

**General Education Task Force
September 19, 2006**

Announcements:

In response to the concern about the process by which the Goals and Outcomes are being approved, Dr. Keefe has approached Jeff Butts of the AP&P. He will check into the possibility of the GETF presenting them to the council AP&P does, however, have a very tight schedule; since we have no curriculum to present, we may not be able to present to them at this time.

Dr. Keefe met with Michael Krenn about the concerns of the History department. She offered for GETF members to attend the departmental meeting on Wednesday to answer questions from all of the department members. The purpose of this meeting would be to respond to concerns and reassure them that History will not be left out of the core curriculum.

Because of the above announcement, it was suggested that we have a public place (the GETF website perhaps) to list public concerns and note how they were addressed by the GETF. This way, everyone will feel that their concerns have been heard and considered. It was decided that we will not post what changes have already been made, but will distribute a copy of any revisions we make in the Goals & Outcomes with edited notes. We need to provide an introductory statement with the Goals and Outcomes that describes the process and includes definitions of controversial terms used in the document. Ann, Tim, Sammye, and Dave will work with Sue on this statement. It was agreed that we need to first address the changes that will be made to the Goals and Outcomes before we can respond to these concerns.

Elaine Gray, Instructional Designer, has a lot to offer us. It was decided that we have her come in at some point to explain curriculum design.

In response to the clearinghouse suggestion from the September 15 forum, Dr. Keefe has spoken to our webmaster to see if there is a possibility of including this on our website.

There will be an assessment workshop on October 6 at 3pm in the Attic Window room. This is for any faculty but will be especially beneficial for those interested in the summer grants.

Discussion:

Changes to the Summer Faculty Grant Application form:

- There is no mention of assessment on the grant application. This will be added.
- We need to add specific format instructions for course proposal submissions.
- A paragraph was added to encourage applicants to follow the progress of the future model on the GETF website.
- In #5 of the grant application, “approved” will be replaced with “proposed.”

Q: The team-taught option needs more clarity. If individuals receive \$2,000 for summer work, what is the limit if more than one person applies for work on the same course? Should there be a limit to how many grants are approved for one course?

A: We will look at applications on an individual basis and encourage reworking of the grants if exorbitant amounts are requested. There was hesitation to put a limit on the dollar amount for each course because equipment may also be needed. It was mentioned that we need to be leery of equipment needs for pilot courses since it is not guaranteed that these courses will be offered again.

In order to keep track of how much money is being requested per course, we need someone to monitor all applications coming in. This will also bring immediate attention to small mistakes that need to be addressed. Kelly will look over all applications as they come in to make sure they are complete.

We need to encourage people to apply early in order to be successful applicants.

Changes to Goals and Outcomes:

- Dave Haney presented his suggested changes and distributed copies of his additions/deletions.
- The GETF came to a consensus to switch Goal #2 and Goal #1 chronologically.
- In the Mission Statement, it was suggested that “responsible” be replaced with “productive” or “rewarding.” However, it was mentioned that “productive” can be destructive as well.
- The “Appalachian” wording needs to be addressed in the introductory statement that will be posted on the website. It was agreed that we need to leave “Appalachian” in the Mission Statement and the rationale of Goal #3, but omit from #3 Outcome of Goal #3.
- It was suggested that we also address the concept of “liberal education” in the introductory statement that will be posted on the GETF website.
- Some concern was raised about the mention of “co-curriculum” in the Mission Statement. We need to make a specific comment as to the validity and/or extent of co-curriculum in the new Gen Ed format. A big concern among the faculty is that the student will receive academic credit for co-curricular activities. This will also be addressed in the introductory statement.
- It was suggested that Goal #3 is missing the concept of “language.” It mentions “cultural understanding” and being “globally connected,” but nothing about “language.” If true diversity is desired, then lingual diversity should be encouraged. It can possibly be added to outcome #5 of Goal #3.
- The word “responsible” in the Mission Statement is still bothersome because it holds different connotations for different people. It was suggested that this is not a value-neutral document; therefore, “responsible” is the best word to use for this purpose. The counter-argument was that the idea of educating students in a changing world is not in question, but the judgment of responsibility in itself. It was mentioned that if “responsible” is changed in the Mission Statement, we must address Goal #4 as well.

GETF members should come back next meeting with specific suggestions and copies for everyone.