



GER TASK FORCE MINUTES

DATE: January 17, 1997

PRESENT: Driscoll, Funk, Jenkins, Maraffa, McMahon, **Mullins**, Pusch, Palmer, Singler, Tingley, Walker, White.

ABSENT: Elias, Jennings, O'Neill, Kengor, Martin.

GUESTS: Nader Atway, Student Government

Secretary: Anne McMahon

Bill Jenkins called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. in the Cardinal room, Kilcawley Center. The minutes of the previous meeting were amended by adding the word "informally" to the following sentence: "...the critical thinking committee's report was discussed informally." The minutes were then accepted as amended.

Task Force Membership:

Jenkins then introduced Nader Atway, from Student Government. As we had discussed at an earlier meeting, the task force has had difficulty getting continuous student representation at our discussions. **Atway** confirmed that the students appointed to the task force had schedule conflicts with the times of our meetings. Jenkins contacted **Atway** with out suggestion that we circulate a list of students with 3.5 GPA or above to the task force members. The members may know students who would be interested in participating. **Atway** decided to attend this meeting so that he can better orient students. He also agreed to our suggesting students who might serve effectively. Jenkins will bring the list of students to the next meeting. In the meantime, **Atway** recommended an interested student who is in the honors program; the committee was comfortable with that recommendation. We will attempt to suggest additional name(s).

Looking at the models:

Charles Singler presented a model that he had prepared; it was a revision of the one he had presented earlier. He circulated a draft of the proposal and members asked **informational** questions. Gabriel Palmer also presented a model developed since the last meeting. The members asked questions and discussed its points.

The members then turned to a discussion of areas of agreement across the full set of models. The discussion focused on goals five through thirteen. The following groups of goals were discussed as areas of agreement across many of the models:

The models tended to have one area dealing with science that focuses on goals 6, 7, & 13.

The models tended to have an area dealing with aesthetic experience focusing on goals 8, 10 & 12.

The models had another area dealing with human institutions focusing on goals 9, 10, 11, 12.

The committee then discussed whether we need a area that focuses directly on goal 12 in combination with other goals and whether goal 4 should be an area, included in one of the other areas, **and/or** infused throughout the various areas. In addition, the members recognized that we need to decide whether goals 1, 2, 3 (and 4) need to be infused in the areas organized around goals 5 through 13. The names of the areas also need to be set. The committee also needs to discuss the courses in the first year that deal specifically with goals 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 as well as the orientation course.

Each representative of the colleges should come to the next meeting with information about how the general education requirements now in place map into the majors so that we can judge the actual impact of changes in the requirements. Many majors have specific requirements for the general education units. We need to know the number of hours about which there are major-specific rules and where the majors "double dip."

Jenkins agreed to talk with the provost and president about the plan for going to semesters, so that we do not waste efforts and resources.

AAC&U Meetings in February

Jenkins reminded everyone about the meetings to be held in San Antonio from February 20 to 22. Those interested in attending should let him know.

The next meeting: The next meeting of the GER task force will be on Friday, January 24, 1997.

Adjournment: Jenkins adjourned the meeting at 3:50 p.m.



GER TASK FORCE MINUTES

DATE: January 24, 1997

PRESENT: Driscoll, Elias, Funk, Jenkins **Jennings**, **Maraffa**, **McMahon**, **Mullins**, Pusch, **Singler**, Tingley, **O'Neill**.

ABSENT: Palmer, Walker, White, Kengor, Mar

Secretary: Anne **McMahon**

B P Jenkins called the meeting to order at 2:05 p.m. in the Cardinal room, **Kilcawley** Center. The **minutes** of the previous meeting were accepted as submitted..

Jenkins circulated a packet of information from Walker regarding his participation in the Conference at Daytona Beach. He also checked to see if the members had **all** received the conference materials submitted by Jenkins, Funk, Elias, and **Tingley** which had been sent out earlier. Jenkins also asked if everyone had a copy of the letter Palmer had circulated to the committee.

Task Force Membership:

Jenkins reported that he has not yet heard from Nader **Atway**. **Atway** did say, however, that he should see the materials we develop and give us feedback, since students **often** miss meetings. Jenkins **reminded** us that we need to consider ways to get student feedback. We **might** want to schedule focus group discussions. Jenkins **will** contact **Atway** prior to the next meeting

Continuation of the discussion of the models:

Jenkins circulated a sheet that summarized the decisions that had been made regarding the new model for GER. Members present agreed that these were decisions that the task force has made. The **committee** then turned to its discussion of the model from last time. There was consensus that we needed to make some decisions about goals **2, 3, 4** and **5**. After discussion the task force agreed on the following:

All writing intensive courses must deal **significantly** with goals **2** and **3**.

The task force discussed goal **4** at length. It was agreed that goal **4** should be added to the group of goals that include goals **9, 10, 11, 12**. This **creates** the following model:

1. There will be a senior capstone course or courses, preferably in the major; the course should address goals **1, 2**, and **3** among others.
2. The first year should include a learning to **write** course (similar to English 550) **and** a course that combines **communications**, word processing, **information** gathering, critical thinking and analysis organized around an interdisciplinary theme (similar to English 551).

3. There **will** be a writing across the curriculum **course consisting** of the two **first** year writing courses, at least two additional writing intensive courses (one of which may be in the major and the other **of which will** be a general education course). **All** courses designated as writing intensive courses shall deal **significantly** with goals 2 and 3 as well. The capstone course shall complete the writing across the curriculum sequence.
4. There **will** be three groups of courses developed to address other goals. These groups are: group **6, 7, 13**; group 8, 10, 12; and group **4, 9, 10, 11, 12**.

Not yet decided are the following:

- A. How to deal with goal 5.
- B. What to do about the speech proposal.
- C. Do we need an "other" group of courses?
- D. Do we require that every goal be documented for every student? Some goals for every student (**e.g.** diversity)?

The next meeting: The next meeting of the GER task force **will** be on Friday, **January** 31, 1997.

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



GER TASK FORCE MINUTES

DATE: January 31, 1997

PRESENT: Driscoll, Elias, Jenkins, Maraffa, McMahon, Mullins, O'Neill, Palmer, Pusch, Singler, Walker, White.

ABSENT: Funk, Jennings, Tingley, Kengor, Martin

Secretary: Anne McMahon

Bill Jenkins called the meeting to order at 2:05 p.m. in room 2036, Kilcawley Center. The minutes of the previous meeting were not yet circulated.

Jenkins circulated a packet of information on requirements involving GER units from the College of Business Administration and the College of Education. Jenkins asked the members to read them before discussion. In addition, we need the information from the other colleges.

Assessment:

Jenkins invited Jan Elias to fill us in on assessment issues. Elias pointed out that in addition to developing a new assessment plan for the new program, we need to assess our existing program. It was thought we should assess them in terms of the goals so that we have baseline information for change associated with the new program. In addition, we need to assess our alums for opinions on their general education experience. There is a survey of alums planned for the fall, but we need to add GER to it. Elias also discussed an opportunity to participate in a new survey by ACT that is intended to assess critical thinking outcomes. Elias asked for member of this team to meet with several people from the assessment team to deal with these matters. Jenkins and White volunteered.

Continuation of the discussion of the models:

Jenkins picked up our discussion by providing an overview of where we were last week. The team then discussed an 'other' box and what it might contain. The discussion focused on the possibility of interdisciplinary courses organized around changing themes, on service learning and other extra-classroom learning opportunities, and on the need for a place for interesting courses that do not well fit our other boxes. There was no consensus about this set of issues, so the team moved on to considering the number of units that might be assigned to the other groupings of courses. Jenkins reminded us that 8 units have been allocated to the writing sequence. Four units have been assigned to the capstone course, but they might be in the major. The 8 units assigned to WAC should overlap with other courses. We have not yet decided about allocating 4 units to orientation and/or speech or about allocating units to math. The current situation across colleges requires 60 to 64 GER units.

The team discussed the first box organized around goal 13. It was agreed that students will be required to have 8 hours in this box, that all of the courses shall include goal 13 in

conjunction with either ~~or~~ both goals 6 and 7. Students must meet all three goals.

After discussion of the second box, a similar pattern emerged. Students will take 8 units in the box, all courses in the box shall include goal 8 in combination with either ~~or~~ both p a l s 10 and goal 12. Students will meet all three goals.

Members then discussed the third box briefly. It was felt that consensus about combinations in this box might take time and would be best discussed when members were fresh. Members tentatively assigned 12 credit hours to this box.

Not yet decided are the following:

- A. How to deal with goal 5.
- B. What to do about the speech proposal.
- C. Whether we need an "other" group of courses and what the group might contain,
- D. An administration procedure for requiring that every goal be met by each student.
- E. Whether we have orientation credits.

The next meeting: The next meeting of the GER task force will be on Friday, February 7, 1997.

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



GER TASK FORCE MINUTES

DATE: February 7, 1997

PRESENT: Elias, ~~Funk~~, Jenkins, ~~Maraffa~~, ~~McMahon~~, O'Neill, Palmer, Pusch, Singler, Tingley, White.

ABSENT: Driscoll, Jennings, Mullins, Walker, Kengor, Martin

Secretary: Anne McMahon

Bill Jenkins called the meeting to order at 2:05 p.m. in the Cardinal room, Kilcawley Center. The minutes of the previous two meetings were circulated. The minutes of the January 31 meeting were amended as follows: the expression "8 hours" in ~~the~~ last sentence of p. 1 and in the first full paragraph of p. 2 should read "at least 8 hours" in both cases. With the exception of that amendment, the minutes of both meetings were accepted as submitted.

Jenkins Qscussed ~~his~~ talk with the provost and assistant provost **regarding** switching to semesters. He reported that the semester system is going to **come** to YSU; ~~we~~ need a time line for developing GER so that the switch to the new GER system and the semester system can be made at the same time. Jenkins put a tentative time line on the board for the members to Qscuss. At the end of the Qscussion, the members agreed on the following items.

1. The committee favors starting GER and the semester system **as** early as possible, and that could be as early as Fall, 1999.
2. The committee urges Jenkins to communicate to the Provost that it is imperative that by this Fall there be a director for GER who is nearly full time and that there be a committee **working** with the director whose members have significant time assigned to GER.
3. The GER time table shall be :
 - 1996-97: Development of model and **structure**; ~~take~~ both to Senate.
 - 1997-99: Training Sessions, workshops, course development and approval.
 - 1999-2000: Course experimentation; continued course approval.
 - Fall, 2000: GER is fully implemented.

Continuation of the discussion of the models:

Jenkins picked up our Qscussion by focusing it on the **third** box, tentatively **named**, human institutions. After **discussion**, the members returned to the second box, involving goal 8. It was decided to revise that box such that each course shall deal with goal 8 and at least one of the following goals: 4, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13. There was discussion about renaming the **third** box, human institutions and values. There was discussion about changing the **number** of units assigned to the box to 16. There was discussion about **sub-dividing** the third box. Since the

group did not reach **consensus**, it was decided to delay decision until the **next** meeting. There was a brief **discussion** of the "other" box. There were some who felt **this** should be a box with thematic **courses**. **Others** felt this box should be open to all combinations of **goals and** to alternative ways of meeting goals, such as service learning. The current **allocation** of units implies only 4 **units** assigned to the "other" box. **This might** be **insufficient**. The **members** decided to return to **this discussion** later.

The members **then moved** to a **discussion** of the **math** goal. It was agreed **that** there would be a box organized around goal 5 and that at least 4 units **would** be assigned to that box. In addition, there would be **lots** of ways to **satisfy** the **goal** in that **box**.

The speech committee is still meeting with DACs, so we are not yet ready to discuss that issue again.

The members then **discussed the question** of whether there **would** be orientation units **as** part of GER. The members discussed a course, **the** use of multiple modules that might be **taken** in **different combination** by different **students**, **whether the issues** are better **served** by **the** first course in the major, and whether the issues are best addressed in orientation. The members did not reach **consensus**.

The next meeting: The next **meeting** of the GER task force will be on Friday, **February 14**, 1997.

Adjournment: Jenkins **adjourned the** meeting at 3:50 p.m.



GER TASK FORCE MINUTES

DATE: February 14, 1997

PRESENT: Driscoll, Funk, Jenkins, Maraffa, McMahon, O'Neill, Pusch, Singler, Tingley, White.

ABSENT: Elias, Jennings, Mullins, Palmer, Walker, Kengor, Martin

Secretary: Anne McMahon

Bill Jenkins called the meeting to order at 2:05 p.m. in the Cardinal room, Kilcawley Center. The minutes of the previous meeting were accepted as circulated.

Assessment

Jenkins asked White to report on the meeting of the NCA Assessment Group. She reported that the group discussed the pilot on critical thinking and writing that is being developed. They also discussed an ACT assessment package that is broader in that it deals with more of our goals; it is also thoroughly tested and validated. White reported that an ACT person will be coming to talk with us about the test. ACT also has a student survey we might use. There is a budget for GER assessment annually. It will allow us, in the beginning, to assess first year students and seniors or some other useful sample that might serve as benchmarks for the future. It is probable that we will not do the pilot on critical thinking and writing, assuming that we get appropriate answers from ACT about to whom we will be compared and what different norm groups exist. We also want to avoid having an instrument which is used to direct syllabi; our goal is to use it for internal feedback and improvement. It was recommended that we contact some institutions like ourselves and ask about their experience with the ACT assessment package and student survey. White, O'Neill and Jenkins will also check into it at the San Antonio Conference next week.

Discussion of the model

Jenkins picked up our discussion from last time by circulating a handout from Singler. The handout dealt with issues related to the Sciences and to the usefulness of the criteria we are using in making decisions about the model. After discussion, it was the consensus that there be the following groups of courses:

1. A box for goals 6, 7, and 13. All courses in this area deal with two goals, one of which must be goal 13. 12 units are assigned to this box.
2. A box for courses that deal with goal 8 in combination with at least one of the following goals: 4, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13. 12 units are assigned to this box.

3. A box for courses ~~that~~ combine goals 4 **and** 9 or which combine either of those goals with at least one other goal in the set 5 through 13. 4 units are assigned to this box.
4. A box for **courses that** combine two of goals 10, 11, and 12. 12 units are assigned to this box.
5. Eight **units** are assigned to the "other" **box**.

The remaining issues of speech and orientation **will** be addressed at the next meeting. It was felt that the team needed to consider these issues when they were fresh. They have come up at the end of long and **difficult** sessions thus far.

The **next meeting**: The next meeting of the GER ~~task~~ force will be on Friday, February 28, 1997.

Adjournment: ~~Jenkins~~ adjourned ~~the~~ **meeting** at 3:40 p.m.



GER TASK FORCE MINUTES

Youngstown State University / Youngstown, Ohio 44555-0001

DATE: February 28, 1997

PRESENT: Funk, Jenkins, Maraffa, McMahon, O'Neill, Pusch, Palmer, Singler, Tingley, Walker, White.

ABSENT: Driscoll, Elias, Jennings, Mullins, Kengor, Martin

Secretary: Anne McMahon

Jenkins called the meeting to order at 2:05 p.m. in the Cardinal Room, Kilcawley Center. The minutes of the previous meeting were accepted as submitted.

Jenkins commented on the conference in San Antonio, indicating that the members who attended would draft their notes on the sessions attended. He will circulate them to the rest of the task force. In addition, he indicated that some at the conference cautioned about excessive reliance upon national, standardized tests; they tend not to address an institution's own goals.

Discussion of the model:

Jenkins reviewed the model as it has emerged to date during the last few meetings. He then turned the discussion to the "other box" of possible GER courses. The task force members discussed the role of courses in this box. Suggestions included: upper division courses that create depth for goals in the earlier boxes; flexibility for offering courses addressing goal combinations that do not fit in the earlier boxes; interdisciplinary courses possibly developed around a theme; and alternative learning credits for such things as service learning. After discussion the following items were agreed upon:

1. Students shall select a minimum of 3 upper-division courses from 2 or more of the boxes.
2. Courses in this fifth box (i.e. "Other Box") shall be interdisciplinary, shall address goal combinations that do not fit in the other four boxes, and shall also include alternative learning opportunities such as service learning.
3. Students shall select 2 courses (or 8 hours) from the fifth box, or they shall select one from the fifth box and one from any of the other four boxes.

The discussion then turned to the orientation experience for the first year. As it was late, the committee listened to one suggestion from Nancy White that emerged from the San Antonio Conference. She suggested that the course deal with the theme of education and work.

Jenkins reminded the members that we have to return to this issue the next time, that we have yet to decide the speech issue and that we have yet to decide if we wish to require a lab science.

The next meeting: The next meeting of the GER task force will be on Friday, February 7, 1997.

Adjournment: Jenkins adjourned the meeting at 3:30 p.m.



GER TASK FORCE MINUTES

Youngstown State University / Youngstown, Ohio 44555-0001

DATE: April 4, 1997

PRESENT: Elias, Funk, Jenkins, **McMahon**, O'Neill, **Pusch**, Tingley, Walker, White.

ABSENT: Driscoll, Jennings, **Maraffa**, **Mullins**, Palmer, Singler, **Kengor**, Martin

Secretary: **Anne McMahon**

Jenkins called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m. in room 2169, Kilcawley Center. The minutes of the previous meeting were not distributed, but will be circulated by the next meeting.

Jenkins reported that he has set up meetings with the Deans **and** their DACs. The goal is to complete them in April, and hold other open hearings in May. If feedback **from** these **hearings** is good, we will take the model to the Senate in June.

Jan Elias reported that OBOR has passed laws about the General Education Requirements for two year associate degree programs. Our task force needs to review those and consider those programs in terms of our model. It was agreed that Elias would circulate the laws set by OBOR and Jenkins will put the matter on the agenda for a meeting.

It was also suggested that when we hold the next set of hearings on the Model for GER we should reach out beyond Arts & Science meetings and spaces. Funk suggested we consider spaces in her building.

Jenkins reported on comments from Betty Jo Licata, Dean of Business. Their DAC met in preparation for the meeting with Jenkins. They expressed concern regarding these issues:

- 1) how computer intensive will GER be?
- 2) the need for two math **courses** for business majors (who now take more), and the hope that it is possible to substitute two math and two science courses for 3 science courses.
- 3) what will be done about speech?

Discussion about these issues ensued. It was the consensus of those present that in addition to using computers in the first two writing courses, the other writing intensive courses (including the capstone course) also include computer instruction and reinforcement of earlier computer skills.

The discussion also focused on how to handle the needs of individual colleges. Those present discussed the possibility of developing a general solution that will permit some flexibility for colleges, but which would not require individualized and course-specific agreements with each college.

The members then discussed the issue of the speech goal. It was the consensus of those present that we consider a 20 hour module in speech skills followed by two speech-intensive courses. The courses could be either in the major or in general education. These additional courses will reinforce basic from the basic module as well as additional instruction. The speech department would be responsible for providing some workshops for faculty in the area of

speech. Existing speech courses already designed to serve various colleges might be revised for number of hours and connections to other GER goals.

The task force then turned to a discussion of the orientation course. After discussion, the consensus was that students take a one unit course that focuses on:

Philosophy of College Education,
Ways of **knowing/critical** thinking,
diversity.

If these new agreements are adopted, our **total** GER hours will be 63, **which** is one more than we now have.

Remaining issues to be addressed:

The task force needs to revisit the decisions made today, review the requirements for the associate degree, develop an assessment plan, recommend administrative structures including a course approval process. We also need to collect feedback from hearings and adjust our recommendations accordingly.

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



GER TASK FORCE MINUTES

DATE: April 11, 1997

PRESENT: Driscoll, Elias, Funk, Jenkins, Jennings, Maraffa, McMahon, Pusch, Walker, White, Tingle.

ABSENT: Mulleins, O'Neill, Palmer, Single, Kengor, Martin

Secretary: Anne McMahon

Bill Jenkins called the meeting to order at 2:10 p.m. in Bresnahan Suites I and II, Kilcawley Center. The minutes of the previous three meetings were accepted as circulated.

A brief discussion ensued regarding the **communication** module suggested at the last meeting. It was agreed that the module would include at least one other goal, in addition to oral communication. Further, any department can propose such a **module**; the speech department will provide **workshops/training** for faculty as needed.

Jenkins reported on his talk with Jim Scanlon regarding the need for a coordinator for GER by this fall. He is open to the idea. He is uncertain about the director reporting to the Provost. Jenkins invited the Provost to visit with the **task** force at a meeting about the matter. It was the strong recommendation of the members present that the director ought not report to the Dean of Arts and Science.

GER for the two year programs:

Elias circulated OBOR Standards for GER for **associate** degree programs. After discussion it was felt that the task force needs to be aware of these guidelines and that a group needs to be appointed as a sub-committee of the task **force** to draft goals and guidelines for the two year programs. Jenkins will pull people together, including Wade, Marge (in Business), Paul or Paul's designate, Rick Walker and **others as** needed. He will talk with them and have them move ahead on the project. Elias will provide NCA **information** on general education to that group.

Feedback on the model :

Jenkins reported that he met with the School of Education; some questions were raised. One issue concerned students who switch majors when different colleges **specify** particular GER courses **as** requirements. It was agreed that the situation is the same **as** the present GER system. Students must meet the GER requirements of their major. The adjustment is made by the department **using** electives, substitutions, and additional **hours** when needed. In general the proposed GER model seems to pose no serious problems for the College of Education. They **discussed** a seminar that integrates student teaching and cases into a capstone experience that meets their needs as well as GER goals.

Jenkins meets with Engineering and Health and Human Services on Tuesday. He meets with Business next Thursday and with Arts and Science the following week.

Discussion of the Model:

The task force discussed ~~the~~ names to be allocated to the groups of goals. It was suggested we not use substantive names. Another suggested that we need to articulate the groups for the students. It was decided to come back to ~~this~~ issue next week.

The task force then discussed the issue of three science courses focused on the natural environment. Two colleges have expressed concerns about having more ~~courses in math~~ and fewer in science.

Jenkins reminded us that we have ~~other~~ administrative issues to deal with. ~~One~~ issue concerns transfer credits. The members affirmed their earlier decision to define that set of issues as administrative in character, ~~not~~ requiring the action ~~of the task~~ force. We do need to set criteria for approval of courses and ~~identify~~ any issues related to the background of the teacher of the course.

The next meeting: The next meeting of the GER task force will be on Friday, April 18, in the Pub Party Room, Kilcawley. **Jan Elias** invited the members of the task force to her home for the meeting on Friday, May 30.

Adjournment: Jenkins adjourned the meeting at 3:40 p.m.



GER TASK FORCE MINUTES

DATE: April 18, 1997

PRESENT: Driscoll, Funk, Jenkins, Maraffa, McMahon, O'Neill, Pusch, Singler, Walker, White.

ABSENT: Elias, Jennings, Mullins, Palmer, Tingley, Kengor, Martin

Secretary: Anne McMahon

Bill Jenkins called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. in the Pub Party Room, Kilcawley Center. The minutes of the previous meeting were accepted as circulated.

Feedback on the model :

Jenkins handed out notes from his meetings with the DACs with whom he has already met. The members reviewed those notes and discussed items raised by them. It was decided that Jenkins will gather representatives from the colleges that have two year associate degree programs to deal with GER for those programs. They will share information and report back to this task force.

The issue of number of hours that GER will take when we move to semesters was again discussed. The members affirmed that whatever system we are on, GER will entail approximately 1/3 of the undergraduate hours required for a degree.

The issue of transfer **credit** has been raised again by the DACs. Again, the task force felt that this matter should be left up to the coordinator or director of GER as an administrative matter. It is assumed that transfer credits will be made in a manner that respects current agreements with other institutions and that the solution will not be punitive for students. It was further agreed that students will be able to test out of (or waive if equivalent courses are already taken) the basic two writing courses, the initial math course, and the speech module. Students who take more advanced courses (e.g. calculus) may substitute them for the elementary math course. If a student tests out of or waives a course, he or she does not need to make up those hours with other GER courses.

The issue raised by Business regarding the math test and courses was discussed. Business reports that students with high school calculus and ACT scores of 21 and 24 are being placed into **remedial** math courses. In addition, those **remedial** courses have increased **from** a one quarter to a two quarter requirement. **This** is causing students to avoid becoming majors in business because it adds math courses to an already heavy math requirement. The issues of having one quarter courses and of validating the test were discussed. It was pointed out that the math test was for calculus, not for the basic math course. The validity issue was still a concern.

The committee then turned to the issue of flexibility that was raised by several colleges. In particular, there was concern about the ability to include more than one math course in GER and about the boxes that require 3 courses (i.e. human institutions, human expression, and science). After **discussion**, it was agreed that we require at least two courses but count not more than 4 courses in each of the three boxes; moreover, the total number of units in the boxes must equal 9. With regard to math, it was pointed out that only one math course can be counted toward GER and that **might** not be desirable in principle. It was suggested that math be added to the list of boxes a student can choose for his or her elective course. The task force agreed that we should all consider math further and revisit this issue at the next meeting. Finally, there was a question regarding the box that includes goals 4 and 9. The minutes were not consistent with the handout circulated by Jenkins. After discussion, it was agreed that the minutes were correct. Courses in that box may include courses that include both goal 4 and goal 9 as well as courses that combine either of those goals with other goals as specified

The next meeting: The next meeting of the GER task force will be on Friday, April 26, in room 2036, Kilcawley. **Nancy White announced that the Union Party will be on May 30 from 3 to 5. Jenkins said we would not meet on that day at that time.**

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



GER TASK FORCE MINUTES

DATE: April 26, 1997

PRESENT: Driscoll, Funk, Jenkins, Jennings, Maraffa, **McMahon**, Mullins, Pusch, Singler, Tingley, Walker, White.

ABSENT: Elias, O'Neill, Palmer, **Kengor**, Martin

Secretary: Anne McMahon

Bill Jenkins called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. in the Pub Party Room, Kilcawley Center. The minutes of the previous meeting were amended to correct for the spelling of Wade **Driscoll's** name and to **clarify** the following: with regard to students changing majors, the system will remain as it is currently. Students will meet the requirements of the college of the new major. With those amendments, the **minutes** of the April 18 meeting were accepted.

Statement of the Model:

Jenkins handed out a statement of the model refined for the items recently discussed and to **clarify** items that arose **from** DAC feedback. The task force members read over the handout and **discussed** each point. It was agreed that the revision would list the goals appropriate to each section of the proposal. Also, it was pointed out that the proposal did not include the orientation course. Jenkins will add a section on "Introduction to GER." It shall read:

Each student will complete a 1 credit hour course serving as an introduction to GER.

The GER **coordinator** and the GER Advisory Committee will determine the content of this course. It shall include, minimally, the **purposes** of a college education, the elements of critical thinking, and **diversity**. Colleges ~~may~~ offer their own orientation course in conjunction with pre-approved GER ~~material~~.

It was felt that revisions were needed in Section A of the handout. Goals 1, 2 and 3 should be identified in the **heading** to the section. It should be clarified that any GER course can be submitted for approval as a writing intensive course. Similarly, courses in the major can be submitted for approval as a writing intensive course. **Additionally**, it should be clarified that just as students can test out of the introductory requirement in speech, they may also test out of the introductory requirement (s) in Writing and Math. Similarly, just as the English Department will provide faculty training workshops for those teaching in the Writing Sequence, so the Speech faculty will provide faculty support in the area of speech instruction. Point 3 under Section A should make the point currently at the end of the proposal--that GER courses will attempt to integrate goals 1, 2, & 3 wherever possible, but that the Writing II and Capstone courses must incorporate all three of these goals.

Section B was amended to change the expression "this course" in line 4 to "such a course."

The specific names **used** in Sections C, D, E, & F **should** be deleted. In every case, the sentence reads "from a list of courses that" The current Section F should be moved earlier to the **spot** before the current section B. The expression noted by an * should follow the new section F.

Section G should be re-titled to read "**Special** Elective Courses." Further the discussion should read:

In this section, instructors may combine the GER goals in any **number** of ways. The list includes two kinds of courses: those dealing with interdisciplinary thematic courses and courses with a community service **component**. Students will chose either two **courses** from the list in G or one from the list in G and one elective from areas B, C, D, , E, or F.

In Section 8, the work "computer" was replaced with "technology." It was felt we **should** add a sentence indicating that the capstone courses will be reviewed by the GER Committee for GER goals only.

The members discussed the administration issue again. It was suggested that the current statement be rewritten so that it does not appear that teachers of current GER courses are the appropriate members of the new GER Advisory Committee.

The issue of Assessment was also addressed. An AGLS Assessment Conference is to be held on May 19-20. Jenkins recommended that he or someone **from** the task force attend. He and Jan Elias have been functioning as a GER sub-committee on assessment.

The members **discussed** whether to require a lab course in science as **part of the** model. There were multiple positions on the matter: requiring a lab course in the Science Box, requiring a lab course but not restricting it to natural science, **and** no lab requirement. No consensus was reached.

The task force discussed **the** issue of "names" for the **course/goal** clusters in the **model**. Darla Funk circulated a list of names taken **from** models we reviewed earlier as a help to the committee. The members decided to attack this issue at another meeting.

Feedback on the model :

Walker passed out recommendations from the DAC of the Health & Human Services College. We will discuss that at the next meeting. **Jenkins** circulated copies of a memo from Phil **Munro**, Electrical **Engineering**. A letter from Floyd **Barger** was mailed to all members earlier. Funk and Jenkins discussed issues raised by the meeting with the Arts College. Some of them have already been addressed. Others were added to the current agenda of topics we need to decide. Members decided not to raise the minimum number of WAC courses.

Additional Agenda Items:

The committee has yet to decide the names of the groups of courses and goals, how extended will be the understanding of goal 8, what upper Qvision courses will mean, whether to require a lab course, and administrative **stucture**.

The next meeting: The next meeting of the GER task force will be on Friday, May 3, in the pub party room, **Kilcawley**. On Wednesday, May 7, there will be **an** open hearing **at** the Senate Meeting. Another open hearing will be held in Kilcawley on Wednesday, May 14.

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

GER TASK FORCE MINUTES

DATE: May 2, 1997

PRESENT: Driscoll, Funk, **Jenkins**, Jennings, Maraffa, **McMahon**, **Mullins**, Singler, Tingley, Walker.

ABSENT: Elias, O'Neill, Palmer, Pusch, White, Kengor, Martin

Secretary: Anne **McMahon**

Bill Jenkins called the meeting to order at 2:10 p.m. in the Pub Game Room, Kilcawley Center. The minutes of the previous meeting were amended to correct for the several typos and for the date. The correct date was April 25, 1997. On p. 2, "The Arts College" was corrected to "The Fine and Performing Arts College." The spelling of minimum and word were also corrected on p. 2. With those amendments, the minutes of the April 25 meeting were accepted.

Jenkins circulated a revised version of the proposal for the new GER model. He also circulated the write-up of his notes from the San Antonio Conference. Elias had previously circulated materials from North Central on assessment.

Jenkins announced that the OEA gathering is to be on May 30; Jan Elias has invited us to her place also, but in light of the OEA meeting it was decided to cancel GER for that week.

Jenkins reminded us that all further meetings this quarter will be held in the Pub Game Room.

Jenkins indicated that the Provost was unable to meet with us at any of our scheduled meetings this quarter. We will have to hold a special meeting at some other time.

Statement of the Model:

It was pointed out that in the revised proposal goals 4 and 9 were not listed. Jenkins said he would correct that.

The members also indicated that the task force needs to deal with the test out levels for Math, English 550 and other courses that students can test out of. Tingley offered to investigate the bench **marking** that has gone into the levels set for English 550 and to gather information about the number of students who test out of that course and to provide some information about the relationship of the test out levels to ACT scores. It was hoped that the principles and practices used by English for English 550 might inform the task force about how to norm the new GER courses for testing purposes.

Feedback on the model :

Walker reminded us that his college had serious concerns about the Selected Topics and

Electives Box. They feel that since their majors already require service learning courses, those courses should meet the GER requirement. The task force reviewed the North Central Accreditation guidelines for GER and agreed that GER courses should not be courses designed for a specific major. The courses required for General Education should be broad and open to a wide spectrum of students. Some of the current courses in Health and Human Services might well be submitted as GER courses open to all students and could also be required of specific majors.

Jenkins reported on his meeting with Fred Owens regarding the current specification of the strategy for meeting the speech goal. He said that the cost would be two to three additional full time equivalents. Jenkins said he would talk with the Provost, but that we would have to revisit this strategy.

Discussion of the Model

Jenkins then lead a discussion of what to name the groups of goals and courses. It was decided to name the first group "Essential Skills." This group includes goals 1, 2, 3, under B as well as the group of courses meeting goal 5.

The group of courses dealing with the science goals will be named "Natural Science."

The group involving goal 8 will be named "Artistic Perspectives."

The group of courses dealing with goals 10, 11 & 12 was tentatively titled "Societies and Institutions." This title will be revisited.

The group dealing with goals 4 and 9 was tentatively titled "Personal and Social Responsibility." This title will be revisited.

The group of courses dealing with interdisciplinary, thematic courses and service learning activities was tentatively called :Selected Topics and **Electives**." This title will also be revisited.

The Capstone course group was not renamed.

The task force discussed the issue of requiring a lab course in the Natural Science group of courses. The members did not yet agree. The discussion will be revisited.

Additional Agenda Items:

The committee has yet to finalize the names of the groups of courses and goals, how extended will be the understanding of goal 8, what upper division courses will mean, whether to require a lab course, and administrative structure.

The next meeting: The next meeting of the GER task force will be on Friday, May 9, in the pub party room, Kilcawley. On Wednesday, May 7, there will be an open hearing at the Senate Meeting. Another open hearing will be held in Kilcawley on Wednesday, May 14.

Adjournment: Jenkins adjourned the meeting at 4:15 p.m.

GER TASK FORCE MINUTES

DATE: May 9, 1997

PRESENT: Jenkins, Maraffa, O'Neill, Jennings, Elias, Funk, Walker, Tingley, Pusch, White, Mullins, Palmer

ABSENT: Driscoll, McMahon, Singler, Kengor, Martin

Secretary: N. White

Bill Jenkins called the meeting to order at 2:10 p.m. in the Pub Party Room, Kilcawley. The minutes of the previous meeting were approved as distributed.

Discussion of the May 7 Senate meeting discussion of GER. Many questions were raised:

Do students in majors that automatically **satisfy** certain goals have to take GER courses in that goal anyway?

Can a course for majors only ever be certified as general education?

Should students concentrating in a particular area take fewer GER course there and more in other areas to still total 60 hours?

Can a course in the major ever be certified GER? North Central permits one or two to count.

Should departments or colleges be allowed to resolve these questions internally, **e.g.**, in Engineering students would take less from the science category but no more anywhere else because of the rigidly structured program, while students in English would take fewer goal 8 course but make up the hours in some other category, given their greater flexibility. It was suggested that a major may substitute requirements of a program for one category if the substitution is approved, hence reducing the total number of GER course, **e.g.** in Psychology the department might decide that the goal 4 - goal 9 category is automatically satisfied by every major, so they would only have to take 56 hours instead of 60. Administrative difficulties were discussed.

What if a program or course is not approved? We need an appeals process of some sort.

Moved to a discussion of the orientation course: as there appeared to be a lot of negative comments and concerns, it was suggested that the orientation course be removed from the package for now, to be revisited when more substantive details are ironed out. Level one decision.

Other concerns - new GER will total more hours than current program, accreditation issues, whether Arts & Sciences should be permitted (?) to run GER, should we visit individual departments where concerns are greatest to try and resolve difficulties. Problems with speech class - not enough resources available to continue current offerings and add the new course, would need 2 or 3 new FTE faculty. Might speech faculty do workshops so the "communication across the curriculum" component could be retained? Dan will consult with faculty. No decision was made about this.



GER TASK FORCE MINUTES

DATE: May 16, 1997

PRESENT: Driscoll, Jenkins, Maraffa, McMahon, O'Neill, Palmer, Singler, Tingley, Walker, White.

ABSENT: Elias, Funk, Jennings, Mullins, Pusch, Kengor, Martin

Secretary: Anne McMahon

Bill Jenkins called the meeting to order at 2:10 **p.m.** in the Pub Game Room, Kilcawley Center. The minutes of the previous meeting were not circulated.

Jenkins handed out copies of a list of the associate degree programs on campus. He reminded us that **we** need to address GER requirements for these programs.

Feedback on the Model:

Jenkins handed out copies of the feedback on the model as a result of circulating various drafts to various groups. The **members** reviewed the materials. **Some** of the feedback asked us to change **the** goals, **we** cannot do that. **Other** items were either settled or on the agenda. Jenkins also reported on his conversation with Duane Rost. **After** discussing Rost's concerns, **he** felt that **he** **was** quite supportive.

Discussion of the Model

Jenkins then lead a discussion about the speech issues. **He** has since met with **people** in that program. It appears that **keeping** the speech requirement as **currently** stated will mean an addition of two to three new faculty. There is no money for that. The **sense** of **the** situation is that the department, college and university would **have** to re-prioritize things in order to hire at that **level**. **After** discussion, it was agreed that the **task** force:

recommends a speech skills requirement supported by speech intensive courses in and out of the major. Current **staffing** levels do not **permit** the specific set of courses preferred by the task force. The task force (or its successor group) shall return to the **Senate** **next** year with a recommendation regarding the speech goal.

After discussion, it was also decided to table the **orientation** course **until** next year. There is some concern about staffing it, even though it is only 1 unit and even **though** it might be incorporated with college orientation courses.

After discussion about the associate degree programs, the members **felt** that **the** following **was** **appropriate**:

A minimum of **28** hours of an associate degree program should **meet** GER goals. In particular these hours shall include writing I and II, taken In the first year: one course in

each of boxes D,E, & F; and one writing intensive course either in GER or in the degree-related courses.

There was also discussion regarding whether a math course (any course) should be required. The members will run this suggestion by the program directors in each college to get feedback. Jenkins will check to see if a math course is required by OBOR.

The task force then took up the issue of a lab requirement in science. McMahon suggested a compromise solution that stipulated that every course that counts toward the science box in GER include some "lab-like" dimension. Thus, students will get three such experiences in different fields. This addresses the concern by some that laboratory experience is an integral part of science education in the natural sciences. Singler said he would reflect on this suggestion and get back to the group.

The group then discussed Box F, composed of goals 10, 11, and 12. Some were concerned that the box, as described, sounds too inclusive, implying that every course needs to address all dimensions of goal 11 if goal 11 is chosen. The task force did not think that problem was necessary. Courses will focus on dimensions of goal 11. Other departments are concerned about combining goals in that area. The task force felt that these issues are precisely the ones the new system is designed to deal with. GER courses need to be multiple goal courses. This may pose a problem when departments use their introductory courses both for GER purposes and for their requirements for majors.

Additional Agenda Items:

The agenda called for the task force to address the issues of higher level courses and of administration. However, there was no time. These issues will be taken up at the next meeting.

The next meeting: The next meeting of the GER task force will be on Tuesday, May 27, in the pub party room, Kilcawley.

Adjournment: Jenkins adjourned the meeting at 3:50 p.m.

MINUTES OF GER TASK FORCE

Monday, June 9, 1997 10-12 am

Present: Driscoll, Elias, Funk, Jenkins, Jennings, Maraffa, Mullins, O'Neill, Palmer, Singler, Tingley, Walker, White

Absent: McMahon, Pusch

Schedule for the summer -- each person filled out a time sheet for the summer. It was decided that the Task Force would meet throughout the first summer session. The chair would circulate updated copies of the decisions via hard copy. Those on vacation would have until July 15th to contact the chair about the proposal as developed to that point of time regarding substantial concerns. If necessary, further meetings would be held to create a finalized product by the middle of August. The overall objective is to have a recommendation that could be circulated to faculty, staff, and students by September 15th.

Subjects needing discussion and a decision --

- 1) whether to have an introductory course
- 2) commitment to 1/3rd as percentage of courses devoted to GER
- 3) conversion of GER requirements under a semester system
- 4) minimum GER requirements for an associate degree
- 5) what happens if there is no speech course requirement?
- 6) criteria for being a writing intensive course
- 7) math as a basic skill and its inclusion of goals 1, 2, and 3.
- 8) use of graduate assistants to teach the writing courses
- 9) inclusion of at least one course as a laboratory science under the natural science category
- 10) expansion of area F (goals 4 and 9) from one course to two courses (taken possibly from area G)
- 11) definition of thematic courses and community service

- 12) capstone course in the major -- can we require it?
- 13) number of upper division courses required in GER
- 14) composition and charge of the advisory committee
- 15) procedure for submission of courses, role of department and faculty, report on new University Curriculum Council
- 16) evaluating the credentials of faculty for teaching a GER course

The Task Force made the following decisions: a) to change the name of the Artistic Perspectives category to Artistic and Literary Perspectives; b) to alter the description under Natural Science to read a minimum of 2 and no more than 4 courses from a list of courses that meet goal 13, and, in addition, goal 6 or 7."; c) to change the description under personal and social responsibility to read "1 course from a list of courses that meet goal 4 or 9 in combination with one other goal from 4 through 13"; d) to recommend that there be a coordinator of GER; and e) to permit students to take any 2 writing intensive courses meeting GER criteria.

REMEMBER THE MEETING ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 11TH, AT 12 NOON IN PUB. THE FIRST THREE ITEMS ON THE AGENDA WILL BE: ITEM 4, ITEM 10, ITEM 2.

interoffice

MEMORANDUM

to: GER Task Force
from: Bill Jenkins
subject: Minutes of 6-11-97 meeting
date: June 18, 1997

Present: Driscoll, Elias, Funk, Jenkins, **Jennings**, Maraffa, **Mullins**, O'Neill, Palmer, Singler, Tingley, Walker, White
Absent: McMahon, Pusch

Summer agenda -- Jenkins passed out the list of 16 areas needing a decision. He indicated that, although not everyone could be present at each meeting, the Task Force members would receive a hard copy or a disk updating the decisions made. It was decided that July 15th would serve as a deadline for those not present to provide feedback on the decisions made. The target is to finish all decisions so that the Task Force might send out a copy of the proposed model sometime around September 15th. **THE NEXT MEETING WILL BE ON MONDAY, JUNE 23, FROM 3 TO 5 PM IN KILCAWLEY, ROOM 2036.**

Item 4 -- minimum GER requirements for an associate degree. Joseph **Mistovich** from Allied Health came at the invitation of Rick Walker to discuss the reaction of the associate degree programs in Health and Human Services to the proposal from the Task Force (28 credit hours with student taking Writing I, Writing II, at least one course from natural science, artistic and literary perspectives, and societies and institutions, and 2 electives from GER approved courses). Mistovich explained the concern of his **affiliates** with the requirement that students take a humanities course. Although OBOR had such a requirement for associate in technology degrees, there had not been any enforcement. Programs had received approval without including a humanities course. He indicated that, if humanities stayed, then the programs would have to find room elsewhere, such as dropping the Writing II course, which most of them wanted to remain. After much discussion and negotiation, the Task Force decided to recommend that each student in an associate program take a minimum of 24 hours in GER. The distribution of such courses should include Writing I, one basic skills course (Writing II, mathematics, speech), and 4 electives spread over at least three of the four categories of natural science, societies and institutions, artistic and literary expression, and personal and social responsibility. Wade Driscoll, Anne McMahon, Paul **Mullins**, and Rick Walker were to make sure that each of the associate programs in their college would be contacted regarding the workability of this new proposal.

Item 10 -- expansion of area F (goals 4 and 9) from one course to two courses (taken possibly from special electives). Janice Elias presented a rationale for increasing the number of courses under personal and social responsibility by requiring 11 courses over the four categories with ranges of 2-4 in natural science, 2-4 in artistic and literary perspectives, 2-4 in societies and institutions and 2-3 in personal and social responsibility. Several members expressed strong

objections to recasting the three categories into four. It was argued that this decision had been reached earlier and that there had been an opportunity at the meeting at Dan O'Neill's house to revise it, but no changes had been made. Gabriel Palmer suggested that we look at the Special Electives area for a place from which we might take at least one course. Palmer had spoken to Duane Rost, and agreed with Rost that the category did not have **sufficient** definition to be meaningful. Jenkins commented that this category had been built upon the desire of the Task Force to encourage interdisciplinary courses, that many schools had such choices for students, and that the meaning of the terms was rather clear. Interdisciplinary meant that a course must combine several disciplines (it did not have to be team-taught), and that a theme, such as war and peace, might serve as a **unifying** topic around which material **from** various disciplines could be drawn. The general discussion did not produce a consensus, and so it was decided to continue the discussion at the next meeting on Monday, June 23rd, at 3 pm in Kilcawley, Room 2036.

Wade Driscoll announced his decision to resign from the Task Force. He expressed appreciation for the work of the Task Force, but felt that he had fulfilled his duty by serving for three years. In addition, he had other committee assignments requiring his attention.

- AGENDA:
- 1) Expansion of personal and social responsibility category
 - 2) definition of thematic courses and community service
 - 3) inclusion of at least one course as a lab science under natural science
 - 4) commitment to 1/3rd as percentage of courses devoted to GER
 - 5) In order, item 1, items 6 and 8, item 5, item 7, item 12, item 13, item 14, item 15, item 16, item 3.

MINUTES OF GER TASK FORCE

Monday, June 9, 1997 10-12 am

Present: Driscoll, Elias, Funk, Jenkins, Jennings, Maraffa, Mullins, O'Neill, Palmer, Singler, Tingley, Walker, White

Absent: McMahon, Pusch

Schedule for the summer -- each person filled out a time sheet for the summer. It was decided that the Task Force would meet throughout the first summer session. The chair would circulate updated copies of the decisions via hard copy. Those on vacation would have until July 15th to contact the chair about the proposal as developed to that point of time regarding substantial concerns. If necessary, further meetings would be held to create a finalized product by the middle of August. The overall objective is to have a recommendation that could be circulated to faculty, staff, and students by September 15th.

Subjects needing discussion and a decision --

/1) whether to have an introductory course

, 2) commitment to 1/3rd as percentage of courses devoted to GER

/ 3) conversion of GER requirements under a semester system

/4) minimum GER requirements for an associate degree

/5) what happens if there is no speech course requirement?

— 6) criteria for being a writing intensive course

✓X7) math as a basic skill and its inclusion of goals 1, 2, and 3.

✓X8) use of graduate assistants to teach the writing courses

✓X9) inclusion of at least one course as a laboratory science under the natural science category

✓10) expansion of area F (goals 4 and 9) from one course to two courses (taken possibly from area G)

✓11) definition of thematic courses and community service

- ✓ 12) capstone course in the major -- can we require it?
- ✗ 13) number of upper division courses required in GER *rational*
- ✓ 14) composition and charge of the advisory committee
- 15) procedure for submission of courses, role of department and faculty, report on new University Curriculum Council
- ✓ 16) evaluating the credentials of faculty for teaching a GER course

✓ number of goals that course must meet

The Task Force made the following decisions: a) to change the name of the Artistic Perspectives category to Artistic and Literary Perspectives; b) to alter the description under Natural Science to read "a minimum of 2 and no more than 4 courses from a list of courses that meet goal 13, and, in addition, goal 6 or 7."; c) to change the description under personal and social responsibility to read "1 course from a list of courses that meet goal 4 or 9 in combination with one other goal from 4 through 13"; d) to recommend that there be a coordinator of GER; and e) to permit students to take any 2 writing intensive courses meeting GER criteria.

REMEMBER THE MEETING ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 11TH, AT 12 NOON IN PUB.
THE FIRST THREE ITEMS ON THE AGENDA WILL BE: ITEM 4, ITEM 10,
ITEM 2.

double-dipping

GER AGENDA

- 1) whether to have an introductory course
- ~~2)~~ commitment to 1/3rd as percentage of courses devoted to GER
- 3) conversion of GER requirements under a semester system
- DD ~~4)~~ minimum GER requirements for an associate degree
- 5) what happens if there is no speech course, . requirement?
- 6) criteria for being a writing intensive course
- 7) math as a basic skill and its inclusion of goals 1, 2, and 3.
- 8) use of graduate assistants to teach the writing courses
- ~~9)~~ inclusion of at least one course as a laboratory science under the natural science category
- DD ~~10)~~ expansion of area F (goals 4 and 9) from one course to two courses (taken possibly from area G)
- ~~11)~~ definition of thematic courses and community service
- 12) capstone course in the major -- can we require it?
- 13) number of upper division courses required in GER
- 14) composition and charge of the advisory committee
- 15) procedure for submission of courses, role of department and faculty, report on new University Curriculum Council
- 16) evaluating the credentials of faculty for teaching a GER course

GER TASK FORCE MINUTES 6-23-97

PRESENT: Jenkins, Jennings, Maraffa, Mullins, O'Neill, Palmer, Singler, Tingley, Walker

ABSENT: Elias, Funk, McMahon, Pusch, White

The meeting began in Kilcawley 2036 at 3:10 pm. The meeting dealt primarily with the questions of whether to increase the courses required in the Personal and Social Responsibility category to two courses and where the extra course would come from. The original Elias proposal had suggested that the four categories of Natural Science (NS), Artistic and Literary Perspectives (ALP), Societies and Institutions (SI), and Personal and Social Responsibility (PSR) should be lumped together with a total of 11 courses spread overall. The range in each category would be: NS - 2-4, ALP - 2-4, SI - 2-4, and PSR - 2-3. Paul Mullins argued that this proposal was a good one because it made each of the four categories more equal. He believed that there would be less opposition to such a division. Jenkins pointed out that this proposal had been brought up at the meeting at Dan O'Neill's house, and strongly rejected. Further discussion occurred regarding the necessity of increasing the number of courses in PSR, and whether the course could come from the Special Topics and Electives (STE) category. Jenkins asked the committee to vote on the Elias proposal to group the four categories together. It was decided 6-3 to not do so. Gabriel Palmer objected to the vote, and asked why we were now voting. Jenkins responded that the voting had been occurring for a while, and that there was a need to make decisions more quickly. He concluded that, henceforth, there should be a motioner and seconder for each motion, and that ordinary parliamentary rules should be followed.

Paul Mullins made a motion (Maraffa second) that the categories, PSR and STE, should have a total of three courses with a range of 2-3 in PSR and 0-1 in STE; and that none of the categories could total more than four courses. He argued that this arrangement would strengthen the perception that PSR was being treated equally, and provide for a larger number of courses in a category bigger than originally thought. Jenkins pointed out that psychology belonged officially to the PSR category. Singler and Jennings argued against the motion because each felt that it was important to retain the interdisciplinary courses; Jennings also thought that it would give the School of Education more flexibility to satisfy the range of courses required by its accreditation agency. Maraffa responded

that the interdisciplinary courses were sure to occur in the other boxes, and that it was not necessary to retain them in the STE category. Charles Singler moved (Maraffa seconded) to eliminate "and that none of the categories could total more than four courses." Singler noted that we had permitted more than four because of the needs of some of the schools, in particular business and engineering. The vote was 7-2 in favor of Singler's motion.

Singler then moved (O'Neill seconded) to amend the Mullins motion to change the distribution to 1-2 courses in both PSR and STE. Singler argued that this would enable us to retain the interdisciplinary requirement. Walker rejected the argument, and contended instead that there must be a minimum of 2 courses in the PSR category. He also suggested that it might be better to defeat the amendment and offer instead a new amendment that required two courses in the PSR category, and one course in the STE. The amendment was defeated 6-3. Walker then moved and O'Neill seconded to amend the Mullins motion to change the distribution to 2 courses in PSR and 1 course in STE. This amendment passed 5-2-2.

The main motion as amended was now under consideration -- that the two categories of PSR and STE should have a total of three courses with PSR having 2 and STE having 1. It was agreed to in the ensuing discussion that the STE category should permit the student to take the one course either from a list of interdisciplinary courses under that category or from math skills, NS, ALP, SI, or PSR as an elective. The motion passed unanimously.

THE NEXT MEETING OF THE GER TASK FORCE WILL BE
WEDNESDAY, JUNE **25TH**, AT **3 PM** IN KILCAWLEY 2069.

GER MINUTES FOR 6-25-97

Present: Jenkins, Jennings, Maraffa, Mullins, Palmer, Singler, Walker

Since there was no quorum, there were no decisions made, but the Task Force did discuss item 3 (conversion of Ger requirements under a semester system). Clara Jennings informed the committee that the President intended to appoint a task force this summer which would make a recommendation to the President. He would then announce his decision at the fall meeting with the faculty. The only problem for GER, but a significant one, in switching from quarters to semesters would be in the number of courses allowed under each. Hence, 60 hours under the quarter system would translate into 40 hours under semesters. If semesters were run with 3 credit courses, then there would be only 13, not 15 courses. It was also possible that the semesters might be run with 4 credit courses, which translates into 10 courses. The committee believed it extremely important to find out from the semester study committee whether it was to be 3 or 4 credit courses before having to discuss how to divide courses among the boxes.

Also discussed was the definition of community service course. Those present thought that, if such a course were retained under the Selective Topics and Electives box (STE), then it should fulfill GER goals, and it should require an academic outcome based on the volunteer work in the community. In other words, no student should receive credit for volunteer work alone. There was much debate, however, over whether to retain it at all. One suggestion was to encourage community service components anywhere in the model, but not to require them. A statement in a preface would encourage this possibility. Some felt that no such statement was necessary. There was also extended discussion over the question of how much community service was necessary. Was one hour sufficient? No decision was reached.

NEXT WEEK'S MEETINGS WILL OCCUR ON MONDAY, JUNE 30TH, AT 3 PM IN KILCAWLEY 2036, AND ON WEDNESDAY, JULY 2ND, AT 3 PM IN KILCAWLEY 2069. PLEASE CALL ME IF YOU CAN NOT BE THERE.

GER TASK FORCE MINUTES FOR 7/7/97

Present: Jenkins, Walker, Maraffa, Jennings, White, O'Neill, Singler, Tingley (minute-taker)

Jenkins called the meeting to order at 3:07 p.m.

Once it was established that there was a quorum present, the group discussed its commitment to 1/3rd as the percentage of courses devoted to GER (item #2 on GER Agenda list).

Singler made the following motion:

"That approximately 113 of the total curriculum for the GER model is what we are working toward--whether on quarters or semesters." The motion passed unanimously.

Next, the group continued the discussion from the last meeting about the pending conversion to the semester system--approx. 41 semester hours = 1/3 of the curriculum

If YSU adopts a 4 credit hour model for semester, only 10111 courses under GER

If it adopts a 3 credit hour model 14 courses would be available for GER.

White suggested that we follow the 3 credit hour model for now (that seems most likely). A Work Group is meeting to discuss the details/process of semester conversion (White is a member). Jenkins suggested we wait a week or two to see what that committee says before we make the conversion for GER. Asked that task force members begin thinking about how to make the shift, which will require tightening. The consensus was that the 3-semester hour model would work better for GER.

Walker moved "that the GER task force recommend a 3-credit model to the conversion committee." The motion passed unanimously. White will take the recommendation to that committee.

The third item discussed was about definitions for the thematic/community service components listed in the "Selected Topics/Electives" box and about whether the Gen Ed proposal should require these kinds of courses or, instead, encourage these kinds of courses in a prefatory statement.

O'Neill moved "that the Gen Ed preface will encourage faculty to include community service components in their Gen Ed courses where appropriate and that it be removed from the "Special Topics and Electives" box."

The motion passed unanimously.

A lengthy discussion followed about how to define "interdisciplinary" and "thematic" courses. Does "interdisciplinary," for instance, mean that materials are drawn from a variety of disciplines OR that the course must be team taught?

Jenkins promised to return to the group with some language that would describe these kinds of courses--courses that combine GER goals in creative ways--courses that reach across the disciplines and highlight topics and ideas that don't fit in any other boxes.

Next, the group talked about the introductory course (#1 on the GER agenda). Should we have such a course or not? White moved "that the GER Task Force make no recommendation. That discussion of the introductory course be tabled and left to the GER coordinator/advisory board to deal with down the road. The current task force asks the

successor committee to make an assessment 2/3 years in future to see whether there is a need for such a course."

The motion passed unanimously.

Next, the discussion turned to the speech requirement. O'Neill moved: "The GER task force recommends that the speech requirement as described in the original proposal/model to the

Senate be adopted if and when the resources become available and that the GER director/advisory committee will need to reexamine the feasibility."

The motion passed unanimously.

#12 on the agenda: "Capstone course in the major--can we require it?" was discussed. The group agreed that GER cannot require a major to have a capstone course as part of the major but it CAN (and should) require students to have a capstone course either in a major/minor or in GER. A question was raised about how many assessment plans include a capstone course--

Jenkins announced that the GER Writing subcommittee would be meeting soon to talk about criteria for writing-intensive courses (Julia Gergits is now chairing the subcommittee).

The next meeting was tentatively set for Wednesday, July 9 at 3 p.m. in Kilcawley Center.

Meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

MINUTES OF GER TASK FORCE 7-9-97

PRESENT: Elias, Jenkins, Jennings, Maraffa, Mullins, Palmer, Singler, Tingley, Walker, White
ABSENT: Funk, McMahon, O'Neill, Pusch

Jenkins began the meeting at 3:10PM in Kilcawley 2057. He distributed the minutes, which were accepted with one change. In the first line of the second page it should read 2 to 3 rather than 2/3. Then followed a brief summation of what had been decided among the 16 areas requiring a decision before presenting a recommendation to the Senate. It was noted that the Writing Across the Curriculum Subcommittee would be reviewing their criteria for writing intensive courses, and would answer our questions before we acted on this area.

ITEM 3 - CONVERSION OF GER REQUIREMENTS UNDER A SEMESTER SYSTEM. Jan Elias and Nancy White reported on the Semester Transition Committee. It met yesterday for the first time, and discussed its charge. Much discussion ensued over the GER recommendation that 3 credits become the standard for the semester courses. Jenkins commented that he thought quite a few faculty would argue for 4 credit courses based on their desire to have only 3 preparations. The GER recommendation that 3 credits be the standard was presented to the semester committee.

ITEM 8 - USE OF GRADUATE ASSISTANTS TO TEACH GER COURSES. Janice Elias motioned and Stephanie Tingley seconded the motion that Graduate Assistants assigned to teach GER courses receive training and supervision from full-service faculty and that the department involved file the guidelines for training and supervision with the GER Coordinator. This motion passed with one dissent. Debate revolved around what was required by North Central. Jan Elias commented that the North Central standards applied only to regular faculty, and that, since the percentage of graduate assistants teaching our courses was so low, North Central would not be concerned. Stephanie Tingley described the training program used in the English Department. In response to a question about how extensive a use was being made of graduate assistants in the composition courses, she responded that most of them taught 550, and that they taught somewhere between 10% and 20% of the courses offered. Palmer questioned whether the GER Coordinator/Advisory committee was able under the motion to set standards for training and supervision. Elias said that GER should not set standards; rather the departments should be trusted to provide adequate training and supervision. She believed that the requirement of filing a report would serve to produce the desired effect.

ITEM 7 - MATH AS A BASIC SKILL AND ITS INCLUSION OF GOALS 1, 2, 3. Nancy White motioned and Charles Singler seconded that courses certified as satisfying goal 5 (math goal) shall also address at least one other goal from among goals, 1, 2 and 3. Charles Singler suggested that the other goal satisfied could be any goal, but Nancy White did not agree with this suggestion.. In the discussion it was agreed that the symbolic logic used in mathematics was a form of critical thinking, and would automatically satisfy goal 3. The motion passed unanimously.

ITEM 14 - COMPOSITION AND CHARGE OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE. Charles Singler presented his proposal which offered a combination of appointment by the Senate in the

traditional fashion of one representative from each school, and appointment by the Provost and Chair of the Academic Senate of 7 representatives demonstrating an interest in general education and nominated by self, dean, or Coordinator. Discussion ensued without a motion being offered. Areas of concern included: the need to keep the statement regarding the appointment of the Coordinator by the Provost, whether the first part of the recommendation should be a part of the motion (some felt that only the three recommendations should remain), how the motion might address the appointment of administrators and students, the inclusion of a job description for the advisory committee, and the dependence of the motion upon trust placed in the present provost. Singler indicated in the report presented and in the discussion that the prime issue was the appointment of people who had a genuine interest in general education.

Jenkins led a discussion on when to hold the next meeting. Since there would be a significant number absent next week, it was decided to hold the next meeting on Monday, July 21st at 3 pm. The first items on the agenda would be number 9 regarding a lab course, and number 14 regarding composition of the advisory committee.

The General Education Advisory Committee will play a major role in the development of the new general education program. It is **important** that the Task Force take into account the following parameters in constructing this committee:

- a) representation **from** across the university
- b) appointment of faculty with a focused interest in general education
- c) consistency with the mission of the University and its colleges
- d) manageable size
- e) connection to the Senate

It seems imperative that the advisory committee members have a genuine interest in general education and what it is supposed to be. For example, membership on the advisory committee of faculty whose only interest in protecting their program would be a detriment to the integrity of general education. Similarly, faculty who have minimal interest in general education, and perhaps serve as token members only, will potentially compromise the work of the advisory committee. Members of this committee should have a **primary** commitment to the education of university students, and only secondarily to **program/career** students.

With these principles in mind, the committee may want to consider the following structure:

- 1) The advisory committee will consist of up to 13 members, not counting the coordinator.
- 2) Each college may have one representative member, selected by the usual Senate procedure, determined when the Senate requests the faculty to declare their interest in serving on Senate committees. There will be a two-year staggered term with three members selected each year.
- 3) There will be up to seven at-large members selected by the Provost with the concurrence of the Chair of the Academic Senate. The pool of candidates will be comprised of individuals nominated by themselves, their respective dean, or the General Education Coordinator. There will be a two-year staggered term with 4 nominated one year and 3 the alternate year.
- 4) The General Education Coordinator will serve at the discretion of the Provost.



Youngstown State University / One University Plaza / Youngstown, Ohio 44555-0001

GER TASK FORCE MINUTES

DATE: July 21, 1997

PRESENT: Elias, Jenkins, Maraffa, McMahon, O'Neill, Singler, Tingley, Walker, White.

ABSENT: Funk, Jennings, Mullins, Palmer, Pusch, Kengor, Martin.

Secretary: Anne McMahon

Jenkins called the meeting to order at 3:10 p.m. The minutes of the prior meetings had been circulated in the mail. There were no amendments.

Lab Requirement in the Sciences

Jenkins then turned the discussion to the agenda topic dealing with whether we will have a lab requirement in the sciences. Singler moved that students shall take at least one course in the natural science area with a lab component. The motion was seconded and discussed. The motion passed. It was agreed that the group will return to the issues related to the language in which this requirement is cast, including concerns raised by Elias and McMahon as well as what we shall mean as a lab.

Jenkins reminded the committee that we will want to return to the language issue in many places in order to communicate things we wish to encourage when course proposals are submitted for GER credit approval.

Structure of the General Ed. Committee

Jenkins turned the discussion to the topic of how to structure the General Education Advisory Committee. Singler circulated a handout that drafted for the committee issues he thought were important. The committee discussed the items. Singler made a motion based on the handout. It was seconded. There were several friendly amendments dealing with wording, the number of at-large members, who may nominate members, and whether or not the appointment of the General Education Coordinator belonged in this motion or a separate one. In addition, it was moved that there be 2 student members nominated by the president of Student Government with the concurrence of the Provost. The amendment passed unanimously. It was also moved that the first full paragraph (including items a-e) be deleted. The motion was seconded and passed. The amended motion, made by Charles Singler and seconded by Stephanie Tingley, was as follows:

The General Education Advisory Committee shall be defined according to the following outline:

- 1) The advisory Committee will consist of 15 members including the General Education Coordinator.
- 2) Each college shall have one representative member, selected through Senate procedures, and determined at the time when the Senate requests the faculty to declare their interest in serving on committees. These will hold three-year terms with two members selected each year.
- 3) There will be 6 at-large members selected by the Provost with the concurrence of the Chair of the Academic Senate. The pool of candidates will consist of faculty and administrators nominated by themselves, faculty, or academic administrators. These will hold a three-year term with 2 members selected each year.
- 4) There will 2 student members nominated by the President of Student Government with the concurrence of the Provost.
- 5) The General Education Coordinator will serve as chair of the General Education Advisory Committee.

This motion and the following amendment were tabled at the end of the meeting held on July 21. Walker moved and Mullins seconded the following amendment to the main motion: No more than three at-large representatives shall come **from** any particular college.

The meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.



GER TASK FORCE MINUTES

DATE: July 23, 1997

PRESENT: Elias, Jenkins, Maraffa, McMahon, O'Neill, Palmer, Tingley, Walker, White.

ABSENT: Funk, Jennings, Mullins, Pusch, Singler, Kengor, Martin.

Secretary: Anne McMahon

Jenkins called the meeting to order at 3:10 p.m. The minutes of the prior meetings were not ready for circulation. However, McMahon circulated the final version of the motions that had been tabled at the last meeting.

Structure of the General Ed. Committee

Jenkins turned the discussion to the topic of how to structure the General Education Advisory Committee and the two motions that were tabled at the end of the previous meeting. The amended motion, made by Charles Singler and seconded by Stephanie Tingley, was as follows:

The General Education Advisory Committee shall be defined according to the following outline:

- 1) The advisory Committee will consist of 15 members including the General Education Coordinator.
- 2) Each college shall have one representative member, selected through Senate procedures, and determined at the time when the Senate requests the faculty to declare their interest in serving on committees. These will hold three-year terms with two members selected each year.
- 3) There **will** be 6 at-large members selected by the Provost with the concurrence of the Chair of the Academic Senate. The pool of candidates **will** consist of faculty and administrators nominated by themselves, faculty, or academic administrators. These will hold a three-year term with 2 members selected each year.
- 4) There will 2 student members nominated by the President of Student Government with the concurrence of the Provost.
- 5) The General Education Coordinator will serve as chair of the General Education Advisory Committee.

The following amendment to that motion was also tabled at the last meeting: No more than three

at-large representatives shall come from any particular college. It was moved and seconded that we untable those motions. The motion passed. After some discussion, the amendment to the main motion passed. The members then voted on the main motion. It passed.

Semester report

Elias brought the task force up to date on the activities of the semester conversion process. She reported communicating our conviction that Fall, 2000 should be the earliest date for the semester conversion and that full implementation of the GER system should coincide with semester conversion. However, it was agreed that some items of the GER program might be started or piloted earlier than that. The conversion will require curriculum reduction; courses will need to be combined with the total number reduced by 1/3. It will not be possible to increase the number of units in a program.

Writing Committee report

Tingley reported that the committee has met and is revising criteria for writing intensive courses. They expect to hold to the criteria that at least 30% of the grade be based on writing, but not that 30% of class time be spent on writing. Regarding the criteria of collaboration, the committee felt that not every course should be required to involve a collaborative assignment, but the committee does mean that peer evaluation and assessment should be included. The committee has not yet completed its task and will report back to the task force when they are done.

Upper Division Courses

Jenkins asked that we decide what we shall mean by upper division courses and how many we shall require. After discussion, Maraffa moved that each student seeking a baccalaureate degree take a minimum of 4 GER courses at the upper-division level. As under the current system, upper division shall refer to courses with 700 and 800 numbers. O'Neill seconded the motion. It was agreed that the requirement does not apply to the 2-year programs, and that the task force will need to manage the language issues well in order to communicate the rationale for this requirement. It was also agreed that the current practice of setting pre-requisites that must be met at the lower division or requiring junior class standing shall be followed for upper division courses in GER. Walker moved that we table this motion to permit time for reflection and for discussion with others. The motion to table passed.

Procedure for course submission

Jenkins then asked the members to address the procedures for submitting courses. Elias volunteered to get some proposals that will help us decide what form(s) to use during curriculum review. White passed out some suggestions developed by a committee for review of senate curricular procedures. The members agreed to look at them and give feedback at the next meeting.

Review of prior understandings

Jenkins asked whether it was formally voted on that each course must meet more than one goal. The task force indicated that we had agreed to such a requirement. The members present reviewed the requirements for each of the categories of courses and satisfied themselves that the criteria that define each category do impose such a requirement.

Jenkins asked us to discuss again what we had agreed to do regarding the matter of evaluating faculty credentials for teaching a general education course. The task force **affirmed** its earlier decision that the procedures and structures shall be the same as for all other courses on campus, since faculty will propose courses through their departments.

Future agenda

We need to consider a charge for the Advisory Committee and for the Coordinator. We need to complete the discussion of course submission processes. We need to decide the motion that is tabled. We need to consider the criteria for writing intensive courses and guidelines for course development in other areas. We need to consider again issues raised by the semester conversion process.

The meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

I N T E R

O F F I C E

MEMO

To: GER Task Force
From: Erin
Subject: Meeting, Thursday, July 31, at 3 pm in Cardinal room
Date: July 24, 1997

AGENDA: 1) number of upper division courses required in GER

2) criteria for writing intensive courses

3) double-dipping

4) job description of coordinator

5) powers of Advisory Committee



GER TASK FORCE MINUTES

DATE: July 31, 1997

PRESENT: Elias, Funk, Jenkins, McMahon, Tingley, Walker, White.

ABSENT: Jennings, Maraffa, Mullins, O'Neill, Palmer, Pusch, Singler, Kengor, Martin.

Secretary: Anne McMahon

Jenkins called the meeting to order at 3:20 p.m. in the Cardinal room, Kilcawley Center. The minutes of the prior 2 meetings were accepted as corrected. The minutes of the July 21 meeting had one typo and, in addition, one sentence was omitted. The minutes of the July 23 meeting had a correction to section headed "**Procedure** for course submission." The corrected sentence (second to the last) now reads: "White passed out some suggestions developed by a committee for review of senate curricular procedures."

Upper Division Courses:

Jenkins turned the discussion to the matter of the tabled motions for the last meeting. The members discussed the issues related to the motions. Elias suggested an alternative approach to the one in the motions. She felt that her approach was better because of the number of upper division courses totally available to students when we move to semesters, because of the results of her bench marking analysis, and because of the State of Ohio transfer agreements. Members responded positively to Elias's suggestions. It was felt, however, that we should not untable the motions until Tom Maraffa was here to argue for the motions as tabled. No decision was made.

Writing Committee report

Tingley reported that the committee's report on criteria for writing intensive courses is nearly complete. We will have it soon.

Review of prior understandings

Jenkins indicated that there had been another suggestion that the computer goal may also be met by two foreign language courses that include oral communication. There was no motion to adopt this suggestion.

Jenkins asked that we consider the issue of double dipping--i.e. a course counted for both the major and for GER. The motion Jenkins made was: If a course is approved for general education credit, it meets general education requirements. Whether the course counts toward the

fulfillment of program requirements is not the prerogative of the GER Task Force. This motion was seconded by Tingley. The motion passed.

Defining the General Education Committee and the General Education Coordinator Position

Both Jenkins and Elias prepared handouts suggesting language for defining the responsibilities of the GE Committee and the Coordinator position. The members discussed the handouts at length. Several suggestions were made that combined the two sets of ideas. The final motion made by White and seconded by Walker was as follows:

General Education Coordinator Responsibilities

The coordinator shall:

1. Serve as chair of the General Education Committee.
2. Work with the Center for teaching and Learning to provide faculty development for the general education program.
3. Work with the Director of Assessment and the Assessment Council to plan and coordinate assessment of student achievement of general education goals.
4. Develop information materials (e.g. catalog copy, brochures, handbooks to explain the general education program to students, faculty and the public).
5. Produce the Annual Report of Student Educational Outcomes in general education.
6. Work with deans and department chairs to effectively deliver general education courses.
7. Work with Admissions, academic departments, and advisors to evaluate transfer courses for general education credit.
8. Work with the Articulation and Transfer Module contact person in complying with OBOR regulations such as the annual revision and submission of the Transfer Module.
9. Lead a periodic review of the general education program and make recommendations for change.
10. Assist as needed with development of the new degree audit program to incorporate new general education requirements.
11. Develop policies regarding general education requirements for transfer and returning students.
12. Develop policies and procedures for periodic "recertification" of general education courses.
13. Seek external funding for general education initiatives.
14. Keep current with the field of general education.

The motion passed. The committee reminded itself that it is not our charge to write job descriptions. However, it was felt that our definition of what a general education coordinator might do should be passed on to Scanlon and was central to the way we see the program emerging during the next phases of development. Elias was encouraged to share this motion with Scanlon for information purposes.

The members then turned to a definition of the charge for the proposed General Education Committee. Jenkins moved and White seconded the following motion:

The General Education Committee

The Committee shall:

1. Approve and **recertify** courses for general education credit.
2. Recommend policy changes to the Academic Senate regarding General Education Requirements.
3. Serve in an advisory capacity to the General Education Coordinator.

The motion passed.

Future agenda: The next meetings are Aug. 7, 14, and 21, all at 3:00 p.m. in Kilcawley

We need to discuss:

- the change to semesters for effects on the total number of hours in GER and the consequences for our distribution recommendations over the several categories of courses;
- the motions about upper division courses;
- the writing intensive course criteria;
- guidelines for course development, both general and for specific areas, application forms, and how to draft the proposal to the senate.

The meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

TO: GER Task Force Members

FROM: Bill Jenkins

DATE: August 4, 1997

SUBJECT: Meeting - Thursday, August 7

There will be a GER meeting on Thursday, August 7, 3:00 p.m. in Room 2036, Kilcawley Center.

Agenda: Upper Division Criteria
✓ Writing Intensive Criteria
✓ Semester Conversion
✓ Curriculum Procedures

J. Chas - Phastin

To: GER Task Force
From: Bill Jenkins
Subject: Meeting on Thursday, August 21, 2-5 pm, Kilcawley
2036
Date: August 15, 1997

MEMORANDUM

Please note that I have made the time an hour earlier so that we might conclude as much business as possible. Come prepared with your schedule so that we can figure out when we might meet further.

AGENDA:

- 1) UPPER DIVISION REQUIREMENTS
- 2) COMPOSITION OF GENED COMMITTEE
- 3) SEMESTER CONVERSION
- 4) CURRICULUM PROCEDURES
- 5) PARTIAL PHASE-IN OF GER REQUIREMENTS.



Youngstown State University / Youngstown, Ohio 44555-0001

GER TASK FORCE MINUTES

DATE: August 14, 1997

E

PR SENT! Elias, Funk, Jenkins, Maraffa, McMahon, Singler, Tingley, Walker, White.

ABSENT: Jennings, Mullins, O'Neill, Palmer, Pusch, Singler, Kengor, Martin

Secretary: Anne McMahon

Bill Jenkins called the meeting to order at 3:45 p.m. in Room 2057, Kilcawley Center. The minutes of the previous meeting were not yet submitted

The Writing Intensive Committee Report:

The members present reviewed the latest report from the writing sub-committee regarding semester conversion. The report argued for a two semester writing requirement. Jenkins indicated that he wanted to decide this when we deal with semester conversion, but that *it was all right* thought we should *discuss* consider this request prior to making the decision. It was decided to ask the English Department to look at their norming and course design decisions in light of the very small proportion of people who test out of English 500. Some data seems appropriate, such as comparisons of placement and scores to ACT scores, comparison of first year scores and senior scores.

Upper Division Courses:

Members discussed the issue of upper division courses. Several suggestions were discussed. The tabled motion was withdrawn. The following motion was moved, seconded and passed: "To be certified as writing intensive for General Education Purposes, a course must be at the 700 or 800 level." Thus, our GER program will have a capstone course and two writing intensive courses at the upper division level. In addition, other courses in all the categories should have upper division alternatives available. The members decided not to require that the thematic courses be all upper-division. Elias reported discussions with Miami which is having such trouble with thematic sequences that they are dropping them. Our campus can anticipate greater trouble than Miami with sequences.

proposal
Future Agenda: The committee has yet to finalize the *proposal* for semester conversion, or to settle curriculum procedures. A draft of the program description is also needed. The lab science issue needs to be revisited as does the composition of the GER committee. Finally, the task force needs to discuss phasing in parts of the program.

Next Meeting is August 21, 1997 in Room 2036 Kilcawley, 2-5 PM,



Youngstown State University / Youngstown, Ohio 44555-0001

GER TASK FORCE MNUTES

DATE: August 7, 1997

PRESENT: Funk, Jenkins, Jennings, Maraffa, McMahon, Mullins, Tingley, Walker, White

ABSENT: Elias, O'Neill, Palmer, Pusch, Singler, Kengor, Martin

Secretary: Anne McMahon

Bill Jenkins called the meeting to order at 3:10 p.m. in Room 2036. Kilcawley Center
The minutes of the previous meeting were accepted as submitted

The Writing Intensive Committee Report

The members present reviewed the latest report from the writing sub-committee (See Attached). The report clarifies that writing intensive courses shall devote 30% of the grade (but not necessarily 30% of class time) to writing assignments. The form of the writing and of the assignments are variable according to disciplines, students, and goals of the course. The courses need not require collaborative assignments although they are encouraged, but the courses should include instruction on drafting, revising, and editing writing. The courses shall reinforce a process the students already know. Tom Maraffa moved and Tingley seconded adopting the original draft of the WAC program with this report folded in to clarify the above issues. A friendly amendment to the motion added that Writing Intensive Courses should have between 20 and 30 students per section. The motion passed.

Semester Conversion Report:

White reported that the semester conversion will ^{occur in} take until Fall, 2000. It was thought that the conversion would entail departments deciding the number of units attached to their courses. However, this does create a scheduling problem. Most courses will be 3 hours, a department may have a 2 or 4 unit course, but a good reason will be required. This fits GER goals well. It was also pointed out that when schools shift to the semester system, they experience an enrollment drop. The members then discussed whether it was possible to phase in some GER courses in 1999. Some 4 unit quarter courses could automatically become 3 unit semester courses. 124 units will be required to graduate GER courses would then be reduced to 13 or 14 courses. We need to decide this at the next meeting, ^{or} This will require that we review how we have packaged the courses ^{will}

Course Approval Procedures:

White circulated a draft of curriculum guide issues and course approval forms that are being developed as part of a review of senate curriculum procedures. She invited the task force members to provide feedback from the point of view of GER. She also recommended that the members review the process discussion in the document about domains and meeting the goals on

p. 5. She hopes *that* the section will help us in our deliberations of these issues and in our communication of them.

Upper Division Courses:

After some discussion, it was decided to leave this issue tabled until Jan Elias can attend.

Lab Science Requirement

Jenkins reported that there had been a change in the situation as we understood it regarding the feasibility of requiring a lab science for General Education. Jenkins reported that several departments ~~now~~ state that ~~more~~ resources will be required--especially faculty resources. The members decided to have Singler check further into this. Perhaps a less ambitious definition of what a lab science might mean is in order. It was decided to ask the sciences to put together a statement about what constitutes a lab science *course*. We will need criteria for awarding GER credit to such a course. Such a statement should also allow a decision about resources to be made.

Future Agenda: The committee has yet to decide about the issue of upper division courses, to revise the program for the semester system, and to settle curriculum procedures.

Next Meeting is August 14, 1997 in Kilcawley.



GER TASK FORCE MINUTES

DATE: August 21, 1997

PRESENT: Elias, Funk, Jenkins, Maraffa, **McMahon**, Singler, Tingley, Walker, White.

ABSENT: Jennings, Mullins, O'Neill, Palmer, **Pusch**, Kengor, Martin

Secretary: Anne **McMahon**

Bill Jenkins called the meeting to order at 2:35 p.m. in Room 2057, Kilcawley Center. The minutes of the meetings of August 7 and 14 were reviewed. Singler pointed out that he was listed as both present and absent on the 14th; he was present. The minutes were accepted as submitted with the exception of that correction.

Jenkins circulated a copy of an article from the Chronicle of Higher Education on curriculum reform and mastering core skills. He also circulated copies of materials that might serve as a draft of a report to the Senate.

The issue of a laboratory science revisited:

Singler reported on his investigation of resource concerns associated with a general education requirement for a laboratory course in the sciences. He reported that there was some concern about whether one course could be a lab course, given its size. When it was made clear that not all courses had to be lab courses, the concern was reduced. The chairs of the relevant departments said that they did not think the resource issue would be a big problem. They want to design new things in terms of the lab component of courses. They hope to use a discovery approach to investigation in the labs, not the same approach as they might take for their majors. The members of the task force recommended that Singler ask the science people to develop guidelines for the committee that help determine whether a course should carry lab credit for GER purposes. The members suggested that Singler encourage the group working on the guidelines to view the lab course as a scientific investigation experience.

Upper Division Courses:

Members discussed the issue of upper division courses. Elias passed out Toledo's statement about what the numbering system means with regard to course level and intended audience. After some discussion, the consensus seemed to be that the issue be left as last discussed. White moved to reaffirm the writing intensive requirement that both writing intensive courses be upper division and that one of them may be in the major while the other should be a GER course. Walker seconded the motion. Jenkins clarified that the motion meant that one of the courses must be an upper division GER course and the other one may be in the major or anywhere else. The motion passed.

GER Committee Composition Issues:

There was a review of the earlier wording regarding the number of people on the General Education Advisory Committee from each college. Singler moved to strike the limitation that **no** more than three at large members shall come from any particular college. Maraffa seconded the motion. Some members felt the limitation affirmed the value that General Education is a university wide responsibility and right while others felt it communicated distrust. The motion failed to pass.

Conversion to Semesters:

The committee then discussed a method of switching from quarters to semesters. Elias reminded everyone that the method requires that the proportions of components to the total number of hours for graduation remain the same. It was decided to continue this issue at the next meeting. It was further agreed that the proposal for GER not be sent to the October meeting of the Senate. There will be another meeting of the task force after September 15.

Report to the senate:

Jenkins asked us to discuss what will go into the report. Jenkins agreed to serve as the general editor of the report. Tom Maraffa will assist in that process. It was affirmed that the **report** goes to the Academic Standards Committee first, and they will decide to send it on or not. The committee then reviewed the materials that Jenkins had circulated at the beginning of the meeting for suggestions and corrections. The members all made comments. Jenkins will incorporate them into the next draft. It was suggested that it might be useful to produce a sparse document for voting supplemented by rationale and discussion in a question and answer format. (Examples: How does a course get approved for GER credit? What makes a course writing intensive? Can majors double count courses?) White agreed to prepare a sample form for course proposals for GER credit.

Future Agenda: The committee has yet to finalize the report to the senate or to finalize the units in each grouping of courses for semesters.

Next Meeting is Tuesday, September 23 from 2 until 4:30 p.m. in the Arts and Science Faculty Lounge.

GER TASK FORCE MINUTES

DATE: August 21, 1997

PRESENT: Elias Funk, Jenkins, Maraffa, McMahon, Singler, Tingley, Walker, White

ABSENT: Jennings, Mullins, O'Neill, Palmer, Pusch, Kengor, Martin

Secretary: Anne McMahon

Bill Jenkins called the meeting to order at 2:35 p.m. in Room 2057, Kilcawley Center. The minutes of the meetings of August 7 and 14 were reviewed. Singler pointed out that he was listed as both present and absent on the 14th; he was present. The minutes were accepted as submitted with the exception of that correction.

Jenkins circulated a copy of an article from the Chronicle of Higher Education on curricular reform and mastering core skills. He also circulated copies of materials that might serve as a draft of a report to the Senate.

The issue of a laboratory science revisited:

Singler reported on his investigation of resource concerns associated with a general education requirement for a laboratory course in the sciences. He reported that there was some concern about whether one course could be a lab course, given its size. When it was made clear that not all courses had to be lab courses, the concern was reduced. The chairs of the relevant departments said that they did not think the resource issue would be a big problem. They want to design new things in terms of the lab component of courses. They hope to use a discovery approach to investigation in the labs, not the same approach as they might take for their majors. The members of the task force recommended that Singler ask the science people to develop guidelines for the committee that help determine whether a course should carry lab credit for GER purposes. The members suggested that Singler encourage the group working on the guidelines to view the lab course as a scientific investigation experience.

Upper Division Courses:

Members discussed the issue of upper division courses. Elias passed out Toledo's statement about what the numbering system means with regard to course level and intended audience. After some discussion, the consensus seemed to be that the issue be left as last discussed. White moved to reaffirm the writing intensive requirement that both writing intensive courses be upper division and that one of them may be in the major while the other should be a GER course. Walker seconded the motion. Jenkins clarified that the motion meant that one of the courses must be an upper division GER course and the other one may be in the major or anywhere else. The motion passed.

GER Committee Composition Issues:

There was a review of the earlier wording regarding the number of people on the General

Education **Advisory** Committee from each college. Singler moved to strike the limitation that no more than **three** at large members shall come from any particular college. Maraffa seconded the motion. Some members felt the limitation affirmed the value that General Education is a university wide responsibility and right while others felt it communicated distrust. The motion failed to pass.

Conversion to Semesters:

The committee then discussed a method of switching from quarters to semesters. Elias reminded everyone that the method requires that the proportions of components to the total number of hours for graduation remain the same. It was decided to continue this issue at the next meeting. It was further agreed that the proposal for GER not be sent to the October meeting of the Senate. There will be another meeting of the task force after September 15.

Report to the senate:

Jenkins asked us to discuss what will go into the report. Jenkins agreed to serve as the general editor of the report. Tom Maraffa will assist in that process. It was affirmed that the report goes to the Academic Standards Committee first, and they will decide to send it on or not.

The committee then reviewed the materials that Jenkins had circulated at the beginning of the meeting for suggestions and corrections. The members all made comments. Jenkins will incorporate them into the next draft. It was suggested that it might be useful to produce a sparse document for voting supplemented by rationale and discussion in a question and answer format. (Examples: How does a course get approved for GER credit? What makes a course writing intensive? Can majors double count courses?) White agreed to prepare a sample form for course proposals for GER credit.

Future Agenda The committee has yet to finalize the report to the senate or to finalize the units in each grouping of courses for semesters.

Next Meeting is Tuesday, September 23 from 2 until 5 p.m. in the Faculty Lounge of DeBartolo Hall.

interoffice

MEMORANDUM

to: GER Task Force
from: Bill Jenkins
subject: Meeting on Tuesday, 9-23-97, 2 to 4:30 pm, Faculty Lounge, DeBartolo
date: September 16, 1997

- AGENDA:**
- 1) Review of model work of past summer.
 - 2) Conversion to 3 credit semester courses and impact on GER
 - 3) Review of Nancy White's forms for curriculum approval.

My apologies for holding the meeting in **DeBartolo**, but Kilcawley is having a laser war contest on that same day. I will be sending a copy of the updated model (based on summer decisions) as soon as it is finished. Please review it for the meeting.

$$\frac{100}{3} \times \frac{12}{100} = \frac{1200}{300} = 4$$
$$\frac{41.33}{3} = 13.78$$



GER TASK FORCE MINUTES

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

DATE: September 23, 1997

PRESENT: Elias, Funk, Jenkins, Maraffa, McMahon, O'Neill, Palmer, Pusch, Singler, Tingley, Walker, White.

ABSENT: Jennings, Mullins, Kengor, Martin

Secretary: Anne McMahon

Bill Jenkins called the meeting to order at 2:15 p.m. in the Arts and Science Faculty Lounge in DeBartolo Hall. Jenkins circulated forms, asking members to fill them out with information on their fall schedules so that he can set future meetings.

The minutes of the August 21 meeting were reviewed and accepted as submitted. However, Singler pointed out that the wording used at the previous meeting was not exactly correct where it concerned the manner in which the GER Proposal will be sent to the Senate. He suggested that the wording should be that the proposal will go to the Academic Standards Committee for disposition. The members of the task force agreed.

White circulated a possible approval form for GER courses; she asked everyone to read it and provide her with feedback--preferably in writing.

Jenluns announced the upcoming meetings of the AGLS in Toronto on October 23-25. The theme is globalization of the academy. There was some funds for members to attend; those interested should contact him.

Report to the senate:

Jenkins circulated a copy of the proposal he had drafted. He pointed out that it was a draft of the proposal only, not the entire document containing the rationale and surrounding discussion. The committee members read it for comments. These included: noting that section one did not contain all the essential skills since one was in another area; meet and meets were used in similar passages and should be made consistent; the section on p. 1 should be re-designed; the provisos should go at the end; the speech requirement needs to be clarified to avoid the notion that existing courses will be grand fathered in; the selected topics section on p. 5 should be re-ordered; there is an error in the capstone section. It was suggested that the wording on the writing courses be revised to indicate that one must be in General Education but the other could be in the major or anywhere else in the student's program.

Elias moved and White seconded that the following be added to the responsibilities of the GER advisory committee in the recommendation to the senate: "develop and implement assessment of the General Education Program." The motion passed.

Conversion to Semesters:

The committee then Qscussed switching from quarters to semesters. Several suggestions were made. White submitted a written suggestion. Another suggestion was to drop the Selected

Topics category, leaving all else the **same**. A third suggestion was to change the number of courses from 9 to 8 in the main categories, leaving everything else the same. The members were not in agreement. The matter will be the focus of our next meeting.

The Speech Requirement:

The task force then discussed the issue of the speech requirement in terms of the semester system. It was decided to leave the speech requirement recommendation as it is currently worded for quarters.

Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Future Agenda: The committee has yet to finalize the report to the senate . It must also complete the recommendations for converting to semester.

Next Meeting was not set at the meeting.

I N T E R

O F F I C E

MEMO

To: GER Task Force
From: Bill Jenkins
Subject: Future meetings
Date: September 24, 1997

I have checked the schedules of those at the meeting today, and have concluded that the only viable time is on Friday afternoon from 2 to 4 pm. Since I will be gone for the chair's retreat on Friday, October 3rd, I would like to attempt meeting this Friday, September 26th, in Kilcawley 2057 (the Penguin mural).

AGENDA -- 1) CONVERSION TO 14 (15?) COURSES UNDER SEMESTERS

2) SPEECH REQUIREMENT -- SHOULD IT CONTINUE TO BE IN THE
PRESENT PROPOSAL OR LEFT TO A FUTURE COMMITTEE?

If you cannot be at this meeting, please notify me or my secretary as soon as possible. If a quorum will not occur, I will then cancel the meeting and reschedule for Friday, October 10th

MEMO

To: GER Task Force

From: Bill Jenkins

Subject: Meeting on Friday, October 17, 2 to 4 pm, in Cardinal Room, Kilcawley

Date: October 14, 1997

AGENDA: 1) placing the Speech component into the Writing Courses. Issue was raised by Health & Human Services DAC. Rick Walker will report.

2) editing the General Education Report. Please see the attached report. I have included all suggestions and reformatted the file.

In the model as recommended, I have presented the semester option. However, in order to indicate what it would be like if we remained on quarters, I have use a Q.= to designate the differences.

Minutes of GER Task Force 10-10-97

Present: Elias, Funk, Jenkins, Jennings, Mullins, O'Neill, Palmer, Pusch, Singler, Tingley, Walker, White

Bill Jenkins opened the meeting by presenting the options discussed at the previous meeting for changing the model from quarters to semesters. Possibilities included dropping one course from categories B, C, and D (eight courses instead of nine), and dropping the Selected Topics and Electives category. He suggested that a compromise might be dropping one course from categories B, C, and D and removing Personal and Social Responsibility from the Selected Topics and Electives category. Under this option each of the major areas would have to give up something.

Tom Maraffa moved (**Dan O'Neill** seconded) that the total number of courses under categories B, C, and D be reduced from nine to eight, and that Personal and Social Responsibility be removed **from** the Selected Topics and Electives category. After much debate, the motion passed with only one dissent.

The next topic was the speech course, and whether it should remain in the present recommendation. It was pointed out that the present recommendation does include the speech proposal subject to the availability of **funds** and staffing. The committee decided to let the proposal stand as it is, and allow the Academic Senate to decide whether to retain it. **There** was concern expressed about running over the number of hours (approximately one-third) set aside for GER, but the Task Force was so undecided about where to cut another course that members thought it better left up to the Senate to cut.

Charles Singler motioned (Nancy White seconded) that the number of courses within categories B, C, and D be restricted to 2-3 instead of the present 2-4. The motion passed unanimously.

The Task Force then discussed the report that will present the recommendation to the Academic Senate. Suggestions included: changing Academic Standard to Academic Standards, eliminating brackets, rewriting the last sentence under "What is General Education?", adding "of each" to the sentence regarding writing and speaking intensive courses, dropping **full-time** as a modifier of coordinator, changing "the Academic Senate will create" to a recommendation to Academic Senate, better spacing under the goals, including the Capstone course on the first page of the GER model, and emphasizing students rather than faculty under Selected Topics and Electives.

Jan Elias moved (Nancy White seconded) that under Personal and Social Responsibility there should be an addition of goal 3, so that it would read "...in combination with one other goal from 3 through 13." **Dan O'Neill** asked the question as to whether critical thinking could be a course on its own. He believed that Bruce Waller's course should fit under GER. It was felt that

GER Task Force
Page 3
October 14, 1997

Waller's course could fit in Personal and Social Responsibility; hence, the motion. It passed. In the midst of the discussion Paul **Mullins** raised a question about goal 2 and the use of computers. He believed that it too should be part of Personal and Social Responsibility. He then offered an amendment (Palmer seconded) to include goal 2. It was suggested, however, that a course on computer ethics or computers and society already had goal 7 as its frame, and so did not need a special motion. The Task Force concurred. **Mullins** and Palmer withdrew the motion.

Submitted by William **D.** Jenkins, chair.

Next meeting will be on Friday, October 17, 2-4 pm in Cardinal Room.



CER TASK FORCE MINUTES

Youngstown State University / Youngstown, Ohio 44555-0001

DATE: October 17, 1997

PRESENT: Elias, Funk, Jenkins, Jennings, McMahon, Mullins, O'Neill, Palmer, Pusch, Walker, White

ABSENT: Maraffa, Tingley, Kengor, Martin

Secretary: Anne McMahon

Bill, Jenkins called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. in the Cardinal Room, Kilcawley Center. Jenkins circulated a handout from Tingley and the Writing Sub-committee that describes writing intensive courses for the Senate in addition, he circulated Elias' handout drafting her ideas on the central identifying characteristics of the proposed General Education Program.

The minutes of the October 10 meeting were reviewed and accepted as submitted, except that Rick Walker reported that he did not attend that meeting and minutes showed him both present and absent. McMahon, who also missed the October 10 meeting, asked for a clarification. The minutes were not clear as to whether courses addressing the math goal would also be included in the revised selected topics options. Jenkins and the other members assured McMahon that courses addressing the math goal were indeed included and that the draft of the program prepared for the Senate did make that explicit and clear.

Report to the senate:

Jenkins then asked that the members review the updated report to the senate. The prior report had been circulated and Jenkins had included suggestions from the last time. There were detailed changes made to each page of the document. A revised version of Elias' handout will also be included. Jenkins will make the revisions and circulate them.

The members discussed again the process by which courses would be reviewed for general education. The issues of which department(s) needed to be involved and matters of instructor expertise were revisited. Consensus was not reached. The matter will be discussed again at the next meeting. Jenkins will draft new language.

Jenkins then asked for confirmation that there are two recommendations to be made to the Senate. One is the new model for general education and the other is a recommendation for an advisory committee. Further, he asked for confirmation that the two recommendations were separate recommendations to be voted on individually. The members affirmed his understanding of those matters.

Walker raised a issue that arose from the DAC at his college regarding how to reduce the number of courses in GER for the circumstance that YSU converts to semesters. The suggestion is that we reduce the writing requirement to one course followed by two writing intensive courses. The members will discuss this suggestion at the next meeting.

✓ **Adjournment:** The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Future Agenda. The committee has yet to finalize the report to the senate It will also address Walker's suggestion regarding the number of writing courses and it will finalize the manner in which courses are reviewed for general education.

Next Meeting: October 17,1997 in Kilcawley.



GER TASK FORCE MINUTES

DATE: October 17, 1997

PRESENT: Elias, Funk, Jenkins, Jennings, McMahon, Mullins, O'Neill, Palmer, Pusch, Walker, White.

ABSENT: Maraffa, Tingley, Kengor, Martin

Secretary: Anne McMahon

Bill Jenkins called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. in the Cardinal Room, Kilcawley Center. Jenkins circulated a handout from Tingley and the Writing Sub-committee that describes writing intensive courses for the Senate. In addition, he circulated Elias' handout drafting her ideas on the central identifying characteristics of the proposed General Education Program.

The minutes of the October 10 meeting were reviewed and accepted as submitted, except that Rick Walker reported that he did not attend that meeting and minutes showed him both present and absent. McMahon, who also missed the October 10 meeting, asked for a clarification. The minutes were not clear as to whether courses addressing the math goal would also be included in the revised selected topics options. Jenkins and the other members assured McMahon that courses addressing the math goal were indeed included and that the draft of the program prepared for the Senate did make that explicit and clear.

Report to the senate:

Jenkins then asked that the members review the updated report to the senate. The prior report had been circulated and Jenkins had included suggestions from the last time. There were detailed changes made to each page of the document. A revised version of Elias' handout will also be included. Jenkins will make the revisions and circulate them.

The members discussed again the process by which courses would be reviewed for general education. The issues of which department(s) needed to be involved and matters of instructor expertise were revisited. Consensus was not reached. The matter will be discussed again at the next meeting. Jenkins will draft new language.

Jenkins then asked for confirmation that there are two recommendations to be made to the Senate: one is the new model for general education and the other is a recommendation for an advisory committee. Further, he asked for confirmation that the two recommendations were separate recommendations to be voted on individually. The members affirmed his understanding of those matters.

Walker raised a issue that arose from the DAC of his college regarding how to reduce the number of courses in GER for the circumstance that YSU converts to semesters. The suggestion is that we reduce the writing requirement to one course followed by two writing intensive courses. The members will discuss this suggestion at the next meeting.

Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Future Agenda: The committee has yet to finalize the report to the senate . It will also address Walker's suggestion regarding the number of writing courses and it will finalize the manner in which courses are reviewed for general education.

Next Meeting: October 27,1997 in Kilcawley.

To: GER Task Force
From: Bill Jenkins
Subject: Meeting on Monday, 10-27, 4 pm to ?, Cardinal Room
Date: October 21, 1997

MEMORANDUM

Because of numerous conflicts involving the meeting on Friday, I have cancelled it. Since there is a compelling need to finish the recommendations for presentation to Senate (not the report, which goes to faculty and staff), I have rescheduled for next Monday afternoon. Only one person has a conflict according to the time sheets handed in to me.

We will deal with issues related to the recommendations, and not the editing of the Report, except insofar as material in the Report touches upon the recommendations. Please be there if at all possible. Rick Walker wants to discuss the Writing I and Writing II sequence, and whether some reduction is possible. We also have to finish the discussion on the course approval process, including such questions as does the faculty member begin with the home department. The latest copy of the material to go to faculty, administrators, and students should accompany this memo. I have rewritten it based on the suggestions of the last meeting, and also have proposed new wording for the course approval process.

General Education Requirements
Report to the University

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Recommendation #1 GER Model	-- 3-7
Recommendation #2 General Education Committee	-- 8
Report from the General Education Task Force	-- 9-14
Statement of Purpose (Appendix A)	-- 15
Preface and Goals of GER (Appendix B)	-- 16-18
GER Task Force Members (Appendix C)	-- 19
12 Principles of General Education (Appendix D)	-- 20
Bibliography (Appendix E)	-- 21

RECOMMENDATION #1

GER MODEL

Essential skills --

WRITING I AND II	2 COURSES
SPEECH	.5 COURSE
MATH COURSE	1 COURSE

Natural Science
Artistic and Literary Perspectives
Societies and Institutions

SELECTION OF 2-3 COURSES IN EACH AREA	8 COURSES
(Q. = selection of 2-4)	(Q.=9)

Personal and Social Responsibility 2 COURSES

Selected Topics And Electives 1 COURSE

TOTAL 14+ COURSES
(Q.=15+)

Capstone 1 course

the descriptions

See below for definitions of each area. Each area requires courses to meet specific goals in order to be included in the list of courses satisfying that area. The Capstone course, if taken within the major or minor as intended, will not count as an additional GER course. The Task Force prepared this recommendation with the assumption that it should fit the 3 credit semester model presently under consideration. For purposes of comparison the designation Q.= has been included to indicate what the **recommendation** is under the present quarter system if no changes are made.

A. ESSENTIAL SKILLS

GOAL 1 -- WRITE **AND** SPEAK EFFECTIVELY

GOAL 2 -- ACQUIRE, PROCESS, AND PRESENT QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE INFORMATION USING THE MOST APPROPRIATE TECHNOLOGIES, INCLUDING COMPUTERS

GOAL 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.

1. To learn the skills of effective writing, students will take two courses: Writing I -- the standard introductory writing course, and Writing II -- a course in which students investigate a thematic topic, gather evidence from the library, Internet, or other appropriate sources, and write a research paper in a computer-assisted environment. Students may test out of these two courses through taking a placement test. In addition, students must take two courses with a writing intensive component. A student may take one writing intensive course on the upper division level outside of GER; preferably, the course will be in the major or minor. Because writing intensive components will occur in courses already meeting other GER goals, or on the upper division level (and meeting other requirements), the student will not have to take an additional general education course. Any faculty member may propose a writing intensive course. Writing coordinators, however, will offer training courses. To be certified as a writing intensive course for GER purposes, a course must be at the 700 or 800 level.
2. To become effective speakers, students will take a speech introductory course (minimum of 20 class hours). Students may test out of this requirement through ways to be determined by the GER coordinator and the communication department. The *implementation*

of this provision is subject to the availability of faculty and resources.

In addition, students must take at least two speaking intensive courses, which are not regular speech courses; rather, they include a speaking assignment. Any faculty teaching a GER course may offer a speaking intensive course. Students are permitted to take one such course on the upper division level outside of GER. As in the case of writing intensive courses, the speech intensive requirement is not meant to add two additional courses. Communication coordinators will offer training courses.

3. It is expected that all GER courses will attempt to integrate goals 1, 2, and 3 wherever possible. Writing I, Writing II, and the capstone course must incorporate all three.

**GOAL 5 -- COMPREHEND MATHEMATICAL CONCEPTS AND REASON
← MATHEMATICALLY IN BOTH ABSTRACT AND APPLIED CONTEXTS**

Students must take one course which teaches mathematical and statistical skills needed to function as a numerically literate citizen. A student may satisfy goal 5 by taking such a course, by passing a mathematics entrance examination, or by taking a higher level mathematics course, such as calculus. This course must also address one of the first three goals.

B. NATURAL SCIENCE

GOAL 6 -- UNDERSTAND THE SCIENTIFIC METHOD; FORMING AND TESTING / HYPOTHESES, AS WELL AS EVALUATING RESULTS

GOAL 7 -- REALIZE THE EVOLVING RELATIONSHIPS AMONG SCIENCE, / TECHNOLOGY, AND SOCIETY

GOAL 13 -- UNDERSTAND AND APPRECIATE THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT AND THE PROCESSES THAT SHAPE IT

A minimum of 2 and no more than 3 (Q.=4) courses from a list of courses that meet goal 13, and, in addition, goal 6 or 7.* Students must take at least one course with a lab component as part of this requirement.

C. ARTISTIC AND LITERARY PERSPECTIVES

GOAL 8 -- GRASP AND APPRECIATE ARTISTIC EXPRESSION IN MULTIPLE FORMS AND CONTEXTS

A minimum of 2 and no more than 3 (**Q.=4**) courses from a list of courses that meet goal 8, and, in addition, goal 4, 7, 9, 10, 12, or 13.*

D. SOCIETIES AND INSTITUTIONS

GOAL 10 -- UNDERSTAND THE DEVELOPMENT OF CULTURES AND ORGANIZATION OF HUMAN SOCIETIES THROUGHOUT THE WORLD AND THEIR CHANGING RELATIONSHIPS WITH WESTERN **SOCIETY**

GOAL 11 -- EVALUATE THE IMPACT OF THEORIES, EVENTS AND INSTITUTIONS ON THE SOCIAL, ECONOMIC, LEGAL AND POLITICAL ASPECTS OF SOCIETY

Goal 11 does not imply that a course must cover all of the areas mentioned. *does not*

GOAL 12 -- COMPREHEND AND APPRECIATE THE DEVELOPMENT OF DIVERSITY IN AMERICA IN ALL ITS FORMS

A minimum of 2 and no more than 3 (**Q.=4**) courses from a list of courses that meet a combination of two goals from 10, 11, or 12.*

*⁷ The number of courses in B, C, and D must total a minimum of eight (**Q.=nine**)

E. PERSONAL AND SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

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

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

2 courses from a list of courses that meet either goal 4 or goal 9 in combination with one other goal from 3 through 13.

F. SELECTED TOPICS AND ELECTIVES -- 1 course. In this area, students will have the opportunity to take a course that combines the goals in ways that do not fit into the areas above. A student may select one such course from a list of approved courses. The student also has the option to select instead one course from mathematics, natural science, artistic and literary perspectives, and societies and institutions.

G. CAPSTONE COURSE -- Each student will take an upper division capstone course, preferably in the major, with emphasis on student ability to gather data, think critically, use technology appropriately, present information orally, and write well. If a department chooses not to offer a capstone course for its majors, then they will take a GER capstone course in addition to other GER requirements.

The GER Task Force recommends this model with the following provisos:

1) that the Senate approve the speech recommendation provisionally. If problems arise with staffing or cost, then the General Education Coordinator and General Education Committee will study the speech requirement, and make a recommendation to the Academic Senate.

2) that associate degrees require a minimum of six GER courses with two of those courses being Writing I and Writing II, and four courses selected from at least three of the following areas: natural science, artistic and literary perspectives, societies and institutions, and personal and social responsibility.

3) that the faculty be encouraged to include a community service component in GER courses.

4) that those departments using graduate assistants to teach GER courses provide training and supervision through full-service faculty members, and that they keep a copy of the guidelines for the training and supervision on file with the office of the GER coordinator.

5) that each major will determine whether or not it wishes to count courses within the general education area toward the major.

6) that transfer students will receive general education credit as mandated by the OBOR transfer policy.

RECOMMENDATION #2

SENATE GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE

A General Education Committee will be established as part of the Senate committee structure. It will have the power to approve and recertify courses for general education credit, recommend policy changes to the Academic Senate regarding general education requirements, develop and implement assessment of general education, and serve in an advisory capacity to the General Education Coordinator.

The committee will be composed of 15 members, including the Coordinator, who shall serve as chair. Each college shall have one representative member, selected through Senate procedures, and determined at the time when the Senate requests the faculty to declare their interest in serving on committees. These will hold three year terms with two members selected each year. There will also be six at-large members, no more than three of which can come from any college, selected by the Provost with the concurrence of the Chair of the Academic Senate. The pool of candidates will consist of faculty and administrators nominated by themselves, faculty, or academic administrators. These will hold three year terms with two members selected each year. There will be two student members nominated by the president of Student Government with the concurrence of the Provost.

REPORT

The General Education Task Force, comprised of faculty members from each college as well as representatives from the administration and student government (see Appendix C for a list of members), has been meeting since mid-Summer 1994. The task force has been asked to examine, evaluate and redesign the university's general education program. Members of the Task Force have spent that time reading about the history of general education as well as a wide range of current theories about the purposes of general education, attending national conferences devoted to curriculum development in higher education, and analyzing materials from university campuses across the country that have strong general education programs in place.

The committee's mission is to recommend to the Academic Senate a model based on current practices and theory, the input of faculty, administrators, and students, and the consensus of committee members. It is the purpose of this report to acquaint the university committee with its recommendation.

What **is** General Education?

According to the "Statement of Intent" which accompanied the Academic Standards and Events committee's report to the Academic Senate in May, 1994, "General education requirements (GER) are those courses or groupings of courses which each student, regardless of major or degree, must take in order to graduate." A successful GER program will enable students to acquire knowledge and develop skills essential to living as productive and responsible citizens and professionals in the 21st century. A 1994 report published by the Association of American Colleges and Universities, Strong Foundations: Twelve Principles for Effective General Education Programs, concurs, and argues that general education should focus on the skills and knowledge college students need to be well-educated persons in a rapidly changing world, qualities such as:

a broad base of knowledge in history and culture, mathematics and science, the ability to think logically and critically, the capacity to express ideas clearly and cogently, the sensitivities and skills to deal with different kinds of people, sophisticated tastes and interests, and the capability to work independently and collaboratively .

In its report to the Senate in 1994 the Academic Standards and Events Committee also articulated the relationship between General Education courses and the rest of the curriculum: "General education is the ideal complement to professional studies in that it serves to give the students a repertoire of knowledge, skills and dispositions that allows them to animate their personal, communal, and professional lives in thoughtful and productive ways."

Why Does YSU Need to Examine Its Current General Education Requirement Now?

By reforming its General Education requirements, YSU is participating in what has become a nationwide re-examination of the aims of higher education. The goal of these efforts is to improve graduates' ability to function well in an increasingly complex world. Over the last twenty years critics of higher education have urged educators to revise the university curriculum in an effort to do a better job of preparing students for the future. Experts on higher education argue that distribution models for GER usually fail to provide the focus and emphasis on goals needed to better address "changing demographics and world economic conditions, an increasing exposure to social issues and problems, [and] rapid advances in science and technology."

As a response to the criticisms of higher education described above, accrediting agencies such as North Central have established more stringent criteria for general education requirements. These criteria stress the need for a goal-oriented, focused general education program rather than a loosely-structured menu or fragmented distribution system. In its last visit to YSU in 1988, North Central recommended that the university "conduct a thorough faculty review of the university's general /education requirements." It expressed concern that our general education requirements "do not provide a relatively similar academic experience and do not reflect a considered faculty agreement on a coherent program of objectives and outcomes."

To address this need, the Academic Senate in Spring, 1994, adopted thirteen goals which serve as the base on which the model recommended by the General Education Task Force is built. (See the Goals statement in Appendix B) YSU's next campus-wide North Central review and evaluation is scheduled for this academic

year. It is essential that YSU demonstrate to the evaluators that it is developing a coherent and focused plan for general education.

What are the available models for GER?

The available models for GER range from the distribution model to the core. The distribution structure used at YSU sets a minimum number of hours for the student to take in the categories of social studies, humanities, math/science, writing and health/physical education. The student may take any course designated in the catalogue as fitting within a category to satisfy a particular requirement. There are no goals other than exposure to distinct fields of knowledge. At the other end of the spectrum is the core model, which requires each student to take the same courses; no choice is permitted. The core guarantees that each student is exposed to a shared body of knowledge, skills and values. Between these two extremes are variations requiring students to distribute their courses over distinct fields of knowledge and establishing goals which the student must achieve as a result of having taken these courses. Hence, only those courses which enable the student to meet the goals may be taken, thereby ~~drastically~~ reducing the number of courses labeled as general education.

What model is the GER Task Force recommending?

The Task Force recommends a model that follows the modified core. It provides goals for the students to reach and the flexibility of course offerings necessary at a comprehensive university. The new model groups the goals into categories: basic skills, natural science, artistic and literary perspectives, societies and institutions, and personal and social responsibility. Students will take a specified number of courses in each category (with some options and electives) from a list of courses approved by the General Education Committee.

The model requires an integrative approach to the goals. Each course must address at least two goals in concert. The category of selected topics, which brings multiple perspectives to bear on a complex issue, offers students additional opportunities for synthesis. The model encourages departments to find ways to have their students address the goals within the major, particularly goals 1, 2, and 3. This integrative approach culminates in the senior capstone with students demonstrating

proficiency in essential skills in the context of the major.

Communication skills play a major role in furthering one's career. In this model basic skill courses in writing and speaking are to be followed by writing or speaking intensive courses and, finally, /a capstone course that requires students to demonstrate the ability to communicate in both forms about the material learned in their major. Please check later in this report for a definition of what constitutes a writing intensive or a speaking intensive course. **The Task Force hopes that faculty will further the sharpening of these skills by increasing oral and written assignments throughout the entire curriculum.** ✓

In general, the model encourages students to undertake a more active role in learning. They must learn how to use the latest technological tools for the gathering and processing of information. Exercises in critical thinking and problem solving will enhance higher level thinking skills and prolong the memory of material learned. As students repeat these kinds of activities in multiple courses, they will enhance their abilities to become independent learners over the course of their lives. They will function more proficiently within their careers, and as citizens in a democratic society.

How will these new requirements be administered?

The Task Force is recommending to the administration that there be a coordinator, whose job description will include the following duties:

- 1) serve as chair of the General Education Committee.
- 2) work with the Center for Teaching and Learning to provide faculty development for the general education program.
- 3) work with the Director of Assessment and the Assessment Council to plan and coordinate assessment of student achievement of general education goals.
- 4) develop information materials (catalogue copy, brochures, handbooks) to explain the general education program to students, faculty and the public.
- 5) produce the Annual Report of Student Educational Outcomes in general education.
- 6) work with deans and department chairs to deliver general education courses effectively.

- 7) work with Admissions, academic departments, and advisors to evaluate transfer courses for general education credit.
- 8) work with the Articulation and Transfer Module contact person in complying with OBOR regulations such as the annual revision and submission of the Transfer Module.
- 9) seek external funding for general education initiatives
- 10) assist as needed with development of the new degree audit program to incorporate new general education requirements.
- 11) develop policies regarding general education requirements for transfer and returning students.
- 12) develop policies and procedures for periodic "recertification" of general education courses.
- 13) lead a periodic review of the general education program and make recommendations for change.,
- 14) keep current with the field of general education.

To assist the coordinator in the performance of these tasks, it is recommended that the Academic Senate create a General Education Committee. This committee, with a composition of faculty, administrators, and students, will advise the coordinator, be responsible for the approval of GER courses, and review or recommen policies governing the operation of general education. Both the coordinator and the General Education Committee should be appointed as soon as possible to facilitate the transition from the present requirements. See the General Education Committee recommendation (page 8) for a description of the structure of this committee and its duties.

How will courses receive approval as general education courses?

Any faculty member may propose a course, but it must receive the approval of the home department and the college of that department prior to coming before the General Education Committee. After circulating it to departments, the committee will review the proposal, and approve or reject the course. Competency and ability to meet the goals should be the critical factor in approval. In cases of rejection, the coordinator should discuss the criteria with the faculty member or department, and permit them to resubmit the proposal. The Committee will also design a course approval form requiring, at a minimum, the designation of general education goals and

objectives, and the methods of reaching and measuring the general education outcomes. Approved courses will then proceed through the University Curriculum Committee for final approval. The General Education Task Force recommends that the new General Education Committee and Coordinator act as quickly as possible to bring a recommendation before the Academic Senate establishing the guidelines and procedures to be followed in curriculum revision.

APPENDIX A

Statement of Purpose

The purpose of General Education is to enable students to think with and use knowledge of disciplines, fields, and areas of study that **complement** their major in application to the informed conduct of their personal, professional, and civic lives. The intent of General Education studies is to help the students develop a repertoire of knowledge, skills, abilities, dispositions, and values that is both powerful and useful in thinking associatively, interpretively, and applicatively about the problems and issues they encounter in their futures. General Education studies provide opportunities for the acquisition of information. These studies also provide opportunities for the acquisition and critical use of valuable concepts, principles, and ideas.

* General Education studies are liberal studies in the sense that successful completion of the program liberates the student intellectually from uninformed, unwarranted, or limited knowledge from which decisions are made and actions are taken.

* General Education studies are empowering studies in the sense that successful completion of the program empowers the student to **recognize pro-actively** new possibilities, new ways of thinking, and new standards for affecting change and success.

* General Education studies are cultural studies in the sense that successful completion of the program provides the student with a sense of "Who ~~am~~ **I** and who ~~are we~~" regarding the interrelated roles of the individual, the community, the nation, and the world.

* General Education studies are civic studies in the sense that successful completion of the program provides the student with a sense of concern for others, a willingness to show care, and an ethic of tolerance for diversity and difference.

* General Education studies are science/math/technology studies in the sense that the successful completion of the program provides the student with concepts, principles, and ideas that allow for understanding and valuing the processes, products, and interdependency of science, math, and technology.

* General Education studies are personal studies in the sense that successful completion of the program provides the student with better self-understanding, life-long learning skills, flexibility, a sense of pro-active morality, and intellectual **independence** and purpose.

The distinct mission of **General Education** is to provide an opportunity for students to become fully educated human beings. These studies serve as the basis for students to give **thoughtful consideration** to a wide range of understandings, topics, issues, and problems beyond the focus of professional studies and extracurricular interests.

Appendix B

Youngstown State University's General Education Preface and Goals.

as passed by the Academic Senate on May 26, 1994.

Preface

The purpose of the general education requirements is to foster:

qualities such as curiosity, intellectual honesty, fairness, civility, and an openness to ideas and the sharing of knowledge,

thinking that is critical, independent and objective,

integration of knowledge across disciplines,

the ability to function effectively in a technological society,

understanding of the importance of studying the past and present,

appreciation of literature and the arts as expressions of human culture,

recognition of the importance of acting as informed, responsible, democratically-minded citizens of the world,

and an attitude that learning is a personal and a collaborative process exercised over a lifetime.

GOALS

Upon completing the general education and all other requirements, each student should be able to meet the following goals.

1. Write and speak effectively.

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

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.

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.

Students demonstrate the ability to reason critically, to distinguish among forms of argumentation, and to derive justified conclusions.

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

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.

4

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

Students demonstrate a fundamental understanding and competency in the use and interpretation of mathematics for problem-solving and decision-making in their personal and professional experiences.

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

Students demonstrate an understanding of how data are gathered and organized, of how models, theories and laws are constructed and evaluated, and of the purposes, values and limits of scientific investigation. Students are able to critically evaluate scientific problems and assertions using the scientific method.

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

Students understand the impact and changes in society that take place as scientific principles are discovered and new technology developed. Students understand that societal conditions and needs influence and shape progress in science and technology.

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

Students identify the elements and principles in works of art from a variety of artistic media and evaluate their personal interpretations of the works in light of the viewpoints of experts. Through a variety of aesthetic experiences, students recognize that the arts enrich their lives.

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

Students recognize the interdependent nature of the individual, family, and society in shaping human behavior and determining quality of life. They understand that mental, physical, and emotional well-being are interconnected, make informed decisions about life-style choices, and apply this knowledge to their own well-being and that of others.

10. Understand 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.

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

Students develop their knowledge about the markets, social organizations, legal systems, and levels of government that comprise society. They understand, through study of theories, how these institutions function, interact with each other, and evolve in our society and others.

12. Comprehend and appreciate the development of diversity in America in all its forms.

Students comprehend the historical development of the United States as a democratic political system and the ideals, rights and institutions associated with that system. Students appreciate the diverse characteristics of the populations that comprised American society over time, the ways devised to cope with these differences, and the impact of conflicts over differences on politics and society in general. Diversity includes but is not limited to the characteristics of race, social and economic class, religion, gender, ethnicity, age, disability, lifestyle and political identity.

13. Understand and appreciate the natural environment and the processes that shape it.

Students demonstrate knowledge of the characteristics, processes, and laws that define natural environments. They evaluate the impact of events and changing conditions within these environments.

Appendix C

General Education Task Force

Committee Members

Janice Elias	Provost ¹ s Office	ext. 1560
Darla Funk	Music	ext. 1829
William Jenkins	History	ext. 3451
Clara Jennings	Dean of Education	ext. 3267
Thomas Maraffa	Geography	ext. 3316
Anne McMahon	Management	ext. 2350
Paul Mullins	Comp. Info. Sciences	ext. 3796
Daniel O'Neill	Comm. & Theater	ext. 1856
Gabriel Palmer	Ethics Center	ext. 1463
James Pusch	Foundations of Education	ext. 7298
Charles Singler	Geology	ext. 3611
Stephanie Tingley	English	ext. 1633
Richard Walker	HPES	ext. 3650
Nancy White	Psychology	ext. 7236

Past committee members

Cynthia Anderson
Todd Beckett
Richard Bowen
Wade Driscoll

Randy Hoover
Larry Hugenberg
Joseph Mistovich
Virginia Monseau

APPENDIX D

12 Principles of General Education.

- 1: Strong general education programs explicitly answer the question, "What is the point of general education?"
- 2: Strong general education programs embody institutional mission.
- 3: Strong general education programs continuously strive for educational coherence.
- 4: Strong general education programs are self-consciously value based and teach social responsibility.
- 5: Strong general education programs attend carefully to student experience.
- 6: Strong general education programs are consciously designed so that they continue to evolve.
- 7: Strong general education programs require and foster academic community.
- 8: Strong general education programs have strong faculty and administrative leadership.
- 9: Strong general education programs cultivate substantial and enduring support from multiple constituencies.
- 10: Strong general education programs cultivate substantial and enduring support for faculty, especially as they engage in dialogues across academic specialties.
- 11: Strong general education programs reach beyond the classroom to the broad range of student co-curricular experiences.
- 12: Strong general education programs assess and monitor progress toward an evolving vision through ongoing self reflection.

(See Strong Foundations, Appendix E)

APPENDIX E

Bibliography and Supplemental Materials

Toombs, William and Tierney, William. Meeting the Mandate: Renewing the College and Departmental Curriculum. Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, 1991.

Cheney, Lynne. 50 Hours: A Core *Curriculum* for College Students. Washington, DC: National Endowment for the Humanities, 1989.

Gaff, Jerry G. General Education Today. San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1983.

Strong Foundations, 12 Principles for *Effective* General Education Programs. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges, 1994.

TO: GER Task Force Members

FROM: Bill Jenkins

DATE: October 28, 1997

SUBJECT: Friday, October 31st, Meeting - Breshnahan III

The GER Task Force will meet this Friday, October 31, 1997, from 2:00 p.m. - 4:00 p.m. in Breshnahan III, Kilcawley Center.

AGENDA:

- 1) Writing Intensive
Course Description
- 2) Communication
Intensive Course Description
- 3) Editing of Report



GER TASK FORCE MINUTES

DATE: October 31, 1997

PRESENT: Elias, Funk, **Jenkins**, Jennings, Maraffa, McMahon, O'Neill, Palmer, Pusch, Singler, Walker, White.

ABSENT: Mullins, Tingley, Kengor, Martin

Secretary: Anne McMahon

Bill Jenkins called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. in Breshnehan III, Kilcawley Center. Jenkins circulated copies of Elias' suggestions for a revised statement of the approval process. In addition, he reviewed the non-editorial decisions made at the last meeting. These were:

Courses meeting goal 11 do not have to cover all the areas mentioned in the goal;
one sentence was moved;

The capstone course could be in GER or in another program.

There was some discussion of the above agreements, but no change was moved or agreed to.

Jenkins then asked that we agree to forward recommendations one and two to the Academic Standards Committee of the Faculty Senate. At Singler's request, that decision was included in the report.

The task force members reviewed the description of writing intensive courses from Stephanie Tingley's committee. White moved and O'Neill seconded that the final version of the description be included in the report as a curriculum guide. The motion passed.

The task force then reviewed the description of the communication across the curriculum guidelines. O'Neill moved and White seconded that the final version of the description be adopted and included in the report. The motion passed.

Jenkins restated the task force's agreement that both of these descriptions should be in the report but not in the recommendations. The task force agreed.

The task force then discussed the statement provided by Elias regarding how courses receive approval. O'Neill moved and Jennings seconded that the final version of the course approval process be included in the report. The motion passed.

Jenkins then asked the members if there were anything else in the report that needed attention. Pusch gave Jenkins his copy of the report that contained his editing suggestions. Jenkins thanked Pusch and asked for other editing suggestions to be submitted. There being no additional business, the meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.



GER TASK FORCE MINUTES

DATE: October 27, 1997

PRESENT: Funk, Jenkins, Maraffa, McMahon, O'Neill, Pusch, Singler, Tingley, Walker, White.

ABSENT: Elias, Jennings, Mullins, Palmer, Kengor, Martin

Secretary: Anne McMahon

Bill Jenkins called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. in the Cardinal Room, Kilcawley Center. Before turning to the revision of the draft for the Senate, Jenkins gave Walker the floor to discuss a suggestion arising from the DAC of his college. The suggestion was that, as a way to deal with the conversion to semesters, the writing required courses go from two to one courses. Walker provided the reasoning offered by the DAC. The members present discussed the suggestion at length. O'Neill moved and White seconded that the recommendation of the task force with regard to Goal 1 and 2 remain as it appears in the current draft of the report to the University. The motion passed.

The task force then turned its attention to revising the **draft** of the Report to the Senate. There were a number of editorial changes. There were two more substantive changes. Concerning goal #5, it was agreed that the term "major" should be "academic department." Regarding goal #11, it was agreed that the following sentence be added: It is not expected that a course addressing goal 11 must cover all areas mentioned.

Jenkins agreed to incorporate the changes into the draft for the next meeting.

Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Future Agenda: The committee has yet to finalize the report to the senate. It will also deal with the writing intensive course description and the communication intensive course description.

Next Meeting: Friday, October 31, 1997 in Kilcawley, Breshnahan III.



GER TASK FORCE MINUTES

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

DATE: January 16, 1998

PRESENT: Funk, Jenkins, Jennings, Maraffa, McMahon, Mullins, Pusch, Tingley, Walker, White.

ABSENT: Elias, O'Neill, Palmer, Singler, Kengor, Martin

Secretary: Anne McMahon

Bill Jenkins called the meeting to order at 2:05 p.m. in Breshnehan III, Kilcawley Center. Jenkins circulated copies of a draft for a proposed preamble submitted from George McCloud, a copy of revised language for writing and speech descriptions, and he checked to see if we had all received a copy of Shipka's memo. Jenkins reported that Charles Singler hopes that the Admission and Standards Committee will forward at least recommendation #1 by February.

Jenkins then turned the members' attention to the draft of the preamble he had circulated. He indicated that if the preamble were accepted by the admission and Standards Committee it is not likely that it would be part of the recommendation. McCloud felt that the report needed a stronger spine. The members discussed the proposed addition. Walker moved and White seconded that the task force reject the proposed preamble outright. The motion passed unanimously. The committee felt that p. 15 of the report constitutes the task force's preamble for the proposed program.

Jenkins then asked the members to consider the revised language for writing and speech descriptions. The report's language was found to be unclear by some. The revised language (as attached to these minutes) rectifies the problem on p. 4 and p. 5 of the report. The task force agreed to the revisions. In addition the mathematics department requests that the language, entrance requirements, be changed to placement examination. Jenkins accepted the language recommended by the department since they have no entrance examination, but only a placement test. The task force members agreed.

The task force then turned their attention to the reactions by Shipka and by others to the report. Members of the task force reported reactions from various groups on campus. After discussion it was agreed that the task force does not support replacing other parts of the General Education Program to include a whole speech course. The committee felt it had agreed not to increase the number of hours in General Education and it does not support replacement of any existing section of the proposed program in order to accommodate increase in some other component. It was also pointed out that the goal passed by the Senate did not use the words "Critical Thinking" nor did it align itself with a particular form of critical thinking. The goal is infused throughout the curriculum as currently proposed. Just as there is no separate computer literacy course, there is no critical thinking course. These goals are met in an infused fashion. The task force agreed that substituting "shall" for "should" on p. 3, #2 of the report is appropriate and it agreed not to object to changes in p. 3, #4.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.



GER TASK FORCE MINUTES

DATE: October 31, 1997

PRESENT: Elias, Funk, Jenkins, Jennings, Maraffa, McMahon, O'Neill, Palmer, Pusch, Singler, Walker, White.

ABSENT: Mullins, Tingley, Kengor, Martin

Secretary: Anne McMahon

Bill Jenkins called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. in Breshnehan III, Kilcawley Center. Jenkins circulated copies of Elias' suggestions for a revised statement of the approval process.

In addition, he reviewed the non-editorial decisions made at the last meeting. These were:

Courses meeting goal 11 do not have to cover all the areas mentioned in the goal;
one sentence was moved;

The capstone course could be in GER or in another program.

There was some discussion of the above agreements, but no change was moved or agreed to.

Jenkins then asked that we agree to forward recommendations one and two to the Academic Standards Committee of the Faculty Senate. At Singler's request, that decision was included in the report.

The task force members reviewed the description of writing intensive courses from Stephanie Tingley's committee. White moved and O'Neill seconded that the final version of the description be included in the report as a curriculum guide. The motion passed.

The task force then reviewed the description of the communication across the curriculum guidelines. O'Neill moved and White seconded that the final version of the description be adopted and included in the report. The motion passed.

Jenkins restated the task force's agreement that both of these descriptions should be in the report but not in the recommendations. The task force agreed.

The task force then discussed the statement provided by Elias regarding how courses receive approval. O'Neill moved and Jennings seconded that the final version of the course approval process be included in the report. The motion passed.

Jenkins then asked the members if there were anything else in the report that needed attention. Pusch gave Jenkins his copy of the report that contained his editing suggestions. Jenkins thanked Pusch and asked for other editing suggestions to be submitted. There being no additional business, the meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.



GER TASK FORCE MINUTES

DATE: October 27, 1997

PRESENT: Funk, Jenkins, Maraffa, McMahon, O'Neill, Pusch, Singler, Tingley, Walker, White.

ABSENT: Elias, Jennings, Mullins, Palmer, Kengor, Martin

Secretary: Anne McMahon

Bill Jenkins called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. in the Cardinal Room, Kilcawley Center. Before turning to the revision of the draft for the Senate, Jenkins gave Walker the floor to discuss a suggestion arising from the DAC of his college. The suggestion was that, as a way to deal with the conversion to semesters, the writing required courses go from two to one courses. Walker provided the reasoning offered by the DAC. The members present discussed the suggestion at length. O'Neill moved and White seconded that the recommendation of the task force with regard to Goal 1 and 2 remain as it appears in the current draft of the report to the University. The motion passed.

The task force then turned its attention to revising the draft of the Report to the Senate. There were a number of editorial changes. There were two more substantive changes. Concerning goal #5, it was agreed that the term "major" should be "academic department." Regarding goal #11, it was agreed that the following sentence be added: It is not expected that a course addressing goal 11 must cover all areas mentioned.

Jenkins agreed to incorporate the changes into the draft for the next meeting.

Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Future Agenda: The committee has yet to finalize the report to the senate. It will also deal with the writing intensive course description and the communication intensive course description.

Next Meeting: Friday, October 31, 1997 in Kilcawley, Breshnahan III.