GEAC Meeting Minutes

Date: 2/17/2023

Recorded by: Jamie Votraw

Attendance:

* Dani Peterson
* Steve Chase
* William Van Glabek
* Suzanne Biedenbach
* Randy Moffett
* Esmaeel Samaliazad
* Joyce Rollins
* Tim Bishop
* Mary Schultz
* Don Ransford
* Joel Reinking
* Monica Krupinski
* Jamie Votraw
1. Initial Motion:
	1. Randy made a motion to approve the minutes, which Suzanne seconded.
2. Introductions & Announcements
	1. Dani announced two new visitors, Esmaeel Samaliazad from Pure and Applied Sciences, and Joel Reinking from SoAHSS, both interested in GEAC.
	2. They introduced themselves, providing information about their fields of study and teaching experience.
		1. Esmaeel is a full-time faculty member since 2018, but worked part-time since 2000, and teaches science courses.
		2. Joel is a professor on the Hendry Glades campus. He was an adjunct since 2021 before becoming a full-time professor last year. He teaches political science, history, and cornerstone courses
3. Action Items:
	1. The group reviewed a checklist for document managers that faculty can use to label their courses as either general education (gen ed) or writing intensive.
		1. The checklist contains general guidelines, and not all items must be checked. The course must pass a “sniff test” to be labeled gen ed.
		2. Suzanne called for clarification on how the checklist would be used. Dani clarified that it would be used to support decision-making about whether a course fits gen ed requirements and as a resource for faculty looking to see what is needed when creating a course.
		3. Dani presented a document for internal review, which displayed the checklist and included a column for reviewer notes.
		4. Randy noted that he likes the document for organizing thoughts to think more critically about course proposals.
		5. Suzanne noted that it will be a good record-keeping tool.
	2. The group next discussed whether the checklist should include the item “meets Florida SCNS transfer requirements.”
		1. Don noted that it’s a factor that faculty might consider when designing courses.
		2. McClinton suggested removing this item, however, saying that our focus should be on whether the course is gen ed, and whether it transfers is beyond the scope of the committee.
		3. Joyce asked for more information about transferring gen ed courses.
			1. McClinton explained that if a student completes a degree in full, there is an assumption that gen ed requirements are met. However, if a student is looking to transfer a course, it is up to the institution to determine whether it counts as gen ed.
		4. Dani hypothesized that the item might have been included previously for circumstances when specialized classes are looking to pass as gen ed. That maybe, it was intended to communicate that the class is deemed “general” and not too specialized.
		5. Randy argued that we should remove it if we cannot account for it.
		6. Jamie suggested that we add this detail as a recommendation for course designers to consider rather than including it as a checklist item.
			1. McClinton agreed was the best option.
	3. The group moved on to discussing writing-intensive courses.
		1. Dani reviewed the list items.
		2. Suzanne suggested adding language about learning outcomes.
		3. McClinton presented the matter of Simple Syllabus, noting there are conversations already surrounding language about assignments (what assignments are expected, to what extent students will complete writing assignments, etc.).
			1. He recommended including brackets under “integrates items” to indicate that the syllabus contains learning outcomes that reference the writing process in the discipline.
			2. The group agreed to this language.
		4. Suzanne suggestedwe add “include learning outcomes that reference regular instruction time to teaching the writing process in the discipline”.
			1. Dani pointed out that learning outcomes are for students and asked, if we should refer to “instruction” in learning outcomes.
			2. The group agreed and changed the wording to “reference the writing process in the discipline”
		5. Suzanne stated that we should remove the item about grammar over concerns that faculty might mark for incorrect grammar and claim it counts as writing instruction.
			1. McClinton agreed and explained that there needed to be substantial feedback about the writing to count.
			2. The group agreed to remove this item.
		6. McClinton further explained that in a writing assessment course, the syllabus will note some language about the assessment aspect (e.g., the student will write multiple drafts).
			1. Dani asked if this meant we should include assessment details on the checklist.
			2. McClinton believes that including assessment language in the checklist is a good idea, but states that there isn’t a plan in place to integrate this yet.
	4. The group then discussed I/D designations.
		1. McClinton explained that FSW is a state organization, so we will follow state statutes. The college received requests from the governor's budget office for information about courses with I/D designation and documents such as emails dealing with similar topics.
	5. The group returned to discussing writing-intensive courses, specifically regarding the writing-intensive definition.
		1. Dani discussed the FSW definition noting that the state isn’t specific about what classes can be WI, but that FSW has a specification.
		2. FSW’s definition of a writing-intensive course includes 12 hours of coursework, 6 of which must be in English/Comm and the other 6 in Social Science or Humanities.
		3. The group considered whether this definition should be opened to other schools.
			1. The group discussed whether other courses, such as a physics or business course, could fit into this definition, and if so, would these courses be accepted as WI by other schools?
			2. McClinton says if you wanted to make a physics course WI, for instance, you would have to make them all WI. Additionally, if we open it, he states there must be a process for verifying WI coursework. But, still, he argued that broader is better.
		4. Suzanne also supported leaving it open.
		5. Randy asked if students transfer before they get their AA, will other schools accept WI courses from different departments? Or, will they say students need to adjust their courses to meet the transferring school’s Gordon rule?
			1. McClinton is unsure if courses are marked as WI or not, but from the incoming side, if a student took a “WI course”, but it’s not a Social Science or Humanities course (as required for WI courses at FSW), FSW might not accept it.
			2. Suzanne noted that at her last school, the department would have students provide a syllabus and a committee would decide whether or not they could accept it as a particular course.
		6. William pointed out that we’re meeting learning outcomes for some courses, but it doesn’t rise to the level of WI. While some assignments meet these outcomes, they aren’t writing intensive.
		7. Suzanne clarified that she doesn’t intend for writing-heavy courses to become WI, but feels that new courses looking for this designation should be open to the possibility.
		8. Dani asks that the group take time to think about it.
	6. The group then talked about how to close the loop from cornerstone to capstone.
		1. Dani spoke to Joe van Gaalen about where competencies fall in the courses.
		2. Dani asked, and Tim confirmed that Gen Ed courses are required to have one integral competency and can have several supplemental competencies. She noted a lack of research competency across gen eds was a motivation for the capstone course.
		3. Dani asks how are we assessing students in this area? Are we following them from cornerstone to capstone?
			1. Joyce shared her experience with student portfolios in the School of Education, which can be used to assess work across multiple courses.
			2. Dani asked who adds to the portfolio, students or faculty?
			3. Joyce explained that the LMS is tied to assignments, so either students or faculty add and use it as needed.
			4. They use anthology and put informative and summative assessments in a portfolio. Every professor can assess work, but then education can pull info/content from there.
			5. When students leave, they can use it to showcase their work and get a job.
		4. Randy questioned whether this move is necessary given the high cost/demand on students.
			1. He pointed out that there is no requirement for students to do this for this degree, so if they don’t do this, will we stop them from graduating?
			2. Dani agreed Randy’s point is valid, adding that Joe noted that if all of the work is on the students, it’ll be tough to get them to do it, and also, the faculty are already too busy.
			3. Joyce added to Randy’s point, stating that there are required courses and assignments already in Education, so it is a different situation. In other cases, who would the students go to for portfolio problems?
		5. Jamie pointed out that there already is a sub-committee dedicated to bridging the gap between cornerstone and capstone, the “Cornerstone-to-Capstone and Co-Curricular Connections Sub-Committee”.
			1. She suggested that GEAC meet with the cornerstone-to-capstone committee before moving forward.
			2. The group agreed to meet with the cornerstone-to-capstone committee to discuss it further.
4. Reports:
	1. There were no reports from departments or other committees.
5. Announcements:
	1. Capstone event: Observatory Night
	2. OTOC Speaker Series
	3. Monica added that the OER Institute is showcasing OER books in u-109 on March 9th.
	4. Jamie added that the Battle of the Buccaneers is taking place on April 5th 3:30-5pm in the Rush Auditorium.

1. Final Motion
	1. Jamie made a motion to adjourn, which Tim seconded.
	2. The meeting concluded at 11:25 pm.