

MINUTES

University Curriculum Committee for Liberal Education (UCCLE)

November 3, 2010

2:00 - 3:15p.m. - 230 Student Services Building

Present: Sheila Carter-Tod, Marlene Preston, Scott Renneckar, Rachel Holloway, Daniel Wubah, Kurt Hoffman, Ray Van Dyke, Mitzi Vernon, Elizabeth Fine,

Guests Present: Karen Strickler

Absent: Joao Setubal, Cindy Wood, Brandon Carroll, Ally Hammond, Donna Cassell Ratcliffe, Lisa McNair, Carolyn Meier, Meir Schneller, Alan McDaniel, Dan Thorp

1. **CALL TO ORDER** - The meeting was called to order by Sheila Carter-Tod, Chair.

2. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA** –

A motion was made and seconded to approve the agenda. Motion carried.

3. **DR. WUBAH'S VISIT TO DISCUSS CLE**

Dr. Wubah stated that he had just come from a meeting with Dr. Steger, Dr. McNamee, Dr. Spencer and a group of undergraduate students. One of the topics the students brought up for discussion was the CLE. He said that not one student said the CLE was great. According to Dr. Wubah, students are concerned that they get different experiences with the CLE and some students do not know how the CLE fits into their major.

Based on what he heard, he said the bottom line is that we have to do something about the CLE because of students' perceptions and because there has been a very long time since it was reviewed comprehensively. He discussed the possibility of bringing in an external consultant to look at the CLE to see how it may map on to our majors and to see where our CLE stands in terms of national trends in general education. Dr. Wubah went on to say that we need to think seriously about evaluating the CLE comprehensively. He stated that we couldn't continue to do what we are doing.

Committee members stated that we had done a student survey last year and that what Dr. Wubah was sharing was similar to the results in the survey. There was a short discussion around looking at possibly aligning the area goals of the CLE with the Essential Learning Outcomes from AAC&U.

Dr. Wubah said that before committing to a model we need to ask some fundamental questions:

- What is the purpose of our CLE?
- What do we want students to get after they take the CLE?
- How does the CLE map on to the majors?

He stated that after working through these questions, we could address the skill sets and look at other models. He stated that this process would not be easy but that we need to have these conversations.

The committee asked if it would be possible to do both an internal and external comprehensive review. Dr. Wubah stated that the internal review should be done as a self-study to determine what we have, our strengths, etc. The external reviewer could then build upon the areas of strength and suggest areas that still need to be improved.

One committee member stated that one problem could be in how the CLE courses are framed. It was also mentioned that it is not clear that a course is a CLE courses because there is currently no indication on course materials or the course syllabus. Also, in CLE courses, the CLE goals are not listed on the syllabus. Several suggestions were made on changes, which could be implemented to aid in the process.

Dr. Wubah went on to announce that Virginia Tech is one of 32 institutions selected to participate in an AAC&U workshop for institutions that are critically looking at their general education curriculums. One of the things we will be doing in preparation for this workshop is a self-study. Dan along with several others will be

taking part in several meetings over a two-year period with the other institutions and members of AAC&U to share information and get national feedback from the other participating institutions.

Dr. Wubah stated that the formation of Dan's office would play a critical role in coordinating the CLE. The CLE needs to be elevated to a higher level at the university. Dr. Wubah wants everyone to know the CLE is important, that it is on his radar, that he is committed to working on it and he is very committed to making changes.

4. CLE AREAS SUBCOMMITTEE –

As a quorum was not present at the meeting the courses under consideration for first and second reading will be voted on electronically.

Recommendations for Second Reading – The following course proposal(s) were distributed to UCCLE members electronically for review at the October 6, 2010 meeting. The following action was taken at this November 6, 2010 meeting.

EDCI 3024, Issues in American Schooling, Area 3, effective Spring 2011 (already in Area 3 as a 2 credit course – seeking approval as a 3 credit course).

- The additional information requested for the proposal was received and forward to the committee electronically. It is a one-credit addition. The course was approved just last year as a 2-credit course. The course has no pre-requisites. It has a junior standing requirement to give students a little distance from the K-12 experience as they examine the same system. Capped at 23. It is taught by a GTA in Social Foundations with supervision by two professors with regular meetings for discussion and evaluation. It fits the learning goals very well. It has student engagement where they have teaching cohorts where they look at issues in the K-12 curriculum. The committee recommended approval.

Recommendations for First Reading – The following course proposal(s) were distributed to UCCLE members electronically for review.

AHRM 2654, Housing Environments, Area 6, effective Fall 2010.

5. SUBCOMMITTEE UPDATES –

Planning and Directions Subcommittee - Marlene Preston said they had a meeting with Dan to see how they might support him as he moves forward. They focused on how to assess what is going on with the CLE. They decided to figure out how the AAC&U learning outcomes match up with the goals we currently have in the CLE. Information from their meeting and their initial attempts at mapping has been placed on the Scholar site. They will work on this more and bring something back to the committee for our next meeting.

Processes and Policies Subcommittee – Kurt Hoffman stated that they had talked about various course proposal, withdrawal and evaluation processes or the lack thereof. They discussed satisfaction with the current application process for new courses. They did think that perhaps something should be added under section one about online courses. There was discussion around streamlining the process electronically. Kurt has a meeting with the Registrar's Office to see what can be done. Developing a long-term plan for review was also discussed. The committee thought that it should be understood that if you are in the CLE your course will be reviewed every X number of years. Perhaps initially the first thing is to try to find out which courses have not been taught in the last 5 years. Then we can approach departments about plans for those courses. They also discussed looking at criteria for courses such as the date of last approval. It was also mentioned that there would need to be many conversations with other offices and constituents in order for coordination during any process of CLE course adjustments.

6. VICE CHAIR NOMINATIONS –

Shelia discussed the nominations process for Vice-Chair. She asked for committee members to nominate possible candidates. Once someone has been nominated, she will follow-up with those individuals to see if they are willing to serve. The names of those nominated and willing to serve will be forwarded to Karen who will

send out the nominations to the full committee for an electronic vote. Scott Renneckar and Mitzi Vernon were nominated.

7. OTHER BUSINESS –

Marlene ask if anyone had an opportunity to read the Undergraduate Strategic Task Force Report? Karen will post the report on Scholar. Committee members were asked to read the report and either bring suggestions back through your subcommittee or directly as an agenda item. Ray suggested that the committee consider inviting the ACE Fellow who is working with the report to meet with the committee in order to give feedback.

8. ADJOURNMENT -

The meeting adjourned at 3:07p.m.

Submitted by,
Karen W. Strickler
Recording Secretary