

**Minutes from Meeting**  
**3:30-5:00 pm**  
**Rooms 2102 (Bloomington) and 3138B (Indianapolis)**

**Members Present:** Brendan Maxcy, Chad Christensen (acting chair), Erik Tillema, John Hitchcock, Kelzie Beebe, Marjorie Manifold

**Ex-Officio Present:** Annela Teemant, Elizabeth Boling, Ghangis Carter

**Members Absent:** Alexander McCormick

**Staff:** Jezreel McMillen, Liyao Zhao, Matthew Boots

**Presenters:** Andrea Walton, Raymond Smith

I. Introductions

Each member of the GSC/RAFA Committee introduced himself/herself.

II. Nomination for Chair

Elizabeth Boling opened up the floor for nominations for chair of the GSC/RAFA.

- *John Hitchcock moved to nominate Alexander McCormick as chair of the GSC/RAFA committee for 2015-2016 year.*
- *Marjorie Manifold seconded the motion.*
- *All in favor.*

III. Review and Approval of Minutes from April 7, 2015

- *Marjorie Manifold moved to approve the minutes from April 7, 2015, with the following changes: the phrase "Annela seconded" be changed to "Annela supported"; on page two, Chuck Carney's name be removed in favor of his title, Director of Communications.*
- *John Hitchcock seconded the motion.*
- *All in favor.*

IV. New Business

A. **Proposal for Visiting Scholar Policy**

The first item of new business concerned visiting scholar policy. Elizabeth noted that this item was informational only, and that the International Program Committee had already voted on it. The vote had produced a number of documents which would hold visiting scholars, as well as their hosts, more tightly to a process of international study. Scholars and their hosts will now file forms with Conney Freese-Posthuma in the Dean's Office, in order to keep track of students and their contributions to IUB. Elizabeth noted that one of the primary motivations for reforming policy was to ensure

that visiting scholars had academic or other recognized appointments. Beforehand, international students would come to IUB in order to find Ph.D. mentoring.

**B. Proposal for Ph.D. minor in History of Education**

The second item of new business concerned the Ph.D. minor in History of Education. Andrea Walton presented this item. Elizabeth recommended that the name be changed from “Ph.D. minor in the History of Education” to “Doctoral Minor in the History of Education.” The distinction of “doctoral” is important because it means that both Ph.D. students and Ed.D. students can choose this minor. The only difference is that Ed.D. students require only 9 credits in the minor, whereas Ph.D. students require 12 credits. Elizabeth noted that the most significant change resulting from this name-swap will be more freedom for students in choosing courses for this minor. Elizabeth asked Liyao to notify Jane Kaho that this minor already has a code in SIS.

- *John Hitchcock moved to approve the proposal, with the following change: change “Ph.D.” to “Doctoral” minor in History of Education.*
- *Marjorie Manifold seconded the motion.*
- *All in favor.*

**C. Course Change Request for C680**

The third item of new business concerned a course change request for C680: Topical Seminar: Philanthropy and Higher Education in the U.S. This course is already taught as a face-to-face course, and Andrea requested that an online version of the course be approved. She noted that the format of the syllabus would change, but that its content would not. Several members of the committee voiced concern that the committee should see an online version of the syllabus, especially considering that teachers of similar courses were required to do so in the past. Andrea noted that HESA had asked her to bring C680 online in order to incorporate the course into the philanthropy certificate program at IUPUI. There was some disagreement about whether the teacher of an online version of the course should present to the committee an online version of the syllabus. When the committee voted, the understanding that the course content had not significantly changed proved to be an important distinction. Elizabeth charged the committee to develop, during the next meeting, a process concerning whether online syllabi must be given to the committee in cases where an online version of a course is being proposed. The committee voted twice on this item.

- *John Hitchcock moved to approve the absence of an online version of the syllabus, with the explicit understanding that the online version is not different from the face-to-face version.*
- *Marjorie Manifold seconded the motion.*
- *5 in favor; 1 opposed; the motion passed.*

The committee then voted on whether or not to approve this course to be taught online.

- *Marjorie Manifold moved to approve the course change request for C680, as presented.*
- *John Hitchcock seconded the motion.*
- *All in favor.*

D. **New Course Request for L621**

The last item of new business concerned a new course request, L621. Raymond Smith noted that the course is targeted toward people who want to teach W131 and ESL/EFL. He described the three pillars of the course: 1) looking into the demographic composition of people who take these courses on the aforementioned courses on campus; 2) a history of rhetoric and composition on campus; and 3) evaluate textbooks and grading/marketing papers, etc. Annela recommended that on the course description, it should be made clear that this is a course for adult learners, given the term “elementary composition.” Raymond agreed to make this change.

- *Marjorie Manifold moved to approve the new course request L621, with the following change: the description of the course would include phrasing that makes clear the adult orientation of the course.*
- *Brendan Maxcy seconded the motion.*
- *All in favor.*

V. Discussion items

A. **Program review**

The discussion item concerned a program review for Art Education. Marjorie presented on this item. She explained that the Art Education program is internationally recognized as being one of the best in the world, but that it is currently being stretched thin (only two faculty members). She informed the committee of the program’s goals, including the crafting of a focused vision statement, an articulation of the program’s identity, and a strategic plan leading to outcomes. Marjorie then outlined some of the main obstacles to achieving these goals, namely time constraints and marketing problems.