

**General Education Task Force
September 26, 2006**

Announcements:

Jeff Butts has arranged a special meeting of AP&P to consider the Goals and Outcomes on Wednesday, October 25th, from 3-5pm in IG Greer, room 224. We will briefly introduce the Goals and Outcomes as well as the written statement that will accompany the document. This is a discussion format; no vote will take place.

There will be a meeting with the History faculty on Monday, October 2nd, from 1-2pm in the history lounge. Paul, Tim, Dave, Greg, Alexandra, and Sue will meet with them to address any concerns they may have.

Q: Are we setting a precedent to meet with every department?

A: If there is a significant number of faculty members that have concerns, then we will consider meeting with them.

A Public Forum to discuss the General Education Model will be held on Wednesday, October 11th, in the Price Lake room. By this time, we will have the revised Goals and Outcomes.

Q: Do we need a formal structure in place to contact the GETF? Perhaps on our website?

A: The website currently has options for contacting the Chair of GETF. All communications received are copied to all members.

Q: Do we need to send out a general call for feedback to the entire faculty?

A: Dr. Keefe will send out an announcement to the general faculty via e-mail.

Dr. Keefe has spoken with John Whitehead about creating a clearinghouse on our website. It is relatively easy to do. To begin with, the faculty will compose one paragraph expressing their areas of interest. They will then list several keywords that relate to their statement. People will sign-in to the site and search for keywords. They also have the option of perusing all statements if they wish.

Discussion:

Summer Faculty Grant Application Final Revisions:

The signature page should read, "If necessary, buy-outs will be furnished by academic affairs." On number seven, we need to direct faculty members to view the evolving GenEd model on our website.

Q: If we are accepting revisions/resubmissions, is the February 1st deadline too early?

A: We need them by February 1st because department chairs need to set their schedule for fall 2007. Therefore, we will have to encourage early submissions in order to accommodate the revisions.

There were no other suggestions, so the grant application was approved.

Goals and Outcomes:

Everyone was allowed approximately two minutes to present their suggested changes to the Goals and Outcomes. After today, Dave, Paul, Jim, and Paulette will be responsible for redrafting the document. Next week, they will present the proposed final draft.

Jeni: The use of the word “responsible” is acceptable. It is the proper word to use in the document.

Ivan: Why are we including foreign languages? If we include foreign language and history, then we are getting into specific disciplines.

Alexandra: If we are including math and history, then we need language to talk about global/cultural connections.

Lauri: Could we not consider foreign language a skill that we need in order to understand history or math? If we accept it as a skill, then it is not a discipline that is being included in the Goals and Outcomes.

Greg: The replacement of “mathematical” with “quantitative” is acceptable. Because this statement is under the Goal “Communicating Effectively,” the word “quantitative” reads better.

Jim: “Co-curriculum” needs to be sharpened. (It was discussed that this will be addressed in the statement that is being developed that will clarify certain word choices.) Also, Goal 4, Outcome 1 is not as full of comment as it needs to be. In Goal 4, Outcome 1, “now and in the past” needs to be omitted.

Paul: In the rationale of “Thinking critically and creatively,” the concept of interdisciplinary needs to be expanded. We need to list as “disciplinary and interdisciplinary.” Also, all views are not equally valid unless stated explicitly; this concerns Outcome 3 of the same goal. The words “their own” or “relevant” do not mean to agree with their own perspective, but to acknowledge other perspectives. Do the words “account for” acknowledge this?

Nowhere in the document is there mention of law. It can be inserted into the rationale of Goal 4.

Sammye: The first sentence of the Mission Statement needs to be split into two different sentences.

In the “Communicating effectively” Goal, we need to mention “sophistication” of language.

In Goal 3 rationale, if we take out the entire sentence that is highlighted, a lot of science will be removed. Possibly revise the sentence, but keep in the document.

We need to make sure that words in the document do not seem dated.

Tina: Inserting specific disciplines into the document opens the door to everyone. This may result in the Outcomes being muddled a bit. We need to remain clear and concise in order to assess and measure.

Dan: Goal 4 Outcome 3 is too soft.

Does the document read “odd” in the places where we inserted references to history? Do we limit historical consequence by the way we have used it?

By “Thinking critically and creatively ‘*within and across disciplines*’” do we limit ourselves? How useful is this after the students leave the university? The world is not divided up into disciplines.

Ray: If we mention history, then why not mention the sciences? Also, the sentence that Sammye wants to remain in Goal 3 needs to stay in some capacity.

In the revised Outcome 2 of Goal 3, does “global change” need to be defined? Does this revised version do anything for the sciences?

Tim: We have worked very hard not to be provincially or parochially driven, but some of the proposed revisions prove that we are moving in that direction. We need to prove that we are not willing to concede to everyone’s problems.

Mike: We have opened the door to insert disciplines throughout the document. “Sustainable development” needs definition. Only a few people see the clear meaning; many do not.

Paulette: “History” is implied in the Goals and Outcomes and does not need to be stated. Remove the words “Students will” off of all Outcomes; just begin with the verb.

Dave: By inserting history into the document, the discipline is not being catered to. The history department did point out the absence of a very important aspect of the document. We are simply acknowledging the importance of history. Also, we are avoiding the danger of seeming too presentist. Although history is implied to us, we do need to make the document as clear as possible.

We do need to insert “law” in the document.

Ann: Can some of these changes be rerouted into our model?

Carter: We have the opportunity to create a document that contains no obvious concession to any discipline or department. We need to stay firm to the work that has already been done.

David: Students do not have the same language as faculty. Do we need a set of definitions in order to promote clarity? (It was discussed that we need to clarify language in order to alleviate boundary issues among disciplines.)

Sue: Mentioning history once is ok, but the introduction of too many disciplines would prove to be too much.

In Goal 2, Outcome 3, a better term would be “locate self.”

In Goal 3, Outcome 2, we need a definition of sustainability.

In the rationale of Goal 4, “morals” is mentioned too many times. This needs to be reworded.

For the next meeting, we will go over the revised Goals and Outcomes as well as the Introductory Statement. Jeni, Carter, and Alexandra will bring models to look at so we can begin to shape our own.