

Sub B Minutes  
02/15/2008  
APPROVED

Present: Hobgood, Mockabee, Rudd, K-Lando, Lee, Adelson, Miller, Hallihan, Highley

1. Approved Engineering 360.01 and .02 (returning)

**Unanimously Approved**

- A. Concern from History- qualification of the instructor
- B. The history of each subject area is particular to a discipline
- C. We need to make sure their position paper and the GEC guidelines are consistent
- D. Why is the proposal in question if the proposers have answered all the questions and fulfilled the guidelines that were developed?
- E. Need to be consistent with the document of Historical Studies category created last year for anyone interested in applying to the category.
- F. History also indicated that they offered "History of Tech" course; but it's not History of Engineering
- G. Discussion about the definition of the word "technology." In McHale discussion, it was determined that there is a broad spectrum of "Technology." There are very different visions of "Technology."
- H. The enrollment/seats available are the proposer's expectation of enrollment number rather than the limit. If they are willing to accommodate more students, they should express that in the proposal.
- I. Courses should be available to, not just open to, all undergrads. They should have more sessions provided in the year, not just having more seats. Enrollments can be monitored over time to make sure that courses are able to accommodate student demand.

2. Approve the minutes of 1/25/08 meeting  
Unanimously Approved.

Deleted: Approved Engineering 360.01 and .02 unanimously

3. AAAS 571- removed from the agenda today

- i. Val: English 269 is a perfect example of VPA course
- ii. Suggestions for the AAAS 571 proposal will be taken back to the Humanities by Chris
- iii. Chris and Nina: GEC rationale and objectives on OM 66-69 should be on the Model syllabus, to satisfy the accreditation

4. **Pre-existing course's concurrence** – do we seek concurrence for pre-existing courses?

- i. It is appropriate to ask for comments in other departments, but not "yes or no" for concurrence. If we feel that it facilitates the approval process for the GEC status. Consider the comments for the course. Sub B invites comments specifically for the categories Sub B is reviewing.

ii. Jay: Impression from Ed is that Concurrences are only for new courses. Sophia will check. [Ed's response: if an existing course is making change for GEC, we can still ask for concurrence.]

5. Econ 500— **Sent back**

- A. the assessment plan (in all three categories) should be assessing the course not the students
- B. Proposal section I (for Writing)- should answer the GEC questions for the writing category on the Operations Manual (OM)
- C. Proposal section II B Rationale needs to be changed according to the OM
- D. Proposal section III should answer the OM questions for Historical Study
- E. should include “writing manual” (???)
- F. Model syllabus says that any writing course should have “substantial writing”— the proposal does not provide evidence for this element. If it is a writing course, there should be more than just one paper assignment.
- G. on syllabus p.1: The course objectives should be more clearly focused for the students, and be measurable. [send them model syllabi, Art Ed 255 for Culture and Ideas, History of Art 201 for Historical Study, OM p. 17-20 for the 3<sup>rd</sup> level writing. Econ 515, 516 for examples.]
- H. whether “third writing course” should be removed from the GEC list and discuss at CCI whether it should be required in all colleges

Sent back to Econ and SBS, also copy Gene Mumy.

6. Cancel 2/29 Sub B meeting

7. Three tagged degrees from COTA (Art and Art Ed) coming up in Spring 08

8. Spring 08 Sub B meeting schedule: 3-5pm on 4/4 (F), 4/25 (F), 5/16(F), and 6/6 (F) 9-11am.