



GER TASK FORCE MEETING MINUTES

Date: January 12, 1995

Present: Anderson, Beckett, Driscoll, Funk, Hoover, Hugenberg, Jenkins, Jennings, Maraffa, McMahan, Mistovich, Mullins, O'Neill, Palmer-Fernandez, Singler, Tingley, White.

Absent: Multari.

Secretary: Anne McMahan

Jenkins, Chair of the Task Force, called the meeting to order at 3:40 p.m. in the Trustees' conference room on the first floor of Tod Hall. Jenkins introduced President Cochran who had requested this meeting to discuss issues related to changing to semesters.

Discussion with President Cochran:

The President described his experience working with GER reform as provost at Southeast Missouri. He discussed the time frame that the process of GER renewal took there; he asked about the time frame of the process here on this campus and about the members' judgements regarding the connection of that time frame to issues related to the semester vs. quarter system. He indicated how important general education renewal will be in the next North Central Accreditation visit. The group discussed why and why not to go to semesters. The President indicated that trends locally and nationally suggest that we will be going to semesters at some point; his information was very similar to that in his letter about the subject in December last year. The group was concerned that debate about the switch to semesters not dilute the discussions needed for general education renewal. The primary concern was that the campus not have to do major curriculum revision once for department level and college level accreditation issues, another time for general education changes and yet another time to make the switch to semesters. There was consensus that all of these be simultaneous. They need to be done together because of the **amount** of chaos and time involved in each of them. Since we are revising the majors and the general education requirements, it is important that the decision about semesters be made one way or the other; if the decision is to change, the change should be incorporated into the revisions now under way. In addition, campus 2000 requires major changes; we will be redoing computer hardware, software, record-keeping etc. If the change to semesters is to occur, it should coincide with these changes as well. The North Central accreditation year is 1998. The task force felt that it will be working on curriculum in 97.

President Cochran left the meeting at 4:45 p.m. He thanked the members for their input.

Issues relating the to department visits:

Jenkins passed out drafts of the information statement that several members of the task force had worked to develop since the last meeting. He asked that all members read, critique, and recommend changes in the information statement by the next meeting. Those who cannot attend should get their recommendations to Jenkins before the next meeting. Jenkins also circulated a list of all the departments on campus. He asked members to indicate which departments they would like to visit. It was agreed that members should chose departments other than their own; that way there would be two members of the task force at each meeting, since each member would also attend the meeting in his or her own department.

Jenkins thanks the members who worked with him to develop the information handout: Stephanie A. Tingley, Gabriel Palmer, and Todd Beckett.

Actions Taken:

It was the consensus of the task force that we recommend to President Cochran that the university community know by the end of this academic year if YSU is going to the semester system.

Agenda for the next meeting:

The next meeting will be devoted to producing a final version of the handout. The meeting will then deal with what, exactly, we will do at the meetings with the departments. We will also have to deal more specifically with timing the meetings. Jenkins said he would try to go to the DAC meetings.

Next Meeting: The next meeting is Thursday, January 19 at 3:30 in the Dean's Conference Room in Arts and Sciences.

Adjournment: Jenkins adjourned the meeting at 5:00 p.m.



GER TASK FORCE MEETING MINUTES

Date: January 19, 1995

Present: Driscoll, Hoover, Hugenberg, Jenkins, Jennings, Maraffa, McMahon, Mullins, O'Neill, Palmer, Singler, Tingley, White.

Absent: Anderson, Beckett, Funk, Mistovich, Multari.

Secretary: Anne McMahon

Jenkins, Chair of the Task Force, called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m. in the Dean's Conference room in the College of Arts and Sciences.

Issues related to the planned meetings with the departments:

The first order of business was the revision of the information handout to be sent to all faculty on campus. The suggestions for revisions were discussed, revisions were made and the handout was approved as revised. It was decided to send it out by the middle of next week.

The task force members then volunteered for visits with the departments. Each member volunteered for several departments. No member chose his or her own department. A master list was agreed upon. Jenkins said that he would visit most of the DAC meetings. McMahon has already visited the DAC meeting in Business.

The members then turned attention to what we will do at the meetings with the departments. The discussion generated consensus on the following:

1. Meetings with the departments were to provide an opportunity for individuals to respond to and ask questions about task force activities and about the information handout mailed to them. The GER Task Force member is not to make a lengthy presentation, but is there to collect feedback and to request additional written feedback about the majors.

2. The task force member should have a sheet that requests the following:

"The Task Force doesn't want to create a general education program that unnecessarily duplicates what already exists in the majors. We need to know whether and how courses in your major contribute to the general education goals passed by the senate last year." The task force member should request that the department meet and give the task force a report about how the goals are met; we need a report that goes beyond a listing of courses and catalogue descriptions. The task force member should request this information for EACH PROGRAM in the department as that program exists now.

In addition, the form should ask, "What are your department's major concerns regarding the development of a new general educational program?"

3. The report is to be sent to Bill Jenkins, Chair of the task force, by March 31, 1995.

The following time line was set for the activities of the task force:

Send out information to faculty on Jan. 26.

Schedule meetings with departments starting Feb. 6 and before March.

Begin review of feedback in April.

Agenda for the next meeting:

The next meeting will be devoted to 1) a discussion of what report, if any, should be made to the Senate this year, 2) a preliminary discussion of some ideas about how the program might go, and 2) a discussion about our time line in light of the possible shift to semesters.

Next Meeting: The next meeting is Thursday, January 26 at 3:00 in the Dean's Conference Room in Arts and Sciences.

Adjournment: Jenkins adjourned the meeting at 5:00 p.m.



Youngstown State University / Youngstown, Ohio 44555-3452

Department of History

(216) 742-3452

GER TASK FORCE MEETING MINUTES

Date: January 26, 1995

Present: Funk, Hoover, Hugenberg, Jenkins, **Jennings**, Maraffa, **O'Neill**, Singler, Tingley, White.

Absent: Anderson, Beckett, Driscoll, **McMahon**, Mistovich, **Multari**, **Mullins**, Palmer.

Secretary: **Bill** Jenkins

Bill Jenkins, Chair of the Task Force, called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. in the Faculty Lounge in the College of Arts and Sciences.

Discussion of presenting a recommendation to Senate this year:

Jenkins raised the question of whether this Task Force should present a recommendation to Academic Senate regarding the adoption of either a distribution, modified core or core model. Before discussion proceeded on that issue, however, the question was raised as to whether it was necessary for the Task Force to make its recommendations directly to the Senate or through the Academic Standards Committee. It was Jenkins' experience on Senate that led him to believe that task forces appointed by the Senate, such as GER, reported directly. It was suggested by Tom Maraffa and agreed to by those present that he bring up the issue to the Senate Executive Committee, which was meeting immediately after the GER Task Force had finished. Members of the Academic **Standards** Committee (**Darla** Funk, Randy Hoover, Larry Hugenberg, and Stephanie Tingley) concurred in the belief that it would be better if the Task Force reported directly to the Senate. They believed that it would expedite matters.

In discussing the models, it was suggested that the distribution model was lacking because it had no goals, and that core models existed more at liberal arts schools rather than at comprehensive universities like YSU. It was also pointed out that a few core courses posed problems in terms of turf and also in terms of personnel available to teach. Thus, the Task Force reached a consensus that ~~the~~ **modified** core was the appropriate model to recommend to the Senate in the spring.

Discussion regarding the timing of the switch to semesters and the implementation of GER:

Discussion revolved around the fall of 1997 or the fall of 1998. Randy Hoover raised a concern about the School of Education's need to revamp its curriculum in light of new state

standards, which had to be done by the fall of 1997. He also noted that the School of Education had an NCATE review occurring in the fall of 1998. The committee **examined** what would happen if we had to have **everything** ready by the fall of 1997; most committee members seemed to agree that we could not implement that timeline. The chief concerns **raised** were: having to have everything finished by the winter of 1996-97 in order to implement in the fall, the impact of going through semester revisions at the **same** time, and the arrival of a whole body of new faculty members who will not have the time to work on revision. It was also suggested that retirees will not want to work on conversion either. **Bill** Jenkins indicated at the end of the discussion that he would meet with **Cyndy** Anderson regarding how accreditation agencies might also affect implementation, and that the Task Force should discuss this issue at the next meeting when more members might be present.

Discussion regarding what steps need to be taken from now through the implementation:

Without reaching any decision, the Task Force discussed the steps of implementation. Jenkins noted that the Task Force would need to conduct workshops, establish criteria for acceptance of courses, create a committee to review the courses and establish standards of accountability in addition to reporting the Senate and making recommendations along the way. Questions were **raised** about the possibility of faculty, including those on the GER Task Force, receiving reassigned time. Jenkins mentioned the offer of Jim **Scanlon** to compensate faculty in some fashion for their work on cumculum development.

Darla Funk raised the problem of asking people to develop courses without some examples or **guiding** principles available. She suggested that indicating that there were goals as guidelines was not sufficient. It was decided that the committee should review the models collected in the fall, and come to the next committee meeting prepared to debate which were best. We might select three or four to offer to faculty as examples. Jenkins suggested that we take them to the faculty first for feedback. No further decisions were reached.

Agenda for the next meeting:

- 1) discussion of the models, especially those at state universities,
- 2) final discussion of modified core recommendation to Senate, and
- 3) continuing discussion of establishing a timeline.

Next Meeting: The next meeting is Thursday, February 9th at 4 p.m. in the Dean's Conference Room in Arts and Sciences.

Adjournment: Jenkins adjourned the meeting at **3:58** p.m.



GER TASK FORCE MEETING MINUTES

Date: February 16, 1995

Present: Anderson, Driscoll, Hugenberg, Jenkins, McMahan, Mullins, O'Neill, Tingley, White.

Absent: Beckett, Funk, Hoover, Jennings, Maraffa, Mistovich, Multari, Palmer, Singler.

Secretary: Anne McMahan

Jenkins, Chair of the Task Force, called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. in the Dean's Conference room in the College of Arts and Sciences.

Meetings with the departments: Several members reported that they had met with one or more of the departments regarding the information sheet circulated to faculty. Jenkins suggested that members who had met with the departments should write a brief summary of the feedback for the committee.

Report on the Transcript Analysis: Nancy White provided preliminary results to the task force on the transcript analysis that she and Tom Maraffa have been conducting. She reported that she has read all the course descriptions in the undergraduate bulletin and reviewed a sample of 200 student transcripts for courses taken. Courses were coded for manifest relationships to the GER goals. She said the results were the first step in the analysis. The next step will be reviewing another sample of transcripts based on feedback from the departments about how courses relate to the GER goals. It was also decided to get some other unit in the University to replicate one of the analyses on graduation rates to see if the results are replicated using another sample.

Report to the Senate: The task force again discussed what to report to the Senate and when. Jenkins reported that there seemed to be a consensus at the last meeting among those present to report to the senate that we would probably be recommending a modified core program. The members discussed among themselves what that meant to us. It seemed to mean that there would be some courses that everyone would take and some set of restricted alternatives among which students could chose. Further, it could mean that some program components might not be met by a course, but by some other instructional mode (e.g. lab, computerized self-paced instruction). In addition, a modified core could include the existence of multiple cores among which students might chose, each organized around a different theme. Jenkins and the task force agreed that we would not report to the Senate until Spring, so the subject will come up again for discussion prior to then.



GER TASK FORCE MEETING MINUTES

Date: March 2, 1995

Present: Driscoll, Hoover, Hugenberg, Jenkins, Jennings, Maraffa, McMahon, O'Neill, Palmer, Singler, Tingley, White.

Absent: Anderson, Beckett, Funk, Mistovich, Mullins, Multari.

Secretary: McMahon & Tingley

Jenkins, Chair of the Task Force, called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. in the Dean's Conference room in the College of Arts and Sciences.

Discussion of the Asheville Institute on Higher Education. The task force discussed attending the AACU Conference in Asheville on June 3-8. A 4-6 page application is required for selection. Jim Scanlon and Bill Jenkins would go and there are 3 other positions open. The members discussed the appropriateness of the timing of the conference for our agenda and for our academic calendar. There was discussion suggesting that it might be more effective to spend the money inviting one or two experts in to work with the whole committee for a day or two. We could time that around our particular progress. There was consensus that we not apply to Asheville this time, but will seek one or two experts for a planning retreat for the task force, possible in early summer.

Meetings with the departments: Several members reported that they had met with one or more of the departments regarding the information sheet circulated to faculty. Jenkins reminded members to write a brief summary of the feedback from their visits to departments. Several members reported the following items were raised: there seems to be some uncertainty and anxiety and yet an undercurrent of optimism; concerns that students have options and that the system be simple enough to permit students to see a transparent connection between the requirements and options and the goals; concerns about the effects of scheduling and complexity on the administration of major programs; concerns that the new GER not greatly exceed the current number of hours allocated to general education; and questions regarding what North Central Accreditation team/report actually said about our general education program. In addition there was a question about possible other uses of the reports from the departments.

Actions: The committee explicitly reaffirmed that the reports from departments will be used only by the GER task force and only for the purposes of determining what our general education requirements need to do.

The task force also asked Larry Hugenberg to get the North Central report regarding general education from Cynthia Anderson. In addition we need to get the current criteria and any

information about how North Central might assess them this next time.

Future Agenda/Schedule: The committee will receive reports from Departments in early April. There was a suggestion that we may need a sub-committee to look for patterns in those reports. The committee will discuss what impact the reports suggest for the goals and how to address them. We need to clearly frame what the GER courses need to do. There was consensus that just because courses are now on the books doesn't mean they will be in the general education program. All new GER courses will participate in some new review process and assessment process.

Members were urged to send in their schedules to Jenkins.

Next Meeting: The next meeting will be scheduled after Jenkins receives the schedules for Spring Quarter from everyone. Jenkins suggested the possibility of fewer meetings but longer ones (2-3 hours) on Friday afternoons since we may need time to really discuss issues at length.

Adjournment: Jenkins adjourned the meeting at 5:05 p.m.



GER TASK FORCE MEETING MINUTES

Date: April 7, 1995

Present: Driscoll, Funk, Hoover, Jenkins, Maraffa, **McMahon**, Mistovich, **Mullins**, O'Neill, Singler, Tingley, White.

Absent: Anderson, Beckett, Hugenberg, **Jennings**, Multari, Palmer.

Secretary: Anne McMahon

Jenkins, Chair of the Task Force, called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. in the Dean's conference room of the Arts and Science College.

Jenkins reported that few of the departmental reports have come in. He is preparing a list to circulate. He asked that when members receive the list, they make a follow up contact with the departments they visited to encourage the department to complete the report soon.

Jenkins asked for a final agreement on the message he should bring to the Senate. There was consensus that we will not recommend a pure core model in which the exact same courses are required of each and every student. However, it was also agreed that we would not have a wide open distribution model either. The model will be goal driven. Jenkins said he would draft a report to the Faculty Senate for this Spring. He will share it with us in advance of the Senate meeting for our feedback. He will make a report rather than ask for a vote. He will ask for concerns and feedback, not a vote.

McMahon attended the faculty development workshop sponsored by the College of Business on "What does business really want from us?" She circulated a written summary of the speakers' comments to the task force members.

Meeting Schedule and Calendar of Activities:

The committee discussed our time line for the workshop for the task force. We expect to arrange a person from AACU to come in for a day. There was a preference for June 16 or 17. Failing that, the **week-end** before might be scheduled.

We cannot begin reviewing the results of the department reports because so few of them are in. We hope they are all in by the end of April.

Discussion with Provost Scanlon

Provost Scanlon joined the meeting. He restated the understanding that was shared among task members that YSU would not be changing to a semester system in the near future and that the issue would not again be up for debate until the year 2000. Scanlon shared his understanding of the issues involved in that decision. These were: although he felt that there were sound theoretical reasons for semesters, there were several issues that arose which required study. Conducting those studies and making the change added too much to an already heavy set of changes underway.

The provost discussed some issues he felt were important to our success. He felt we needed a statement of the philosophy that might help people understand the goals. He also suggested that we might want to develop some commentary on the goals. He supported the idea of a workshop for the task force and for others on campus as needed. He suggested we add some public events to the workshop to involve others. Scanlon also suggested that we adopt the strategy of a "clean slate" with regard to existing courses and requirements and design a system that is goal driven. He acknowledged that this process does cost money because people will have to develop courses, workshops are needed, speakers need to be brought in and the like. He encouraged us to consider issues of pedagogy as well as content (e.g. opportunities for group interaction, reading beyond the text book, use of the library), and that we address skills and values (such as obligation to the good that is greater than ourselves). He expresses the hope that the curriculum supports many different approaches to subject matter--i.e. diversity of pedagogy--and that it is aimed at producing independent learners.

The members discussed these issues with the provost. There was also discussion of developing support services for students in areas of skill that need to be in many courses such as computer literacy and writing tasks. The importance of such services for the full range of students was discussed, including their consequences for retention. It was also recognized that some achievements by students who enroll without appropriate background might require a manner that entails units beyond the minimum required for graduation.

Next Meeting: The next meeting will be scheduled for April 28th from 2:00 p.m. until 4:30 p.m. At that meeting the agenda will be:

1. Should we develop a written statement of philosophy.
2. Should we develop commentary on each goal.
3. Development issues and procedures for engaging others in this process.
4. Begin our conversation about images of GER at YSU.

Adjournment: Jenkins adjourned the meeting at 4:05 p.m.



Youngstown State University / Youngstown, Ohio 44555-3071
The Warren P. Williamson, Jr. School of Business Administration
Department of Management
(216) 742-3071
FAX: (216) 742-1459

GER TASK FORCE MEETING MINUTES

Date: April 28, 1995

Present: Beckett, **Bowen**, Funk, Jenkins, Maraffa, **McMahon**, **O'Neill**, Palmer, Singler, Tingley, White.

Absent: Anderson, **Driscoll**, Hoover, Hugenberg, **Jennings**, Mistovich, **Mullins**, **O'Neill**.

Secretary: McMahon

Jenkins, Chair of the Task Force, called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. in Room 2057 of Kilcawley Center. McMahon briefly reported on the connection of the task force activities to the successful application for the American Commitments in a Diverse Democracy Project sponsored by AACU. YSU has been selected to participate in the project.

Membership Issues: Jenkins introduced Richard **Bowen**, a student who is replacing Joe **Multari** on the committee. Richard is in Student Government.

Discussion of our June Workshop: Jenkins reported that Jerry Gaff (from AACU) is not available for a workshop in June. The time is a problem for several possible workshop leaders. After discussion the members of the task force decided to ask John **Hinni**, who is Dean for the area of general education at Southeast Missouri. He has delivered many of these workshops, comes highly recommended, is available for the Friday at issue, and is organizer of an association of administrators of general education. The workshop will be held on June 16th. The task force discussed whether anyone other than the task force members should be included in the session; it was agreed that Jenkins would discuss our ideas about that with **Hinni** for his **recommendation**. The task force discussed the items that might be the focus of the workshop. The items that were suggested:

How to involve faculty in the general education process and in the development of curriculum;

What workshops might be needed;

How to involve students and **administrators** in **the** process;

How to create an ongoing information dissemination process that is broad based;

Planning;

Community **involvement** issues;

Resources **related** to the next part of the **process**;

Transition **from** the old system to a new one.

Meetings with the departments: Jenkins reported that only 16 of the 41 departments have sent us the reports on their programs. Several departments have not been able to schedule meetings with the committee members. Jenkins asked that each of us contact the departments again and ask them to reply not later than May 15. Jenkins said he would contact the Deans to let them know which departments had not responded and to urge them to encourage the departments to reply soon. Jenkins will copy all the reports and circulate them to us for review.

Brainstorming session on GER goals and how they might be addressed: Jenkins asked us to brainstorm our reactions to each of the goals in terms of how they might be addressed.

1. Write and speak effectively:

The task force decided to separate them. Ideas for writing that surfaced: writing intensive courses; writing across the curriculum; **some/all** of GER courses have intensive writing requirements; a capstone course is writing intensive; develop different writing tracks that address different audiences; cover styles of documentation; develop a tutor system that supports writing in all courses or in GER courses.

The items that surfaced for speaking: **Speaking** intensive courses; speaking across the curriculum; **all/some** GER courses require formal presentations; the need to include other notions of speaking in addition to formal presentations to audiences (**e.g.** group interaction, effective interpersonal interaction).

The members present suggested that we will need to form a **sub-committee** in this area--particularly as it deals with writing. The sub-committee will need to develop goals for this area. Some end-point assessment levels need to be set. Decisions about remedial backgrounds and very high levels of student performance need to be considered. It does appear that this area will require courses and that one or two is not likely to do the trick. A subcommittee can pull together what is needed. A separate sub-committee may be needed for **speaking** skills.

2. Acquire, process and present quantitative and qualitative information using the most appropriate technologies, including computers:

The items that surfaced were: some of this will have to be done by the major. Different majors have different needs. Use of the library can be included in classes and can be done in an orientation program; using computers can entail an orientation experience; a supported lab that provides tutoring in elementary activities for a set of software and hardware; special workshops can be offered for students; labs and workshops can not only help with remedial issues but also can provide support for independent learning for students of many backgrounds. They can also serve specialized needs such as music technology.

The committee suggested that this area be included in courses that deal with other goals. The information issues associated with different courses help define what technology is appropriate and how to process it.

3. Reason critically, both individually and collaboratively, draw sound conclusions from information, ideas and interpretations gathered from various sources and disciplines, and apply those conclusions to one's life and society.

Issues that surfaced: courses might be relevant (e.g. philosophy courses, courses in critical thinking); it seems that the goal is so complex as not to be addressed by a single course. The committee members present felt that this goal is an umbrella for a variety of courses and learning experiences. The committee suggested that this set of issues probably ought to be in every GER course in a demonstrated and measurable way. Group and individual issues were discussed.

The committee felt that this is an area that requires more study by the ~~task~~ force before any **sub-committee** is appointed or a decision made. Jenkins suggested that perhaps O'Neill and Palmer and any one else with special expertise put together additional information for the task force.

4. Understand the personal and social importance of ethical reflection and moral reasoning.

The issues that surfaced: this is an area that cannot be met totally by GER courses; the majors must address it for specialized connections to careers associated with the major. The members also acknowledged that this area has serious potential for abuse of student rights, particularly in the context of a formal requirement and particularly to the extent that choice is restricted. The members felt that this, too, is an area that requires further study by the committee.

Next Meeting: The next meeting will be on May 12 from 2-4:30 p.m. The place will be listed on the meeting announcement. Kilcawley may not have a room.

Adjournment: Jenkins adjourned the meeting at 4:35 p.m.



GER TASK FORCE MEETING MINUTES

Date: May 12, 1995

Present: Bowen, Funk, Jenkins, Jennings, Maraffa, McMahon, Mullins, O'Neill, Palmer, Singler, Tingley, White.

Absent: Anderson, Beckett, Driscoll, Hoover, Hugenberg, Mistovich.

Secretary: McMahon

Jenkins, Chair of the Task Force, called the meeting to order at 2:05 p.m. in the Dean's conference room of the Arts and Science College. Jenkins announced that the Association for General and Liberal Studies is holding a conference, "The Future of Collaboration," in San Antonio on October 12-14, 1995. Members who are interested in attending should let Jenkins know.

Minutes: In response to the minutes, the members discussed what was needed from the sub-committee on critical thinking appointed at the last meeting. It was agreed that the sub-committee consider what we should all read as a follow-up to the presentations made earlier this year. In response to mention in the minutes about the risk of abusing student rights in courses related to goal #4, it was pointed out that many other courses, perhaps all comes, have a potential to abuse student rights. Jenkins commented that there is no intent to abuse student rights, although in individual circumstances, that might occur.

Discussion of our June Workshop: Jenkins reported that the workshop for the task force is set for June 16th all day. McMahon reported that she had reserved the Cafaro Suite in Williamson Hall for the workshop. She is also making arrangements with the food service people to provide lunch and morning coffee and juice.

Meetings with the departments: Jenkins reported that 23 the 40 departments have sent us the reports on their programs. All of them have been visited. Marketing has indicated that it will not be responding to our request for information.

Brainstorming session on GER goals and how they might be addressed: Jenkins asked us to continue to brain storm our reactions to each of the goals in terms of how they might be addressed.

5. Comprehend mathematical concepts and reason mathematically in both abstract and applied contexts.

The following ideas surfaced: This could be met by a GER course for everyone or by several GER courses among which students 'might pick. For students with backgrounds, it could be met by an advanced course in abstract reasoning in math. It could be met by math intensive courses in the major. Students could take a math placement test, pick from a restricted menu of GER courses, and complete the goal in the major. It seemed to the committee that this is one area where a sub-committee might be needed.

6. Understand the scientific method; forming and testing hypotheses as well as evaluating results.

The items that surfaced were: This area seems to require **experiential learning**--i.e. a lab course or some other course in which the student actually is involved in doing science. There could be one GER course with a variety of applications in both the physical and social sciences. It could be met by a limited menu of GER courses in different content areas. It might be satisfied by a course or courses in the major.

7. Realize the evolving interrelationships among science, technology and society.

The items that surfaced were: This is aimed at producing scientific literacy. It could be incorporated in other GER courses or in the major's courses. There could be a range of GER courses, perhaps with different themes. The content could be incorporated with other goals, especially skill goals.

8. Grasp and appreciate artistic expression in multiple forms and contexts.

The issues that surfaced: This goal could also be met in a series of courses or cluster of courses that link areas of art to the context of the other courses. There could be a menu of courses, so that each course would have some depth; there was concern about a broad course that lacked depth. The course called for is not a performance course but implies appreciation involving some critical review. The **course(s)** ought to involve experiences with area arts events.

9. Understand the relationships between physical, mental, and emotional well-being and the quality of life of the individual, the family and the community.

The items that surfaced: It could be met by new GER course(s) from different departments. There could be a menu of courses with varying thematic interdisciplinary approaches. Some majors may be sufficient to satisfy this goal without additional courses.



GER TASK FORCE MEETING MINUTES

Date: May 12, 1995

Present: Bowen, Funk, Jenkins, Jennings, Maraffa, McMahon, Mullins, O'Neill, Palmer, Singler, Tingley, White.

Absent: Anderson, Beckett, Driscoll, Hoover, Hugenberg, Mistovich.

Secretary: McMahon

Jenkins, Chair of the Task Force, called the meeting to order at 2:05 p.m. in the Dean's conference room of the Arts and Science College. Jenkins announced that the Association for General and Liberal Studies is holding a conference, "The Future of Collaboration," in San Antonio on October 12-14, 1995. Members who are interested in attending should let Jenkins know.

Minutes: In response to the minutes, the members discussed what was needed from the sub-committee on critical thinking appointed at the last meeting. It was agreed that the sub-committee consider what we should all read as a follow-up to the presentations made earlier this year. In response to mention in the minutes about the risk of abusing student rights in courses related to goal #4, it was pointed out that many other courses, perhaps all courses, have a potential to abuse student rights. Jenkins commented that there is no intent to abuse student rights, although in individual circumstances, that might occur.

Discussion of our June Workshop: Jenkins reported that the workshop for the task force is set for June 16th all day. McMahon reported that she had reserved the **Cafaro Suite** in Williamson Hall for the workshop. She is also making arrangements with the food service people to provide lunch and morning coffee and juice.

Meetings with the departments: Jenkins reported that 23 the 40 departments have sent us the reports on their programs. All of them have been visited. Marketing **has** indicated that it will not be responding to our request for information.

Brainstorming session on GER goals and how they might be addressed: Jenkins asked us to continue to brain storm our reactions to each of the goals in terms of how they might be addressed.

10. **Understand** the development of cultures and organizations of human societies throughout the world and their changing interrelationships with Western society.

Items that surfaced: It could be met by a single GER course or be incorporated into a set or cluster of courses around a theme. Multiple courses might exist that a student could chose among (e.g. courses dealing with goals 8, 11, 12).

11. Evaluate the impact of theories, events and institutions on the social, economic, legal, and political aspects of society.

Items that surfaced: This seems to be definitely within the GER area. The course or courses would have to be set in a particular context or contexts. It might well be part of a set of linked or clustered courses. The members felt a need to define this **area** better.

Next Meeting: The next meeting will be on June 2nd from 2:00-4:30 p.m. in Kilcawley 2069.

Adjournment: Jenkins adjourned the meeting at 4:25 p.m.

5. Comprehend mathematical concepts and reason mathematically in both abstract and applied contexts.

The following ideas surfaced: This could be met by a GER course for everyone or by several GER courses among which students might pick. For students with backgrounds, it could be met by an advanced course in abstract reasoning in math. It could be met by math intensive courses in the major. Students could take a math placement test, pick from a restricted menu of GER courses, and complete the goal in the major. It seemed to the committee that this is one area where a sub-committee might be needed.

6. Understand the scientific method; forming and testing hypotheses as well as evaluating results.

The items that surfaced were: This area seems to require experiential learning--i.e. a lab course or some other course in which the student actually is involved in doing science. There could be one GER course with a variety of applications in both the physical and social sciences. It could be met by a limited menu of GER courses in different content areas. It might be satisfied by a course or courses in the major.

7. Realize the evolving interrelationships among science, technology and society.

- The items that surfaced were: This is aimed at producing scientific literacy. It could be incorporated in other GER courses or in the major's courses. There could be a range of GER courses, perhaps with different themes. The content could be incorporated with other goals, especially skill goals.

8. Grasp and appreciate artistic expression in multiple forms and contexts.

The issues that surfaced: This goal could also be met in a series of courses or cluster of courses that link areas of art to the context of the other courses. There could be a menu of courses, so that each course would have some depth; there was concern about a broad course that lacked depth. The course called for is not a performance course but implies appreciation involving some critical review. The course(s) ought to involve experiences with area arts events.

9. Understand the relationships between physical, mental, and emotional well-being and the quality of life of the individual, the family and the community.

The items that surfaced: It could be met by new GER course(s) from different departments. There could be a menu of courses with varying thematic interdisciplinary approaches. Some majors may be sufficient to satisfy this goal without additional courses.

5. Comprehend mathematical concepts and reason mathematically in both abstract and applied contexts.

The following ideas surfaced: This could be met by a GER course for everyone or by several GER courses among which students might pick. For students with backgrounds, it could be met by an advanced course in abstract reasoning in math. It could be met by math intensive courses in the major. Students could take a math placement test, pick from a restricted menu of GER courses, and complete the goal in the major. It seemed to the committee that this is one area where a **sub-committee** might be needed.

6. Understand the scientific method; forming and testing hypotheses as well as evaluating results.

The items that surfaced were: This area seems to require experiential **learning**--i.e. a lab course or some other course in which the student actually is involved in doing science. There could be one GER course with a variety of applications in both the physical and social sciences. It could be met by a limited menu of GER courses in different content areas. It might be satisfied by a course or courses in the major.

7. Realize the evolving **interrelationships** among science, technology and society

The items that surfaced were: This is aimed at producing scientific literacy. It could be incorporated in other GER courses or in the **major's** courses. There could be a range of GER **courses**, perhaps with different themes. The content could be incorporated with other goals, especially skill goals.

8. Grasp and appreciate artistic expression in multiple forms and contexts.

The issues that surfaced: This goal could also be met in a series of courses or cluster of courses that link areas of **art** to the context of **the** other courses. There could be a menu of courses, so that each course would have some depth; there was concern about a broad course that lacked depth. The course called for is not a performance course but implies appreciation involving some critical review. The **course(s)** ought to involve experiences with area arts events.

9. Understand the relationships between physical, mental, and emotional well-being and the quality of life of the individual, the family and the community.

The items that surfaced: It could be met by new GER **course(s)** from different departments. There could be a menu of courses with varying thematic interdisciplinary approaches. Some majors may be sufficient to satisfy this goal without additional courses.

10. Understand the development of cultures and organizations of **human** societies throughout the world and their changing **interrelationships** with Western society.

Items that surfaced: It could be met by a single GER course or be incorporated into a set or cluster of courses around a theme. .Multiple courses might exist that a student could chose among (e.g. courses dealing with goals 8, 11, 12).

11. Evaluate the impact of theories, events and institutions on the social, economic, legal, and political aspects of society.

Items that surfaced: This seems to be definitely within the GER area. The course or courses would have to be set in a particular context or contexts. It might well be part of a set of linked or clustered courses. The members felt a need to define this area better.

Next Meeting: The next meeting will be on June 2nd from 2:00-4:30 p.m. in Kilcawley 2069.

Adjournment: Jenkins adjourned the meeting at 4:25 p.m.



Youngstown State University / Youngstown, Ohio 44555-3071
The Warren P. Williamson, Jr. School of Business Administration
Department of Management
(216) 742-3071
FAX: (216) 742-1459

GER TASK FORCE MEETING MINUTES

Date: April 28, 1995

Present: Beckett, [✓]Bowen, Funk, Jenkins, Maraffa, McMahon, O'Neill, Palmer, [✓]Singler, Tingley, White.

Absent: Anderson, [✓]Driscoll, Hoover, [✓]Hugenberg, Jennings, [✓]Mistovich, Mullins, O'Neill.

Secretary: McMahon

Jenkins, Chair of the Task Force, called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. in Room 2057 of Kilcawley Center. McMahon briefly reported on the connection of the task force activities to the successful application for the American Commitments in a Diverse Democracy Project sponsored by AACU. YSU has been selected to participate in the project.

Membership Issues: Jenkins introduced Richard Bowen, a student who is replacing Joe Multari on the committee. Richard is in Student Government.

Discussion of our June Workshop: Jenkins reported that Jerry Gaff (from AACU) is not available for a workshop in June. The time is a problem for several possible workshop leaders. After discussion the members of the task force decided to ask John Hinni, who is Dean for the area of general education at Southeast Missouri. He has delivered many of these workshops, comes highly recommended, is available for the Friday at issue, and is organizer of an association of administrators of general education. The workshop will be held on June 16th. The task force discussed whether anyone other than the task force members should be included in the session; it was agreed that Jenkins would discuss our ideas about that with Hinni for his recommendation. The task force discussed the items that might be the focus of the workshop. The items that were suggested:

- How to involve faculty in the general education process and in the development of curriculum;
- What workshops might be needed;
- How to involve students and administrators in the process;
- How to create an ongoing information dissemination process that is broad based;
- Planning;
- Community involvement issues;
- Resources **related** to the next part of the process;
- Transition from the old system to a new one.

Meetings with the departments: Jenkins reported that only 16 of the 41 departments have sent us the reports on their programs. Several departments have not been able to schedule meetings with the committee members. Jenkins asked that each of us contact the departments again and ask them to reply **not later** than May 15. Jenkins said he would contact the Deans to let them know which departments had not responded and to urge them to encourage the departments to reply soon. Jenkins will copy all the reports and circulate them to us for review.

Brainstorming session on GER goals and how they might be addressed: Jenkins asked us to brainstorm our reactions to each of the goals in terms of how they might be addressed.

1. Write and speak effectively:

The task force decided to separate them. Ideas for writing that surfaced: writing intensive courses; writing across the curriculum; **some/all** of GER courses have intensive writing requirements; a capstone course is writing intensive; develop different writing tracks that address different audiences; cover styles of documentation; develop a tutor system that supports writing in all courses or in GER courses.

The items that surfaced for **speaking**: **Speaking** intensive courses; speaking across the curriculum; **all/some** GER courses require formal presentations; the need to include other notions of **speaking** in addition to formal presentations to audiences (**e.g.** group interaction, effective interpersonal interaction).

The members present suggested that we will need to form a sub-committee in this area--particularly as it deals with writing. The subcommittee will need to develop goals for this area. Some end-point assessment levels need to be set. Decisions about remedial backgrounds and very high levels of student performance need to be considered. It does appear that this area will require courses and that one or two is not likely to do the trick. **A** subcommittee can pull together what is needed. **A** separate sub-committee may be needed for speaking skills.

2. Acquire, process and present quantitative and qualitative information using the most appropriate technologies, including computers:

The items that surfaced were: some of this will have to be done by the major. Different majors have different needs. Use of the library can be included in classes and can be done in an orientation program; using computers can entail an orientation experience; a supported lab that provides tutoring in elementary activities for a set of software and hardware; special workshops can be offered for students; labs and workshops can not only help with remedial issues but also can provide support for independent learning for students of many backgrounds. They can also serve specialized needs such as music technology.

The committee suggested that this area be included in courses that deal with other goals. The information issues associated with different courses help define what technology is appropriate and how to process it.

3. Reason critically, both individually and collaboratively, draw sound conclusions from information, ideas and interpretations gathered from various sources and disciplines, and apply those conclusions to one's life and society.

Issues that surfaced: courses might be relevant (e.g. philosophy courses, courses in critical thinking); it seems that the goal is so complex as not to be addressed by a single course. The committee members present felt that this goal is an umbrella for a variety of courses and learning experiences. The committee suggested that this set of issues probably ought to be in every GER course in a demonstrated and measurable way. Group and individual issues were discussed.

The committee felt that this is an area that requires more study by the task force before any **sub-committee** is appointed or a decision made. Jenkins suggested that perhaps O'Neill and Palmer and any one else with special expertise put together additional information for the task force.

4. Understand the personal and social importance of ethical reflection and moral reasoning.

The issues that surfaced: this is an area that cannot be met totally by GER courses; the majors must address it for specialized connections to careers associated with the major. The members also acknowledged that this area has serious potential for abuse of student rights, particularly in the context of a formal requirement and particularly to the extent that choice is restricted. The members felt that this, too, is an area that requires further study by the committee.

Next Meeting: The next meeting will be on May 12 from 2-4:30 p.m. The place will be listed on the meeting announcement. Kilcawley may not have a room.

Adjournment: Jenkins adjourned the meeting at 4:35 p.m.



me - copy

Youngstown State University / Youngstown, Ohio 44555-0001

GER TASK FORCE MEETING MINUTES

Date: June 2, 1995

Present: Anderson, Funk, Hoover, Jenkins, Jennings, Maraffa, McMahon, Mullins, O'Neill, Palmer, Tingley, White.

Absent: Beckett, Bowen, Driscoll, Hugenberg, Mistovich, Singler.

Secretary: McMahon

Jenkins, Chair of the Task Force, called the meeting to order at 2:15 p.m. in the Room Room 2069, Kilcawley.

Minutes: There were no amendments or corrections to the minutes.

Discussion of our June Workshop: Jenkins reported that the workshop for the task force is set for June 16th from around 9 in the morning until about 5 in the afternoon. A more detailed schedule of the activities and times will be sent to each member soon. Jenkins then went over the tentative conference agenda sent by John Hinni and Fred Janzow. While the discussion was going on, a new agenda arrived in response to feedback given to the earlier draft. The members felt that the new agenda was promising. Jenkins indicated that he has communicated to the two consultants that we want "meat;" we want to reach conclusions, particularly in the form of a plan for next year's actions.

The members decided that detailed recording of the workshop would not be necessary. We will keep copies of all materials and McMahon will take notes on the main outcomes or conclusions at the end.

McMahon circulated a response form for the conference including a lunch selection form. Members in attendance filled them out. McMahon said she will send the form to the members who are not in attendance. She also described the day's meal plan.

Assessment: Cindy Anderson passed out a draft of the Assessment Plan. She and Jennings are also **working** on that task. North Central turned back many assessment plans, and among the returned plans were ones that took a top-down approach. The draft for our campus gives freedom to individual departments to assess their programs and to develop their own plans for doing so. Anderson's group, however, did develop the skeleton plan for assessing GER. She asked that everyone on the GER task force read the plan and provide comments and feedback. The committee suggested that the plan include a statement that the GER courses will be directly assessed in an ongoing way for their adherence to the General Ed. goals as originally proposed. It should also indicate that each GER course will have an assessment plan as part of its proposal. Both of these are points stressed in the conferences we have attended.

Department Reports: Jenkins reported that 32 of the 40 departments have sent us the reports on their programs. He will reproduce them for us in about a week or two.

Brainstorming session on GER goals and how they might be addressed: Jenkins asked us to continue to brainstorm our reactions to the goals we have not yet discussed.

Goal 12: Comprehend and appreciate the development of diversity in America in all its forms. The following points surfaced:

The issues addressed by this goal form a central theme that all students must take no matter what choices they make among GER alternatives. The goal is not likely to be met by a single specific course on the topic. Some consideration of this theme should exist in many GER courses. A course focused on this theme is a great area for interdisciplinary team teaching. Such a course should not be just information about others. It should be tied to self-identity and who "we" are. It need not focus on every group or category. Many choices of such courses might be available. It is also a theme that is well integrated with other goals such as critical thinking. The goal was also discussed in terms of YSU's participation in the American Diversity project sponsored by AACU. The group agreed that some inclusion of social class and demographic issues is well targeted for people in this area, given its history in the manufacturing industry of the U.S. economy over the years.

Goal 13: Understand and appreciate the natural environment and the processes that shape it. In the discussion, the following emerged:

There was discussion by long-standing members that the original intent of this goal was to stress an understanding of the natural sciences. The sub-text seems to broaden the goals so much as to make it very diffuse. The role of human agency seems great. It was decided that this area requires a better statement than it now has. The committee will have to discuss it more and arrive at something that provides more definition.

Task Force Future Agenda: The committee agreed to meet during the summer months; Jenkins asked everyone to send him a summer schedule. The members who were present gave their schedules to him.

In addition to the workshop and the plan that will be developed there, the committee needs to define the goal areas better. The preface did provide a philosophy of general education. However, more work on our part is needed. The summer meetings are necessary to prepare us for the fall. The task force needs to consider whether individuals who regularly fail to attend should be offered the opportunity to withdraw. There was also a discussion about ways to get student reaction. It was decided that this stage of the task may not require the same methods as a later stage.

Next Meeting: The next meeting will be on June 16 at the workshop in the Cafaro Suite of Williamson Hall (fifth floor) at 9:00 a.m.

Adjournment: Jenkins adjourned the meeting at 4:00 p.m.



GER TASK FORCE MEETING MINUTES

Youngstown State University / Youngstown, Ohio 44555.0001

Date: July 6, 1995

Present: Hoover, **Jennings**, Maraffa, **McMahon**, **Mullins**, Tingley, White.

Absent: Anderson, **Beckett**, **Bowen**, Driscoll, Funk, Hugenberg, Jenkins, Mistovich, **O'Neill**, Palmer, Singler.

Secretary: McMahon

Jenkins, Chair of the Task Force, called the meeting to order at 3:10 p.m. in the Carnation Room of Kilcawley Center.

Minutes: Nancy White had prepared and circulated to everyone notes on the Workshop held on June 16. The members who were present expressed how helpful the notes were and thanked Nancy for doing this for the committee.

Discussion of our June Workshop: Jenkins asked that we begin by discussing the workshop in general. The members expressed consensus that it was very beneficial. The development of a time table for our activities was mentioned as especially important. The overall effect of the full day was strong, even if one or another of the individual activities was seen as weak by one member or another. People worked well together and in good humor. John and Fred reported to Jenkins that we look very good to them in terms of where we are and in terms of the University as a whole.

It was suggested that we have Fred and John back again in about a year. Jenkins reported that they both considered themselves to be "ours" for the duration of the process. They are available for check-ins, to come back, to read materials, and the like. In addition, they will be attending the Assn. of General and Liberal Studies meetings in October in San Antonio. They will be happy to meet with any members of our committee who attend.

Committee Membership: Larry Hugenberg will be going on sabbatical next year; he was appointed when the committee was an Arts and Science Committee. Since the task force now reports directly to the Senate, the position he fills is no longer appropriate. We will not replace him. Stephanie Tingley is also going on sabbatical next year. She wishes to remain on the committee and have someone replace her for the year. It was suggested that we get someone from the writing area for next year. That will help the committee; however, people may not be willing to serve under such circumstances. Stephanie will make inquiries and get **back** with a report. Joe Mistovich will also be leaving. Jenkins has spoken with Alice Betz **and John Yemma**; it appears that Joe will be replaced by Rick Walker who attended the workshop in June. He is also willing to go to San Antonio and attend the relevant sessions.

Finally, Cindy Anderson's promotion implies that she will be replaced by the person who takes her former job. That person has not yet been selected. The names of all the new members will be submitted, in the end, to the Provost for approval.

Department Reports: Jenkins suggested that we discuss the department reports that he circulated last week. Some trends were noticed by the committee members who read them. Some goals are listed as addressed by many, many courses. Others are rarely listed. Jenkins suggested we all read them carefully and reflect on: patterns that emerge about what people are actually doing, criteria that might indicate construct validity for use in reviewing courses, assessment criteria, issues that will help us communicate these criteria. Nancy White and Tom Maraffa will look at them in terms of doing another transcript analysis.

Foreign Language Requirements: Stephanie Tingley and Jenkins ^{ow}reported her meeting with the foreign language department. The department's concern was that we were marginalizing language because we have no explicit goal or statement dealing with it. The committee discussed the concern. It was pointed out that last year's committee said that, at a minimum, the present system would likely continue. Changes to that system should come from the foreign language department in terms of its own program development. The process we will follow creates opportunities for departments to move away from the margins of the campus and into significant roles within general education. Foreign language, in and of itself, is not a goal. What is needed is to create ways to make language available and attractive to more students.

Discussion of a Philosophy Statement: Jenkins asked the committee to discuss the suggestion made by the Provost during his session with us. Do we need a philosophy statement, and if so, what might that mean? The members present expressed consensus that we do not need and should not develop a philosophy statement if that means developing a serious philosophical discussion about the role of general education in the curriculum. The belief was that such a statement will be divisive rather than inclusive. There is room within GER for people with very different philosophical stripes. Such intellectual diversity is at the heart of a strong University. However, we agreed that something needs to be said concerning what we are about. We need a purpose statement that provides a vision of general education and that serves as a backdrop with which we can evaluate the whole program. The goals are too many and too complicated to serve that function by themselves. The preface seems not to be serving that function, although it was intended to do so. The committee discussed how to produce such a statement. Four members of the committee volunteered to work on a draft of a purpose statement (Tingley, Hoover, White, Maraffa). They will use the existing preface and goals to do so. We should keep the original preface and goals; they are the committee's "bible." However, they do not serve as an effective purpose statement for students or the rest of the university community. The task force members discussed features that would be desirable in the new document.

Next Meeting: The next meeting will be in about 3 weeks. Jenkins will circulate an announcement.

Adjournment: Jenkins adjourned the meeting at 4:20 p.m.

GER TASK FORCE MEETING MINUTES

Date: July 27, 1995

Present: Beckett, Driscoll, Funk, Jenkins, Jennings, Maraffa, Mistovich, Mullins, O'Neill, Palmer, Tingley, White.

Absent: Anderson, Bowen, Hoover, McMahon, Singler.

Secretary: Mullins

Jenkins, Chair of the Task Force, called the meeting to order at 2:10 p.m.

Minutes: The Ad Hoc Committee to Draft a Purpose Statement distributed a proposed version. Discussion included the purpose and intended audience of the statement, editorial changes and the underlying meaning. The group agreed that the statement was premature but might serve as a working document for the committee.

The following represents the editorial changes those present agreed upon.

The purpose of the General Education requirement is to provide students with (*) knowledge and skills that complement their major field of study and have significant application to their personal and professional lives. The General Education requirements are designed to allow for flexibility and individual choice for students within a coherent framework of courses. These courses draw from the strengths of existing departments and traditional disciplines while providing opportunities for interdisciplinary approaches.

* A significant point of contention was the use of the adjective "usable" as in "usable knowledge and skills".

Tod Beckett noted that the committee could do better at informing and involving students in the process. One example discussed was an article for the **Jambar**.

It was noted that students have had representation and been involved on each body that has considered Gen Ed requirements, including the Faculty Senate. Jenkins also noted that he reported directly to Student Government last year and intended to do so again this Fall. In addition minutes are disseminated to the campus community via **Usenet** news. Finally, it was generally agreed that there were not enough specifics to report as yet.

The committee discussed writing descriptions for the various goals. It was noted that the existing descriptions were added by the Academic Standards committee and were not approved by the Senate along with the goals. The intent is to accurately reflect the meaning ascribed to the goals by the Task Force.

Jenkins planned to create four subcommittees with overlapping sets of five goals. Subcommittees will write a description that can be used as a guide for course development and that acknowledge the pragmatic difficulties of assessment. Subcommittees may look at combining or categorizing goals as a part of this process.

Subcommittees may begin meeting in August and should finish no later than mid-October. The full Task Force will discuss descriptions in late October. Members were asked to submit a list of goals they were especially interested in. Jenkins will assign members to subcommittees. The first meeting will be called by the alphabetically first person on the subcommittee.

Post-meeting note: Because of vacations, etc. Jenkins assigned specific individuals to call the first meeting of each group.

List of Colleges and Departments

College of Arts and Sciences

- Biological Sciences _____
- Chemistry _____
- Computer and Information Sciences _____
- Economics _____
- English _____
- Foreign Languages and Literature _____
- Geography _____
- Geology _____
- History _____
- Mathematics** _____
- Philosophy and Religious Studies _____
- Physics and Astronomy _____
- Political Science and Social Sciences _____
- Psychology _____
- Social Work _____
- Sociology and Anthropology _____

Williamson School of Business

- Accounting and Finance _____
- Management _____
- Marketing _____
- Advertising and Public Relations _____
- ~~Business Information Systems~~ _____

College of Education

- Early and Middle Childhood Education _____
- Elementary Education _____
- Foundations _____
- Counseling _____
- Education Administration _____
- Secondary Education _____
- Special Education _____

College of **Engineering** and Technology

- Chemical Engineering _____
- Civil and Environmental Engineering _____
- Electrical Engineering _____
- Industrial Engineering _____
- Materials Engineering _____
- Mechanical Engineering _____

School of Technology

Civil Engineering Technology
Drafting and Design Technology
Electrical Engineering Technology
Mechanical Engineering Technology

College of Fine and Performing Arts

Art
Communication and Theatre
Dana School of Music

College of Health and Human Services

Allied Health
Human Ecology
Human Performance and Exercise
Military Science
Nursing

Biel - I don't much care which ones I do,
 I'd enjoy them 2, I think - Anne McMahon

List of Colleges and Departments

16 College of Arts and Sciences

- Biological Sciences
- Chemistry
- Computer and Information Sciences
- Economics
- English
- Foreign Languages and Literature
- Geography
- Geology
- History
- Mathematics
- Philosophy and Religious Studies
- Physics and Astronomy
- Political Science and Social Sciences
- Psychology
- Social Work
- Sociology and Anthropology

Singler ?
 Jennings Hoover
 Ronald Singler
 Hoover
 Tinsley
 ✓ Tinsley Singler
 Tinsley
 ✓ Palmer
 ✓ Paul Mullins
 ✓ Hucenberg
 ✓ White
 ✓ O. Will
 ✓ Dr. Palmer
 ✓ White
 ✓ Palmer

4 Williamson School of Business

- Accounting and Finance
- Management
- Marketing
- Advertising and Public Relations
- ~~Business Information Systems~~

Jennings
 Hucenberg
~~Mullins~~ → Maraffa

6 College of Education

- Early and Middle Childhood Education
- ~~Elementary Education~~
- Foundations
- Counseling
- Education Administration
- Secondary Education
- Special Education

Anderson
 Tinsley
 ← Maraffa
 ✓ Anne McMahon

College of Engineering and Technology

- Chemical Engineering
- Civil and Environmental Engineering
- Electrical Engineering
- Industrial Engineering
- Materials Engineering
- Mechanical Engineering

✓ Paul Mullins
 ✓ Anderson
 ✓ Maraffa
 O. Mullins
 Mullins
 Mullins

✓ School of Technology

Civil Engineering Technology
Drafting and Design Technology
Electrical Engineering Technology
Mechanical Engineering Technology

O'Neill

3 Colleae of Fine and Performina Arts

Art
Communication and Theatre
Dana School of Music

✓ D. Funk
✓ ~~Alvin~~ McMahon - Funk
✓ O'Neill
✓ Telecommunications

5 Collese of Health and Human Services

Allied Health
Human Ecology
Human Performance and Exercise
Military Science
Nursing

✓ White
D. Funk
JRM
JRM
JRM



GER TASK FORCE MEETING MINUTES

Date: November 9, 1995

Present: Elias, Funk, Jenkins, Jennings, Maraffa, McMahon, Monseau, Mullins, O'Neill, Palmer, Singler, Walker, White.

Absent: Beckett, Bowen, Driscoll, Hoover.

Secretary: McMahon

Jenkins, Chair of the Task Force, called two meetings to order, one at 2:00 p.m. and one at 4:00 p.m., both in the Cardinal Room, Kilcawley. This was done to ensure that all members of the task force could attend.

Discussion of the English-CIS project and FIPSE proposal. The main purpose of both meetings was to bring the task force up to date about what has gone on between these two departments and the steps they have taken to be accepted as an applicant for a FIPSE grant. It was important for both groups to understand what the other is doing. The meeting began with a brief presentation of the English-CIS project. Attending were Kelly Belanger, Julia Gergits, and Sandra Stephen, from English, and Robert Hogue and John Sullins from CIS. The discussion focused on a planned revision to English 551; the course would use the world wide web to access research and information. As before the course would teach students how to do research and how to write about it. One goal is to develop a new internet text--an on-line hypertext to be developed from teachers teaching the course. The FIPSE application would be for funds to support this project. The group discussed ideas about including writing and technology in the general education program in the future. The group discussed the possibility that 551 might not exist in the new system; research paper instruction might be part of another course in the GER or it might be taught by faculty from various departments. Jenkins assured the visitors that the task force had not yet fixed anything about how GER might address writing and technology.

Future Agenda: Jenkins said that he hoped to have a report from those who had gone to the San Antonio Conference; one report is not in, so it will be dealt with at the next meeting. He is hoping to have brief comments from those attending; each member should then read the written reports. Randy Hoover is working on a purpose statement for the GER; it will be circulated for the next meeting. We will also begin discussing the revision of the goal clarifications submitted by the various sub-committees. Jenkins asked everyone to send him a schedule of activities for December so he can schedule two longer meetings during finals week and the week after. McMahon reported on an up-coming visit by Dr. Fran Reilly who will be visiting campus in March to address diversity issues. The college of business is sponsoring the visit but would like her visit address campus goals, not only goals of the

Business College. She will meet with a sub-committee of faculty developing GER responses to diversity; faculty developing other courses dealing with diversity goals will also be invited.

Next Meeting: The next meeting will be on November 17 in the Cardinal Room, Kilcawley, from 3:00 to 5:00 p.m.

Adjournment: Jenkins adjourned the meeting at 3:00 p.m.



Youngstown State University / Youngstown, Ohio 44555-3071
The Warren P. Williamson, Jr. School of Business Administration
Department of Management
(216) 742-3071
FAX: (216) 742-1459

GER TASK FORCE MEETING MINUTES

Date: November 17, 1995

Present: Driscoll, Elias, Funk, Hoover, Jenkins, Jennings, Maraffa, McMahan, Palmer, Singler, Walker, White.

Absent: Beckett, Bowen, Monseau, Mullins, O'Neill.

Secretary: McMahan

Jenkins, Chair of the Task Force, called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. in the Cardinal Room, Kilcawley.

The meeting opened with a brief commentary on the San Antonio meetings. Members were encouraged to read the written reports that Jenkins circulated at the meeting today.

Discussion of the Purpose Statement: Randy Hoover had developed a purpose statement for the task force to review and revise. It was circulated and the committee spent most of the meeting discussing it and making editorial changes to it. Jenkins will reprint the statement to include the revisions and editorial changes. He will circulate it prior to the next meeting.

Discussion of the sub-committees' reports on the goals: The task force then turned to the revisions submitted by the sub-committees on the goal statements. Each goal was discussed in several sub-committees; each sub-committee drafted a clarification of the goals assigned to it. Jenkins circulated the drafts of the goal statements from all the committees. It was decided that the committee of the whole is too large to work on several versions of each goal statement. It was decided to create another round of sub-committee efforts. Individuals who did not serve on the committees who drafted a particular goal statement should meet to put together the several drafts produced by earlier sub-committees. That draft would be discussed by the full task force. Jenkins asked that members set up times to meet before leaving this meeting. The sub-committees are as follows:

- Goal 1: Monseau & O'Neill
- Goal 2: Driscoll & Mullins
- Goal 3: Palmer, Jennings & O'Neill
- Goal 4: Palmer & Jennings
- Goal 5: Singler, Driscoll & Mullins
- Goal 6: Singler & White
- Goal 7: White & Singler
- Goal 8: Elias & Funk
- Goal 9: Walker & Elias
- Goal 10: Maraffa & Jenkins

Goal 11: Maraffa, McMahon & Walker
Goal 12: Palmer, Jennings & Jenkins
Goal 13: Singler & White

Subcommittees should meet quickly and get their statements in to Jenkins by December 4th or 5th so they can be circulated. If you cannot get them to him by the 5th, then bring enough copies of it to the meeting to circulate to the entire membership.

Future Agenda: Jenkins reminded all of the members to read the descriptions of the various models we solicited from other colleges and universities. We want to be able to present to the faculty a set of different models we are considering. Our future agenda items include:

1. How to get guidelines to the faculty in some forum and how to involve them better in the process.
2. Selection of a range of GER models to discuss with the faculty.
3. Completion of our discussion of the goals and what they mean.
4. Final revision of the purpose statement (latest draft to be circulated by Jenkins.)
5. Eventual administrative structure. (e.g. Courses may not be tagged to departments; what kind of committee will review the course proposals? How much structure shall we provide before calling for proposals for courses?)

Next Meetings: The next meetings are scheduled for December 7 from 2:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. and on December 14th at the same time. An announcement will be sent out with agenda items and locations.

Adjournment: Jenkins adjourned the meeting at 5:00 p.m.



GER TASK FORCE MEETING MINUTES

Date: December 7, 1995

Present: Driscoll, Funk, Jenkins, **Jennings**, Maraffa, **McMahon**, Monseau, **Mullins**, O'Neill, Palmer, Singler, Walker, White.

Absent: Beckett, **Bowen**, Elias, Hoover.

Secretary: Anne McMahon

Jenkins, Chair of the Task Force, called the meeting to order at 2:10 p.m. in the Cardinal Room, Kilcawley.

Discussion of the goal statements:

The subcommittees had met and developed goal statements. **Jenkins** circulated the combined statements submitted by the different committees for each goal. The members of the task force discussed the goals statements. After discussion, it was agreed that the statement for the first goal should read as follows:

Goal 1: Students demonstrate communication skills necessary to function in society and to compete in the global market place.

After discussing Goal 2, Paul **Mullins** volunteered to **draft** a revision for the next meeting. After discussion of goal 3, **O'Neill** and Palmer offered to **draft** the revision for the next meeting. **After** discussion of Goal 4, there was consensus that the statement should read:

Goal 4: Students develop their capacity for ethical sensitivities and insight and understand important social issues that confront our society and those values necessary for a democratic nation to prosper.

Agenda for the next meeting: The next meeting will be devoted to revising the remaining goals.

Next Meeting: Monday, December, 18, at 1:30 in Kilcawley.

Adjournment: Jenkins adjourned the meeting at 3:55 p.m.



GER TASK FORCE MEETING MINUTES

Date: December 18, 1995

Present: Elias, Funk, Jenkins, Jennings, Maraffa, McMahon, Monseau, Mullins, O'Neill, Palmer, Singler, Walker, White.

Absent: Beckett, Bowen, Driscoll, Elias, Hoover.

Secretary: Anne McMahon

Jenkins, Chair of the Task Force, called the meeting to order at 1:35 p.m. in Room 2067, Kilcawley.

Discussion of the goal statements:

The meeting opened with a discussion about the strategy used to revise the goal statements at the last meeting. In particular, it was asked whether the statements should be behaviorally written or whether they should be more generally descriptive. It was decided to stay with an outcomes orientation that is behavioral in character. The decision was based on a judgement about the audience at issue and the input from people who had attended conferences on the subject. These statements are for the faculty and for ourselves; they are designed to provide direction in course development, model development, assessment development, and for clarification of consensus about what the goals mean. When we write elaborations of the GER for other audiences, we will decide if we need to write more descriptively.

The committee also discussed goal 1 as it was elaborated at the last meeting. There was discussion as to whether or not English should be explicitly specified in the elaboration. The committee also discussed whether the last part of the elaboration of the goal dealing with the global market place belongs in the final description. After discussion, the committee decided to stay with the current wording as adopted at the last meeting. The first goal, then, reads as follows:

Goal 1: Write and speak effectively.

Students demonstrate communication skills necessary to function in society and to compete in the global market place.

After discussing Goal 2, the committee agreed on the following:

Goal 2: Acquire, process and present quantitative and qualitative information using the most appropriate technologies, including computers.

Students demonstrate the ability to select and use effectively the most appropriate technologies for gathering, analyzing and manipulating, transmitting, storing and presenting information.

Goal 10: Understanding the development of cultures and organizations of human societies throughout the world and their changing interrelationships with Western Society.

Students comprehend how various societies have approached the common problems of human existence over time. They learn that solutions to those problems vary because of tradition, geography, philosophy, or religion, economic development, technological change and political power. Students understand how and why these societies have interacted with Western Society, where applicable.

Agenda for the next meeting: The next meeting will be devoted to:

1. Revising the statements for the remaining goals (i.e. 3, 11, 12, 13);
2. Selecting 3 or 4 models for a modified core that we can take to the faculty for discussion.
3. Setting committees for specific goal areas.

Jenkins asked that members review the models from last year and select some that should go to the faculty. He also asked that members think about what committees should be formed and come with suggestions about what individuals and groups should be involved in those committees.

Next Meeting: To be set later. Jenkins asked that members of the task force send him copies of their winter schedule; please distinguish teaching hours from office hours and the like.

Adjournment: Jenkins adjourned the meeting at 3:45 p.m.