuller explanation of how the new 3 credit COM101 will improve our student's communication skills. The proposal makes suggestions, but without specific requirements why will the course be any different. I believe it needs to be different because my advisee's do not find this course valuable in its current form.

The course objectives as currently stated:

"This course is designed to enhance your understanding of human communication and

to refine your presentational skills -- most importantly, your ability to deliver an effective presentation before an audience.

This course will:

provide you with an opportunity to practice the fundamental elements of an effective presentation;

acquaint you with an understanding of how to adapt a message to an audience;

engage you as a critical listener and a respondent to public discourse;

introduce you to theoretical aspects of human communication that will lead to a better understanding of yourself and the role communication plays in the construction of meaning; and

improve your ability to communicate extemporaneously."

Will the students performance of course objectives be evaluated?

Will it be expected that students will be evaluated on impromptu speaking? That doesn't seem to be the case now as it is not listed in the grades given in the course.

How are students evaluated on the "critical listener skills"? Again this doesn't appear in course grades.

Will it be expected that students give speeches of over 7 minutes in length?

Would some of the oral communication learning outcomes be satisfied in the small FYS 101 course?

Finally, the current 3 credit option seems to involve a written critique of a speech. Is that what everyone is required to do in the new 3 credit course proposed?

Comments from Robin Tanke, Chemistry Department

[Show Quoted Messages](#)

Posted: 5/20/2010 2:14 PM

[View Properties](#)



[Williams, Shannon](#)

My name is Shannon Williams and I work in the Student Involvement and Employment Office. My primary responsibility is the coordination of the campus-wide community service program, SERVE. I have worked in student affairs for seven years and I hold a master's degree in Educational Leadership.

As a student affairs professional, I have been trained and have worked with developing learning outcomes and assessing those outcomes. There are competent, credible, and experienced non-instructional staff who have the capacity to develop curriculum and propose it to the curriculum committee.

I have heard arguments from faculty that Category A academic staff are not qualified to teach. There are several departments on campus that hire adjunct lecturers, many whom are members of the community and business world. How are these lecturers qualified to teach but academic staff are not? Student Affairs professionals, specifically, have been educated, trained, and are practitioners of cognitive development, psycho-social development, and identity development, not to mention that we are a living-learning laboratory of communication skills, interpersonal skills, conflict resolution, leadership, and more.

Thank you very much for taking the time to read and consider my comments.

[Show Quoted Messages](#)

Posted: 7/1/2010 9:26 AM

[View Properties](#)



[Piotrowski, Becky](#)

I would like to express my support of keeping non-instructional academic staff as possible instructors for the FYS.

When making important decisions such as who would instruct such a course, it is important to look at the learning outcomes. As it stands, the six learning outcomes are all things that I anticipate a large number of non-instructional academic staff work with on a frequent basis. All of us on this campus should be working together to help students know the importance of a liberal education and improve their study skills. Everyone should be asking students to think critically and to take responsibility for their actions and college experience. I would think academic staff would be especially helpful at being able to share

information about helpful campus resources (as we staff many of those offices) and co-curricular experiences (as many of us advise and organize those opportunities for students).

Doesn't it make sense to keep the pool of potential instructors broad and let the quality of the course proposals determine who will be instructing the course?

Thank you, Greg and committee, for seeking feedback.

[Show Quoted Messages](#)

~~~~~

History Department's response to Step 5a, Course Criteria  
GERPC  
May 10, 2010

The History Department discussed the proposals in Step 5a in the GERPC Report on Monday, May 10, 2010.

The History Department specifically discussed two categories courses: the Freshman Experience and Historical Perspectives.

- The History Department objects to the suggestion that “non-instructional academic staff with at least a Master’s degree to serve as qualified instructors.” The Department believes that appropriate academic credentials are necessary for the Freshman Experience and this statement does not specify whether or not a Master’s degree in the specific field is required for a course, or any Master’s degree, whether or not it is in the subject or study of the course offering.
- The History Department believes that representatives of all consulting departments, not just representatives of each college, should be on the General Education subcommittee.
- The History Department believes that administrators and non-instructional members of the General Education Committee should serve as consulting members of the committee, but not as voting members. To assign voting rights to so many administrators and non-instructional staff is not in keeping with this campus’s policy of **faculty** control of curriculum and revision to the by-laws of faculty governance.
- The History Department believes that the criteria under each General Education category need to be made more specific for purposing of evaluating each proposed course, but also the qualification of each instructor proposing to teach such a class.

Lastly, the History Department – the administrative unit responsible for the Social Sciences majors and minors and the Broadfield Social Science major and minor for teacher certification – should be a consulting department for the GEP category of the Social Sciences. While those two majors interdisciplinary majors, the History Department was left to draft the learning outcomes for these programs with little comment from the other programs and, therefore, feels it should be a consulting

department for whether Social Science General Education offerings provide similar foundations and expect similar learning outcomes.

~~~~~