



GER TASK FORCE MEETING MINUTES

Date: January 19, 1996

Present: Elias, Funk, Hoover, Jenkins, **Jennings**, Maraffa, **McMahon**, **O'Neill**, Rococi, Singler, Walker, **White**.

Absent: **Bowen**, Driscoll, Monseau, **Mullins**.

Secretary: Anne McMahon, Nancy White

Jenkins, Chair of the Task Force, called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. in Room 2067, Kilcawley.

Discussion of the goal statements:

The meeting began with a discussion of goal # 3 which had been delayed. After discussion, the consensus was that the goal description should read:

Goal #3: Students demonstrate the ability to reason critically, to distinguish among forms of argumentation, and to derive justified conclusions.

The committee then turned to a discussion of Goal 11. The consensus on the description of that goal is as follows:

Goal # 11: Students develop 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.

The committee then discussed the description for goal #12. After deliberation, the following was the final consensus:

Goal # 12: 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.

The committee then turned to a discussion of the 13th goal. It agreed on the following description.

Goal # 13: 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.

Discussion of models:

The committee discussed the issue of which models to suggest to the faculty as ones that represent a range of approaches we might take. The issue of constraints arose; Jenkins indicated that we have been assured that money will be made available, but we will not be expanding faculty. There was additional discussion of how the committee means the expression, "modified core" model. Discussion also reviewed ideas such as courses being owned by no department, being team taught, developing operating principles to guide model development and course design.

It was agreed that everyone would review the models from the following schools for discussion next time: Miami University (Ohio), South Florida, Penn State, Virginia Tech, Southwest Texas State, Utah State, Portland State, Southeast Missouri. Many of these programs have theses, and capstone courses.

The committee briefly discussed assessment issues.

Agenda for the next meeting: The next meeting will be devoted to a discussion of the chosen models. Jenkins also asked that members think about what committees should be formed and come with suggestions about what individuals and groups should be involved in those committees.

Next Meeting: February 2, 1996. 2 to 4 p.m. in the Cardinal Room, Kilcawley Center

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



GER TASK FORCE MEETING MINUTES

Date: February 2, 1996

Present: Driscoll, Elias, Hoover, Jenkins, Jennings, Maraffa, **McMahon**, Monseau., **Mullins**, O'Neill, Palmer-Fernandez, Singler, Walker, White.

Absent: Rococi, **Bowen**, Funk.

Secretary: Anne McMahon, Nancy White

Jenkins, Chair of the Task Force, called the meeting to order at 2:05 p.m. in the Cardinal room in Kilcawley. The discussion focused on the models for general education from various institutions. The agenda was to discuss ones **suggested by** various members of the committee. We want to reduce them to a few models that we might present to the faculty in a forum that solicits feedback. We may also need to send the ones selected to committees to flesh out how they might apply here at YSU. The members discussed the following institution's models:

MIAMI (Ohio)

Advantages: two-tiered system, senior capstone course, thematic sequences, 3-course sequence in the theme outside the major, preserves degree of flexibility for student.

Disadvantages: too narrow clusters, integration too departmentalized, clusters not closely tied to goals, permits double-triple dipping, lacks freshman experience.

SOUTH FLORIDA:

Advantages: two-tiers, capstone course, interdisciplinary, writing component, outside the major, not too compartmentalized, writing across the curricula.

Disadvantages: too departmentalized, lacks freshman experience, not thematically connected, too narrow, some important goals only arise at the second tier.

PORTLAND STATE:

Advantages: program involves all four years, freshman experience, capstone experience, flexible, GER courses have a separate identity not tied to departments, attends to transfer students,

Disadvantages: not clear if it works administratively, too lock-step for the students, levels too rigid, year-long courses are a weakness.

PENN STATE: advantages and disadvantages very much like South Florida.

VIRGINIA TECH:

Advantages: Interdisciplinary "areas" with discipline specific courses, clusters, areas similar to ours.

Disadvantages : Goals do not translate into areas, no freshman experience, no capstone, too departmentally based, may be too much like what we are doing now.

SOUTHWEST TEXAS:

Advantages: Writing intensive, freshman seminar, capstone that is major specific.

Disadvantages: too discipline specific.

UTAH STATE

Advantages: thematic cluster, (soft)interdisciplinary , orientation course, two capstones.

Disadvantages: lacks writing-intensive dimension, requires that every cluster addresses every goal.

SOUTHEAST MISSOURI

Advantages: Categories don't use department names, not discipline based, interdisciplinary curriculum in junior and senior years, senior year seminar (capstone), four year approach, stands alone--university studies separately administered.

Disadvantages: much too behavioral, too many categories.

ISSUES SURFACED DURING DISCUSSION

Freshman experience, capstone course, sequences or clusters, concentrated in freshman year or distributed over two, three, or four years, managing senior seminars, interdisciplinary goals vs. Interdisciplinary courses, multiple year program articulation, student demand and selection of courses.

TYPES OF MODELS: The group identified three types of models as follows:

1. Portland State: not department based, highly interdisciplinary, sequences.
2. Goals & themes, courses identified with departments. E.g. Miami, Utah, Va. Tech, SE Missouri.

3. Goals & distribution: choices from traditional academic departments. E.g. SFlorida, Penn State, SWTexas.

AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING :

Jenkins identified the following tasks for the next meeting:

1. **Select/designate** 3 models to take to faculty.
2. Start building subcommittees for developing guidelines for course development.
3. Review issues that surfaced during the review of the models.

Next Meeting: The next meeting is Friday, February 16, at 3:00 in the Cardinal Room of Kilcawley Center.

Adjournment: Jenkins adjourned the meeting on time.



GER TASK FORCE MEETING MINUTES

Youngstown State University / Youngstown, Ohio 44555-0001

Date: February, 16 1996

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

Absent: Ricoci, **Bowen**, Driscoll, Hoover, Walker.

Secretary: Anne McMahon

Jenkins, Chair of the Task Force, called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m. in the Cardinal Room, Kilcawley.

Jenkins circulated the final copy of the goal descriptions and asked everyone to read them **carefully** to make sure that they were correct. The members then discussed how to proceed to the next step. It was felt that we need to find a way to present the three models identified at the last meeting to the faculty and to relevant **staff** and students. It was decided to develop a written, generic description of each of the three types of models. That description will be circulated. The task force agreed that returning to the departments as we did before was too **time-consuming**. It was decided that we would hold a faculty forum; the Arts and Science Faculty Forum could be opened to the entire campus. In addition, a second meeting, perhaps in connection with the Senate, would also be held. These meetings will provide a place for interested persons to discuss the models and provide us feedback. The task force will decide about what model is best only after these meetings. Departments will be encouraged to have representatives at one or both of the meetings.

The members agreed that the types of models identified at the last meeting were the appropriate ones to present to the faculty. The following individuals agreed to serve on subcommittees to **draft** a generic description of each:

Model 1: (Portland State) Nancy **White**, Virginia Monseau

Model 2: (e.g. Miami) Tom **Maraffa**, Paul **Mullins**

Model 3: (e.g. Penn State) Darla Funk, Jan Elias, Rick Walker

Members of the subcommittees were asked to have a two-page draft of each model by the next meeting, March 8th. Bill Jenkins will prepare a front page for the information packet to be sent to faculty.

The task force then turned to the issue of creating subcommittees of faculty who might give us advice and information about how to include some of the skills and process goals into the curriculum. It was decided that two members of the task force should be on each committee. The following subcommittees and task force members were chosen:

Subcommittee on Writing: Virginia Monseau, Tom Maraffa
Subcommittee on Speaking: Dan O'Neill, Darla Funk
Subcommittee on Critical Thinking: Gabriel Palmer, Bill Jenluns
Subcommittee on Technology/Computer literacy: Paul Mullins, Wade Driscoll

The members of the task force are to develop names for the faculty to include in these committees and have them for the next meeting on March 8th. The charge to the committees shall include:

1. Develop new members as needed;
2. Discuss extra-course and **infusion** strategies for meeting goals.
3. Study alternative strategies and give us information about options, what has and hasn't worked, recommendations.

There was some discussion about whether we need to deal with assessment at this time. It was decided to set a due date for these committees' work at the next meeting.

The discussion about any parameters that the task force may want to set on course development or on the model we adopt will be held after the committees have met and provided us with guidance. Decisions about which model to adopt will also await feedback from these committees.

Next Meeting: Friday, March 8, 1996, 1:30 to 3 p.m.

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

TO: Members of GER Task Force
FROM: William Jenkins, Chair - History
DATE: March 4, 1996

There will be a meeting of the GER Task Force this Friday, March 8,
from 3:00 - 5:00 p.m. in the Cardinal Room.

- AGENDA:
1. Review generic models
 2. Review composition of subcommittees on writing, computers, speaking and critical thinking.
 3. Set schedule for spring.

PLEASE SEND ME YOUR SPRING CLASS SCHEDULE ASAP.



GER TASK FORCE MINUTES

Date: March 8, 1996

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

ABSENT: Bowen, Rococi, Hoover, Jennings, Monseau.

Secretary: Nancy White & Anne Mc Mahon

Bill Jenkins, Chair of the Task Force, called the meeting to order at 3:34 p.m. in Room 2036 Kilcawley. The members began by reading the descriptions of the three types of general models: the four year integration model, the core curriculum model, and the Structured distribution model. The group discussed the lack of consistency in the form of the descriptions: e.g. number of credits (or not), whether the goals should be represented in the model, amount of detail. It was agreed that the subcommittee should rewrite the first and third descriptions to be consistent with the form of the description of Model 2--the core curriculum model. The members then reviewed the memo that would accompany the descriptions. It was decided that the first paragraph was OK. It would then be best to move into the descriptions immediately.

The members then discussed the schedule for the faculty forums. It was decided to get the written materials out to the faculty by the 25th of March--i.e. by the start of Spring Quarter. The faculty forum would be scheduled for Tuesday, April 30th, at 4:00 p.m.; the Senate Meeting on May 1st would also be a place for discussion and information. In addition, Student Government would get copies of the materials and they would be asked for feedback at the forum or the Senate meeting. Jenkins also will send a memo asking chairs to process these alternatives with their faculty, inviting feedback. Jan Elias will follow through on encouraging administrative meetings to discuss these options; she will raise it at the Dean's Council and suggest that they deal with the matter at DAC meetings.

Three members of the task force have offered to make brief presentations (5 minutes) at the Faculty Forum: Nancy White will present the first model, Paul Mullins will present the second one and Rick Walker will present the third. Jenkins will moderate the discussions.

The task force agreed that it was not time for the task force to chose a model. After getting feedback, the task force will draft criteria for committees who will study specific areas. These criteria may encourage the committees to go in one direction or the other.

Committee Composition:

Returning to the committees created at the previous meeting, the members reported on the names of the individuals who would serve on their committees. Virginia has added the following four individuals to her Writing Group: Julia Gergits, Chuck Stevens, Robert Hogue, and Tom Maraffa. Paul Mullins has added three names to his Computer Skills Group: Karen Duda, Wade Driscoll, and Jeff Ray. The critical thinking group includes Gabriel Palmer, Bruce Waller, and Dan O'Neill. Jenkins invited everyone to let him know if some one else comes to mind for one of these committees. The Speech Committee includes O'Neill, Jane Reid, Alice Betz, and Tom McCracken.

Jenkins reminded the committees of their charge; to research and develop information for the task force about how to build these skills into and across the curriculum.

AGENDA FOR THE FUTURE :

Jenkins suggested that we would not have meetings during the first few weeks of the quarter since individuals would be meeting with their committees, preparing for the faculty forum and the like. After discussing schedules of those present, it was decided that the meeting times next quarter will be Thursday from 2 to 4 p.m. Members were asked to protect this time from other obligations. We can expect to start meeting from April 25th on. We will start pulling together all this information and feedback by mid to late Spring Quarter. We want to have committees dealing with course development in the Fall.

Adjournment: Jenkins adjourned the meeting at 4:45 p.m.

TO: GER TASK FORCE
FROM: BILL JENKINS
DATE: 4-30-96
SUBJECT: UPCOMING MEETINGS

We had agreed to meet every Thursday this quarter starting April 25th. I am cancelling the meeting for this week, but intend to meet throughout the rest of May and the first week of June from 2 to 4 pm. All meetings will take place in **Kilcawley** Center.

May 9th -- Bresnahan I and II
May 16th -- 2068
May 23rd -- Bresnahan III
May 30th -- 2068
June 6th -- Bresnahan III

In order to avoid sending out an agenda each week, I am listing the following topics as agenda items:

- 1) Reports from subcommittees (critical thinking is next)
- 2) Discussion of feedback from hearings. Also see memo from Christine Kate of Human Ecology
- 3) Set guidelines for courses that will meet GER standards
- 4) Setup of committees and workshops to assist in curriculum revision
- 5) Structure for approval of GER courses -- should it be part of or separate from Senate system?
- 6) Assessment -- see material forthcoming from North Central Association conference in Chicago. Possible workshop with Assessment Committee in June.



GER TASK FORCE MTNUTES

Date: May 9, 1996

PRESENT: Funk, Jenkins, Maraffa, McMahan, Monseau, O'Neill, Palmer, Singler, White.

ABSENT: ~~Blanka~~, Rococi, Driscoll, Elias, Hoover, Jennings, Mullins, Walker.

Secretary: Anne Mc Mahon

Bill Jenkins, Chair of the Task Force, called the meeting to order at 2:05 p.m. in Bresnahan I & II, Kilcawley. Jenkins handed out a corrected list of members. Members of the negotiating team pointed out that they might miss some of the meetings this month due to mediation. Jenkins indicated that we would continue to meet in their absence.

The report from the Critical Thinking sub-committee (Gabriel Palmer, Dennis Henneman and Bruce Waller) was circulated and Palmer discussed it with the task force members. See attached report. The members asked questions such as what it might mean in music to teach critical thinking, the levels of critical thinking (e.g. making evaluations to using the thinking in the act of creation) and the importance of pedagogical issues to what is learned. The creative dimension of critical thinking might be critical to a senior level capstone course in the major while earlier GER courses might stress evaluation and skills of critical thinking not specific to the methods of the student's major. The group agreed that the report should add "information" to the list of items. Jenkins requested that the sub-committee now take on the task of determining criteria that we might use to evaluate courses in terms of the Critical Thinking goal.

The discussion turned to the hearings held in Arts and Sciences and with the Senate. Jenkins circulated copies of written responses received. The members read the responses and shared perceptions of the comments at the meeting. Jenkins reported that he taped the sessions and is having the tapes transcribed. He will circulate them when they are completed. The members felt the need to develop a strategy that allows some room for those who are looking for something similar to what we are now doing and those who seek a dramatically different system. The members discussed structuring some process for next year that might give people the opportunity to do some of both. It was agreed that we cannot impose a model, but we can impose guidelines and goals. The committee discussed a model that includes features of the alternatives presented: a freshman series of courses that stress skills and can be interdisciplinary, sophomore and junior level options that are disciplinary or interdisciplinary, and the possibility of a capstone course in

the major during the senior year. It was pointed out that we could ask the majors what kind of capstone experience they already provide for their students and how that course relates to some of the GER goals.

McMahon discussed a course idea that she brought back **from** a trip by the AAC&U Diversity Team to U. Mass -Boston. The course **would** be spread out over the first three quarters and involve participation by faculty, staff and more senior students. It might orient the student to college and to GER while providing a **peer-mentoring** experience and a cohort for the first year.

Future meetings and agenda:

Jenkins charged the members to develop specific **guidelines/directions** to give to faculty as they begin to develop courses for GER.

May 16: 2068 **Kilcawley**

May **23rd**: Bresnahan III

May 30: 2068

June 6th: Bresnahan **III**

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

To: GER Task Force
Fr: Gabriel Palmer-Fernández *SPF*
Re: Report from Critical Thinking Subcommittee

Three questions were addressed by the Critical Thinking Subcommittee: (i) What is critical thinking (henceforth CT)? (ii) What role does CT play in a liberal arts education? and (iii) Should CT be taught by a single course or set of courses, or should it be integrated into the entire GER?

As is evident in the CT debate around the nation, CT is a subject much desired yet lacking clear definition. It is the judgment of the CT Subcommittee that CT consists of a set of skills that are not necessarily "problem-solving." CT does not solve problems. It evaluates. The CT Subcommittee proposes the following definition:

CT is a mode of evaluating and organizing theories, hypotheses, and assertions in a rigorous and defensible way.

The role CT plays in a liberal arts education is the development of skills in reasoning and communication—e.g., forms of deductive and inductive reasoning (i.e., logic) and clarity and purpose in written and oral communication.¹

It makes little sense to the CT Subcommittee to say that every course will have a CT requirement. Were that the case, many courses will not be approved. The preferred approach is to emphasize CT as an evaluative form of thinking with application to, say, the scientific method (how, for example, do we distinguish science from pseudo-science?), political history, and literary criticism.

Courses in various disciplines are, in our judgment, compatible with the above definition: research methods in psychology, because of the emphasis on scientific method (especially statistical interpretation of data), rhetoric: philosophy, and advanced composition. It was suggested that if a department wishes to propose a course satisfying the CT requirement it could, following an agreed-upon standard of CT, define what it means to think critically in that particular discipline.

Ideally, however, the GER will adopt a mixture of (a) courses that have CT as one among other goals—call these "CT Enhancement Courses"—and (b) courses that aim to develop CT skills in a more systematic fashion—call these "CT Fundamentals Courses."

In sum: CT consists of evaluative (and not problem-solving) skills that are systematically taught by some courses, developed by others, and assumed by the rest. Its distribution in the GER should follow a mixed model of courses that are fundamental to, and those courses that enhance, CT skills.

cc: With thanks to Drs. Dennis Henneman and Bruce Waller.

¹ In this regard, CT is the oldest extant requirement of a liberal arts education, dating at least as far back as the 6th century CE. In the medieval classification of knowledge, the *trivium* (logic, rhetoric, and grammar) defined the "fundamentals" of a liberal arts education, followed by the higher or subsequent curricular requirements, or the *quadrivium*, of arithmetic, music, geometry, and astronomy. Together the *trivium et quadrivium* (or the 7 courses of study) constituted the entire liberal arts curriculum. History and psychology are, of course, relatively new fields of inquiry. But they are, obviously, far from trivial.

² It was suggested that a course on listening would be appropriate in the GER. Survey data strongly suggests that GPA increases 1.5 points in students who complete such a course. Data is from Nichols, Un. of Minnesota.

7 1

TO: GER TASK FORCE
FROM: BILL JENKINS
DATE: 4-18-96
SUBJECT: MEETING ON 4-25-96 IN A&S CONFERENCE ROOM 2-4PM

- AGENDA: 1) Reports from subcommittees.
✓ 2) Discussion of Faculty Forum and Senate hearings
3) Setting up committees for next year
Structure for reviewing course proposals
Assessment

UNABLE TO ATTEND
C. Sykes

TO: GER TASK FORCE
FROM: BILL JENKINS
DATE: 4-30-96
SUBJECT: UPCOMING MEETINGS

We had agreed to meet every Thursday this quarter starting April 25th. I am cancelling the meeting for this week, but intend to meet throughout the rest of May and the first week of June from 2 to 4 pm. All meetings will take place in Kilcawley Center.

May 9th -- Bresnahan I and II
May 16th -- 2068
May 23rd -- Bresnahan III
May 30th -- 2068
June 6th -- Bresnahan III

In order to avoid sending out an agenda each week, I am listing the following topics as agenda items:

- √1) Reports from subcommittees (critical thinking is next)
- 2) Discussion of feedback from hearings. Also see memo from Christine Kate of Human Ecology
- 3) Set guidelines for courses that will meet GER standards
- 4) Setup of committees and workshops to assist in curriculum revision
- 5) Structure for approval of GER courses -- should it be part of or separate from Senate system?
- 6) Assessment -- see material forthcoming from North Central Association conference in Chicago. Possible workshop with Assessment Committee in June.



GER TASK FORCE MINUTES

Date: May 16, 1996

PRESENT: Driscoll, **Funk**, Jenkins, Maraffa, **McMahon**, Monseau, **Mullins**, **O'Neill**, Singler.

ABSENT: **Ricoci**, Elias, Hoover, **Jennings**, Palmer, Walker, White.

Secretary: Anne Mc **Mahon**

Bill Jenkins called the meeting to order at **2:05** p.m. in room 2068 Kilcawley. Jenkins asked that we begin setting guidelines by discussing the idea of a capstone course. The committee discussed having a capstone course that integrated GER goals. It would be a senior level requirement that may be filled with a course offered within the discipline for majors. Disciplines would be invited to submit proposals on their capstone courses that indicate which goals can be met by those courses. Proposals should identify what goals the course specifically addresses and how each goal is related to the activities and content of the course. The proposal should articulate how communication, information gathering and analysis, and critical thinking are included. A significant writing component might be required as part of the communication goal. Each course would address goal areas 1, 2, and 3 as well as at least one other goal that has particular relevance to the discipline. Such courses would count for GER credit as well as for departmental requirements. Some GER courses might be developed for students whose majors do not provide a capstone experience.

The committee then turned to the idea of a freshman orientation course. Areas that might be covered included the following: using the library, introduction to computers and word processing skills, self-assessment and educational planning (including English and math assessment), reading and study skills, basic math and stats, diversity, and orientation to GER. The Task Force will continue discussing the freshman orientation course at the next meeting.

Future meetings and agenda:

Jenkins indicated that the next topic is the one Singler suggested. We will begin developing guidelines for the basic skills development courses for the freshman year and consider the issue of whether they should be interdisciplinary. After that, we will address the other goals.

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

GER TASK FORCE MINUTES

Date: May 23, 1996

PRESENT: Driscoll, Jenkins, **McMahon**, Monseau, **Mullins**, O'Neill, Singler.

ABSENT: Elias, **Funk**, Hoover, **Jennings**, **Maraffa**, Palmer, **Riccoci**, Walker, White.

Secretary: Anne Mc **Mahon**

Bill Jenkins called the meeting to order at 2:35 p.m. in **Bresnahan III, Kilcawley**. Jenkins asked that we begin by continuing the discussion of the first year orientation course. **After** discussion, it was the consensus that there was a need for a computer module, probably dealing with word processing, and that some credit should be assigned to it. Students should be able to test out of that module in favor of some other GER option.

The committee also discussed the need for testing out of GER skills requirements in general and for giving credit for experience in some areas. Jenkins said we would need a special session just on that.

The committee discussed the need for a module on critical thinking skills. It was judged that there probably was a need for such a module and that the critical thinking sub-committee ought to advise us about what it might be.

The committee discussed the need for a module on introducing GER and on academic planning and assessment. It was agreed that the introduction to GER ought to be part of orientation and that GER needed to have a significant section at the first year orientation. There was no consensus on the need for planning and assessment skills.

The committee discussed the need for a writing module. Virginia and her team were asked to take this matter under advisement. There seemed to be agreement that some orientation to the library and to reading and study skills were necessary. However, we were not certain about how to group (or not group) these two areas and what their overlap might be with the writing module. Virginia Monseau and her group should advise us about the relevance of these two areas to the writing module.

The committee also discussed the issue of the timing of these modules; our discussion implies that they would be taken very early and serve as pre-requisites for the other GER courses. This matter was not settled.

The committee also discussed the issue of having models that deal with experience issues, especially in the goals areas relating to diversity, culture and the arts. One could require attendance at some number of events over the first year, for example. No consensus was reached as the time ran out.

Future meetings and agenda:

Jenkins indicated that the next topic for discussion is the other first year GER courses and their interdisciplinary character. **After** that, we will address the other goals.

Adjournment: Jenkins adjourned the meeting at 4:10 p.m.



GER TASK FORCE MINUTES

Date: May 23, 1996

PRESENT: Driscoll, Jenkins, McMahan, Monseau, Mullins, O'Neill, Singler.

ABSENT: Elias, Funk, Hoover, Jennings, Maraffa, Palmer, Riccoci, Walker, White.

Secretary: Anne Mc Mahon

Bill Jenkins called the meeting to order at 2:35 p.m. in Bresnahan III, Kilcawley. Jenkins asked that we begin by continuing the discussion of the first year orientation course. After discussion, it was the consensus that there was a need for a computer module, probably dealing with word processing, and that some credit should be assigned to it. Students should be able to test out of that module in favor of some other GER option.

The committee also discussed the need for testing out of GER skills requirements in general and for giving credit for experience in some areas. Jenkins said we would need a special session just on that.

The committee discussed the need for a module on critical thinking skills. It was judged that there probably was a need for such a module and that the critical thinking sub-committee ought to advise us about what it might be.

The committee discussed the need for a module on introducing GER and on academic planning and assessment. It was agreed that the introduction to GER ought to be part of orientation and that GER needed to have a significant section at the first year orientation. There was no consensus on the need for planning and assessment skills.

The committee discussed the need for a writing module. Virginia and her team were asked to take this matter under advisement. There seemed to be agreement that some orientation to the library and to reading and study skills were necessary. However, we were not certain about how to group (or not group) these two areas and what their overlap might be with the writing module. Virginia Monseau and her group should advise us about the relevance of these two areas to the writing module.

The committee also discussed the issue of the timing of these modules; our discussion implies that they would be taken very early and serve as pre-requisites for the other GER courses. This matter was not settled.

The committee also discussed the issue of having models that deal with experience issues, especially in the goals areas relating to diversity, culture and the arts. One could require attendance at some number of events over the first year, for example. No consensus was reached as the time ran out.

Future meetings and agenda:

Jenkins indicated that the next topic for discussion is the other first year GER courses and their interdisciplinary character. After that, we will address the other goals.

Adjournment: Jenkins adjourned the meeting at 4:10 p.m.



Youngstown State University / Youngstown, Ohio 44555-3071
The Warren P. Williamson, Jr. School of Business Administration

Department of Management

(216) 742-3071

FAX: (216) 742.1459

GER TASK FORCE MINUTES

Date: May 30, 1996

PRESENT: Elias, Funk, Jenkins, Maraffa, McMahan, O'Neill, Palmer, Singler, White.

ABSENT: Driscoll, Hoover, Jennings, Monseau, Mullins, Riccoci, Walker.

Secretary: Anne Mc Mahon

Bill Jenkins called the meeting to order at 2:15 p.m. in 2068 Kilcawley. Jenkins asked that we begin the discussion of the first year skills courses. It was thought that a writing course would be necessary. A course such as 551 might be redesigned for an interdisciplinary focus around a theme; it would not necessarily be departmentally based. It would involve information gathering, analysis, writing, and maybe speaking. It would use material **from** some discipline or **from** some interdisciplinary field. It was thought that such a change would assume some module in writing (**e.g. English 550**) as well as a reading and study **skills** module (or other support). Jenkins said he would talk to the Provost about the current situation **regarding** reading and study **skills**.

The committee then discussed what other skills might be the basis of a first year course. It was thought that mathematics might be. The group decided to get information from a committee about how to develop a response to the math goal for the freshman year. Levels of math achievement might be **different** by college and major, and thus the majors might set specific requirements for this goal.

After discussing the speech goal, the group agreed that this should not be the focus of a first year course. It seemed best to have this goal integrated into the second tier of courses. **O'Neill** said his committee could draft guidelines for courses that desired to include this goal for GER credit.

There was some discussion that the diversity goal needed to be addressed in the first year, but it was not clear what form the response should take.

Future meetings and agenda:

Jenkins indicated that he wanted to continue meeting during the summer; he expected that there would be some smaller groups and some sessions we all attend. He asked that everyone send him a schedule for the summer so he could organize our meetings..

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

TO: GER TASK FORCE
FROM: BILL JENKINS
DATE: 6-5-96
SUBJECT: THURSDAY'S MEETING CANCELLED

Because it is exam week, and a number of people have contacted me about their inability to grade and still attend the meeting, I have decided to cancel it. For those of you unable to attend last **week's** session, I have proposed that we continue meeting throughout the summer. It is important that I receive, as soon as possible, your schedule for the first summer session. The meetings will consist of those who are available. We will, when possible, get a majority or more, and confirm the progress made to that point.



GER TASK FORCE MINUTES

Date: June 18, 1996
PRESENT: Jenkins, Maraffa, McMahon, Mullins, O'Neill, Palmer, Singler, Tingley.
ABSENT: Driscoll, Elias, Funk, Jennings, Walker, White.
Secretary: Anne McMahon

Bill Jenkins called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m. in 2056 Kilcawley. Jenkins began the session by circulating a memo from John Buoni and Bernadette Mullins regarding GER math requirements. The members read the memo and discussed it. It was felt that the memo might reflect the beginnings of subject matter that may be included in meeting the GER goal; however, it could not serve our current needs well in its present form. What we need now is outcomes information that might serve as criteria to define math literacy goals for GER. We are not yet ready for specific course proposals. Jenkins said he would talk with John and explain our needs to him. When John and his colleagues have recommendations about basic math literacy skills students should have as they go through GER, we will meet with them.

Jenkins reported that Virginia's group is still working on the writing area criteria and recommendations. He reported that English appears to be open to looking at 551 as an interdisciplinary GER course that would address the writing goals, critical thinking goals, and additional content goals. They are open to its being taught by other faculty, but point out that faculty would need to be trained. That will require a budget.

Gabriel's committee on critical thinking is also in progress on their task. He had no report today.

The committee turned to a discussion of courses in the second group--ones taken during the second and third year. The question raised was how much direction should the committee provide to the faculty for courses in this area. The committee wanted to give some direction but also wanted the faculty to have full range for innovative approaches. The following categories of directions were discussed: content categories, criteria for goals, number of goals to be met in each course, features of the course proposal that might be required. It was decided to continue this discussion at the next meeting.

Future meetings and agenda:

Jenkins indicated that he wanted to continue meeting every week during the summer. He set the meetings for every Monday, starting next Monday. Agenda items for future meetings will include the following: course proposal format; does our committee function as the curriculum committee; what would be the relationship between the GER committee and the university curriculum committee; what structures need to be put in place to administer the program; a review of the first year program as a whole; a discussion of the fourth year capstone course.

Adjournment: Jenkins adjourned the meeting at 4:55 p.m.



Youngstown State University / Youngstown, Ohio 44555-3071
The Warren I Williamson, Jr. College of Business Administration
Department of Management

GER TASK FORCE MINUTES

(330) 742-3071
FAX (330) 742-1459

Date: June 24, 1996
PRESENT: Driscoll, Elias, Funk, Jenkins, Jennings, McMahon, Mullins, O'Neill, Palmer, Singler, Tingley, White.
ABSENT: Maraffa, Walker.
Secretary: Anne McMahon

Bill Jenkins called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. in 2057 Kilcawley. Jenkins reported that he spoke with John Buoni. Buoni was comfortable with not attending the meeting; his main objective had been to communicate to the committee those courses which he felt should not be regarded as candidates for GER credit. Jenkins ask Buoni to develop a list of outcomes and criteria for GER math goals; his group will get back to us.

Jenkins reviewed the form of the model that has been emerging **from** our recent meetings. It includes a capstone course in the senior year, **hopefully** in the major. That course would include investigating, problem-solving, and writing. The first year experience would involve **English** 550 and a second course modeled after **English** 551 in that it would deal with information gathering, critical thinking and writing around some theme. However, the course would be open to a broader development and to faculty from other departments. The **English** department seems open to the modification of 551. There has also been discussion of an orientation course or set of units; there has been no consensus on that course. Finally, there will be some courses taken in the second and third years, many of which will be interdisciplinary and thematic. Jenkins asked us to deliberate on how to develop guidelines for faculty that will enable them to see what they need to do to develop a course for GER credit. The committee discussed the following topics:

- a. Outcomes and criteria for each goal
- b. The issue of balance across the goals, especially if courses involve multiple goals
- c. The need of a format for a proposal that will indicate what is at issue for a course to carry GER credit
- d. The structure that would need to be in place
- e. Whether the clusters of the courses should emerge from the submissions or be guided by the committee's clustering of the goals beforehand.

Charles **Singler** agreed to work with others on the committee to develop a suggested set of clusters of the goals that might be used to guide course development. He will bring them to the next meeting.

The committee also discussed whether we might issue criteria such as indicating that each course shall focus on one or two of the first four goals and one or two of **goals** 5 through 13. There was consensus that the courses should deal with multiple goals, but not a large number of them. There was also concern that, without guidance, courses would select one goal

from 5 through 13 and one or two of the first four goals. This would require too many units to cover **all** the goals. The committee decided to continue this discussion after hearing **from** Singler's committee next week.

The committee decided to review John **Hinni's** suggestions for a procedure to follow as a starting place for our discussion of some of the structural issues that need to be discussed. Jenkins agreed to send everyone a new copy of that document for the next meeting. Elias also agreed to **send** everyone copies of the University's syllabus format by next week.

The next meeting is Monday, July 1, 1996

Adjournment: Jenkins adjourned the meeting at 4:40 p.m.

GER TASK FORCE MINUTES

Date: July 1, 1996

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

ABSENT: Elias, Funk, Hoover, McMahon, Riccoci, White.

Secretary: Paul Mullins

A subcommittee on clusters or themes consisting of Mullins, Singler and White (absent) presented two possible models for grouping goals. Two sample models were distributed: "GER 7/1/96 Clusters," prepared by Singler and "Tight Thematic Model," prepared by Mullins. It was noted that the two models were not offered as proposals, but rather intended to foster discussion by presenting two significantly different possibilities. Key points raised about the two include that "GER Clusters" did not include YSU goals 1, 2 or 3 as these have been generally viewed as having been taught across the curriculum. The "Thematic Model" is a close representation of the Virginia Tech system. References to the number of courses within an area were not removed, although this was not intended to propose that those hours or distribution be used at YSU. References to required lab courses were also not intended to reflect committee opinion or a proposal of the subcommittee.

Points raised in the discussion of cluster or thematic models included the overlap of various goals, whether a course in a cluster must address all goals in that cluster (minimum and maximum goals), whether a student may miss fulfilling a goal using the cluster system, how a cluster system can be used to require a student to study in a particular area, and whether clusters might provide inherent bias.

The consensus of the group was that we should create clusters with the following questions to be addressed: who is competent to teach what, are labs required, what does it take to satisfy a goal within a cluster, what is the minimum number of goals a student must satisfy before graduation?

There was discussion of the number of gen ed hours available under the current system. The catalog indicates 60 quarter hours, but it was noted that some of these hours are used within the major or as specified courses outside the major. The committee is to consult with colleges to determine the number of gen hours we can work with based on the current system.

After discussing possible implementations for freshman experience, Writing One and Two, and the capstone it was generally agreed that we may have 12 courses available to accomplish goals in the students' second and third years.

The issue of who can teach for the writing goal (or mathematics goal, etc) was discussed at length. This issue involved faculty capabilities and competencies and whether any Department could stop another from offering a course for a particular goal. In keeping with the general theme that goals are not "owned" by any Department, it was decided that any Department could design and submit a course for review intended to accomplish any goal. Such a course would have to complete the normal process of course approval in addition to demonstrating how it accomplished the targeted goal(s) for a general education review panel.

GER Task Force Minutes

Date: July 8, 1996

Present: Jennings, Jenkins, Mullins, Walker, White, Singler,
Driscoll, Palmer

Absent: Elias, Funk, McMahon, O'Neill, Tingley, Maraffa

Secretary: Nancy White

Bill Jenkins called the meeting to order at 3:07. There was some discussion directed to clarifying the previous week's activities regarding ownership of courses (or goals); e.g. "Writing I" can be offered by many different departments, if course description satisfies criteria. Bill and Paul are to develop specific language to clarify our understanding of this issue. It was pointed out that we need to be in agreement and have a clear understanding of this issue.

Discussion of the Tight Thematic Model and the Clusters Model, regarding development of second and third year courses. Should we provide some kind of organization (clusters, themes) for faculty ahead of time for developing new/revised courses? Some side issues immediately were raised: Can students graduate without satisfying two or three goals? Unclear. How do we monitor? What about students who transfer in? We need to set up a structure that gets you in the ballpark and don't worry about the little details (Wade). Stay away from a "point" system, be flexible (Charles). We can't violate our transfer agreements with other schools. Paul: let's make a statement, we recognize that transfer students may not meet all goal. Charles: premature, let's look at this later. Discussion ensued, we agreed that the actual mechanism for handling transfer students will be developed later. Clara: we're developing a template to send to people who write courses? Yes; need to look at the number of prerequisites to complete GER courses. Bill: lot's of problems like that, will address later, can't do all questions simultaneously, only way we can get through is piecemeal, question by question approach.

Discussion of models returned to . Gabriel expressed concern with both models as having the effect of excluding a number of departments from producing courses with the (apparent) lab requirement. Charles clarified that not every course in section IV of V must have a lab, have to discuss labs at some point later. We did agree that students should take some kind of lab, but may take other courses (without labs) as well to satisfy the Scientific Reasoning and Discovery cluster (should it be adopted). We did agree that we want to provide some kind of cluster system. Whether they should be specific guidelines of illustrative examples was then discussed, with most appearing to favor the strict guideline approach. Discussion followed about precise make-up of the clusters, e.g., under IV, do all four goals have to appear in each course? No: encourage to do so, but not a requirement. Also need discussion about how to take courses, e.g. one or two from each category? Discussion moved to how to identify which goals are met by which courses in the catalog. The following statement

emerged for the record GER will tell faculty to design courses to meet the goals rather than establishing clusters as guidelines. We will however, provide clusters as examples of what could be done. The committee may, after courses are submitted, construct clusters. Bill stated that this is an agreement of this group, subject to continued discussion next week, and some homework.

Meeting adjourned at 4:30

Discussion centered around indexing of flagging courses to specific goals, so that students have a mechanism to keep track of goals met.

TO: GER TASK FORCE
FROM: BILL JENKINS
DATE: 7-11-96
SUBJECT: MONDAY'S MEETING

The members of the writing subcommittee will be coming to our meeting on Monday with some suggestions about writing across the curriculum and some questions about English 550 and 551. I have made them aware of our recent discussion regarding English 550. They have some concerns which they want to convey to us. For this meeting I would like to have us act as a listening body, which poses questions for purposes of clarification and understanding, rather than expressing individual opinions which might not reflect the consensus of the committee. Our discussion should come afterward. If you disagree with this approach, please let me know.



GER TASK FORCE MINUTES

Date: July 15, 1996

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

ABSENT: Funk, Jennings, Tingley.

Secretary: Anne McMahon

Bill Jenkins called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m. in 2057 Kilcawley. Jenkins introduced the members of the task force to the members of the writing sub-committee whose report is the agenda of the meeting. The sub-committee consisted of Bob Hogue, Julie Gergits, Charles Stevens, Virginia Monseau, and Tom Maraffa. The report under discussion was circulated at the meeting. Jenkins reminded the Task Force that we were to function as a listening body, asking questions for clarification and understanding of the recommendations. Discussion of the report by the task force will occur at the next meeting. The discussion focused on two areas of the report: a) the writing across the curriculum recommendation, b) the design and administration of Comp I and II. The task force took a few minutes to read the report.

Comp II was described as a "learning to write" course that would also be computer intensive. It will stress argumentative writing and research papers. It might involve joint teaching with English faculty at least once by faculty from other departments who would then staff sections of the course independently. It would also require some training, such as writing workshops. It was suggested that Comp I would be revised to prepare students for computer skills and writing emphases needed in Comp II. Comp I and II are modifications of the current English 550 and 551. It was argued that the courses should be designed and administered by the English department, although they might be taught by other faculty. Both courses were recommended by the sub-committee since one quarter is insufficient time. A number of additional specific issues were raised, including the following: use of graduate students and limited service faculty to **staff the** courses; "learning to write" vs. "writing to learn;" number of sections of 550 and 551 currently offered and the percent that are staffed by full-service English faculty; the testing practices used to determine student placements; the current administration of the first year writing program; the degree to which both courses would have a standard design and common syllabus; practices on other campuses.

The discussion of the recommendations regarding a writing across the curriculum program focused on: the role of the major in the Junior and Senior years; the importance of treating it as a unitary program administratively and for assessment; the administration of the program by GER, the relationship of the first year writing sequence to the writing across the curriculum program; its non-remedial nature; the significance of an integrated, forward direction that includes specialized writing in the major.

The sub-committee placed particular emphasis on the importance of having two "learning to write" courses (as distinct from who teaches them), on the importance of having the English

Department administer the first year **comp** sequence since they already have a process for doing that and since they have expertise in the area, and on the importance of a writing across the curriculum program over the four years and that includes the major.

Jenkins thanked the sub-committee for their time and guidance. Jan Elias circulated the outline of a course syllabus format adopted for the University.

Jenkins reminded the members of the task force that if their sub-committees require specialized reading, we can purchase what is needed. Palmer reminded us that he had circulated four copies of the Bruce **Waller** book on critical thinking to the members months ago and he has yet to get them back. After a number of members indicated that they have not received it yet, Jenkins said he would phone people and try to locate the books and get them back in circulation.

The next meeting is To Be Announced. A new meeting time is necessary **due** to the start of the second summer session. The agenda will be to discuss the recommendations of the writing sub-committee **further**.

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



GER TASK FORCE MINUTES

Date: July 23, 1996
PRESENT: Elias, Funk, Jenkins, Jennings, Maraffa, McMahon, Mullins, White.
ABSENT: Driscoll, O'Neill, Palmer, Singler, Tingley, Walker.
Secretary: Anne McMahon

Bill Jenkins called the meeting to order at 8:10 a.m. in 2057 Kilcawley. Jenkins asked the group to review the list of GER decisions he had circulated before the meeting. He had reviewed the minutes to collect a set of issues that appeared to have been decided. He asked the committee to review each.

1. *There will be a senior capstone course or courses, preferably in the major. The course should address goals one, two, and three.*

The members agreed that these sentences express the decision of the task force. In related **discussion** it was suggested that the forms used to submit a capstone course/courses for GER credit should ask what other goals the course addresses.

2. *The first year should include a learning to write course (similar to English 550) and a course that combines communication, wordprocessing, information gathering, critical thinking, and analysis organized around an interdisciplinary theme (similar to English 551).*

The members agreed that point #2 is a consensual decision. The group agreed, further, that the point needs to be developed for details of the first of the two courses, for administration issues, and for matters relating to departmental control of the courses.

3. The third point that Jenkins raised in his list did not yet reflect a group consensus. The point addressed what guidelines apply to how other GER courses are related to the goals.

4. *Where a major has a requirement for developing its students' speaking skills, that requirement shall meet the GER goal. Students whose programs do not have such requirements shall take a speaking intensive GER course. _____, if approved by a GER review committee.*

The task force agreed that point #4 reflects committee consensus.

5. *No GER course will be the exclusive prerogative of any department. Any faculty member or members, department or group of departments may submit course proposals.*

The committee agreed that point #5 reflects a decision made by the task force.

The task force then discussed administrative issues associated with the first year composition courses. The discussion follows up on issues raised by the report of the writing sub-committee at our last meeting. It was felt that it would be necessary to have a sub-committee to determine criteria for courses that would be approved as part of that first year sequence and that sequence will need competent administration in terms of scheduling and the like. It was suggested that the people in the English department have administrative tools for doing that. It was felt, however, that the subcommittee needed to have faculty from other

departments as well. The sub-committee would recommend to the larger GER structure.

Jenkins was also urged to inform the administration that there will be a necessity for the GER program to have a director, **committees**, and perhaps some additional **staff**. Jenkins needs to communicate the costs related to where we are going. If the current University financial situation precludes appropriate costs, we need to know that.

Jenkins indicated that he had spoken with the Chair of English regarding the grant proposal for English 551 to NEH. The grant would be for technology to support the computerization goals of the course. The task force encouraged Jenkins to communicate its support for the grant proposal and for the project.

Jenkins announced that the 1996 meetings of the Association for General and Liberal Studies will be at Daytona Beach on October 24, 25, 26. Members who want to attend that conference should let Jenkins know.

The next meeting: Tuesday, July 30.

Adjournment: Jenkins adjourned the meeting at 10:00 a..m.



GER TASK FORCE MINUTES

Date: July 30, 1996
PRESENT: Driscoll, Elias, Funk, Jenkins, Jennings, McMahon, Mullins, Singler, Tingley.
ABSENT: Maraffa, O'Neill, Palmer, Walker, White.
Secretary: Anne McMahon

Bill Jenkins called the meeting to order at 8:10 a.m. in 2057 Kilcawley. Members of the committee, after reflecting upon the minutes of the previous meeting, raised a concern that the statement about the speech requirement appears to grandfather in existing courses. This appearance opens the door to other courses that might be argued to meet other goals. Since this was not the intent of the committee, it was agreed to reword that statement as follows:

*Students may **satisfy** the speech **goal** by choosing a GER designated **course(s)** that meet that **goal**. Where a major has a required **course(s)** that develop its students' speaking skills, that requirement, subject to review by the GER committee, shall meet the GER goal.*

The committee also reconsidered the wording of the 5th point in the minutes of the last meeting. It was agreed to revise that statement to:

*Any faculty **member(s)**, department, or group of departments may submit course proposals that address any of the GER goals. A GER committee will periodically review and assess courses for GER credit.*

The task force then discussed whether the GER courses would be allocated to years (e.g. 1st year, 2nd year, etc.) or whether they would be defined in some other way. The committee also discussed what other guidelines should apply to these courses. After discussing the logistical issues, it was agreed that :

*Other GER courses will be divided into lower and upper division levels. Upper division admission will depend on completion of the course similar to English 551. **These** courses must address at least three of the GER goals and include both **skill** development and comprehension.*

In addition to defining the number of goals to be addressed and the importance of both skill and content objectives, the committee discussed whether these courses need to be interdisciplinary.

The committee agreed on the following statement:

*The GER Committee will encourage the development of interdisciplinary courses, i.e. courses that include content and skills that reflect multiple disciplines and **staffed** by faculty **from different** departments.* The committee discussed that there may need to be carrots for this.

Jenkins noted that it was time to close the meeting and suggested that we continue with this area next time. What other general guidelines do we need to provide for the development of course proposals?

Future Agenda: Jenkins reviewed his strategy for our activity and invited comments. He sees us getting through this basic discussion so that, in the Fall, it can be sent to department chairs. In addition, workshops may need to be held for sub-committees working on specific guidelines for the individual goals.

The next meeting: Friday, August **16, 1996** at **10:00** a.m until noon. Cardinal Room, Kilcawley.

Adjournment: Jenkins adjourned the meeting at **10:00** a.m.

TO: GER Task Force
FROM: Bill Jenkins
DATE: July 31, 1996

The GER Task Force will meet:

Friday, August 16 - 10:00 a.m. - 12:00 Noon in Cardinal Room, Kilcawley

GER Decisions (for now) 7/31

1. There will be a senior capstone course or courses, preferably in the major. The course should address goals one, two, and three.
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. Students may satisfy the speech goal by choosing a GER designated **course(s)** that meet that goal. Where a major has a required **course(s)** that develop its students' speaking skills, that requirement, subject to review by the GER committee, shall meet the GER goal.
4. Any faculty **member(s)**, department, or group of departments may submit course proposals that address any of the GER goals. A GER committee will periodically review and assess courses for GER credit.
5. Other GER courses will be divided into lower and upper division levels. Upper division admission will depend on completion of the course similar to English **551**. These courses must address at least three of the GER goals and include both skill development and comprehension.

TO: GER TASK FORCE

FROM: BILL JENKINS

DATE: AUGUST 30, 1996

SUBJECT: MEETING ON WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 18TH, 2:30 TO 5 PM IN
CARDINAL ROOM, KILCAWLEY CENTER

- AGENDA:
- 1) A review of policies agreed to at summer meetings. Please confer with minutes to see what statements were actually agreed to. Dan O'Neill wants to discuss the policy on speaking in particular.
 - 2) Report on meeting with President and Provost about administrative structure for GER, and costs of WAC program.
 - 3) Freshmen orientation course?
 - 4) Meeting dates for the fall -- I would like to meet each week from 2-4 on Friday.
 - 5) Discussion of work to be accomplished this year.

Jim Scanlon has asked me for three dates on which he might host a dinner for the Task Force at his home as recognition for the work accomplished this past summer. I have proposed Wednesday, September 18, Monday the 23rd or Tuesday the 24th. Please let me know if any of these evening dates are a problem for you.

The Association for General and Liberal Studies Convention is in Daytona, Florida, October 24-26 at Embry-Riddle University. Reservations must be made by September 14. Please contact me by September 10 if you intend to go.

GER DECISIONS

This is all I remember.

I. There will be a senior capstone course, **preferably** in the **major**. The student should engage in active research within the major and produce a written paper detailing the results of that research.)

II. The **freshman** year should consist of a learning to write course (similar to English **550**) and a course that combines communication, word processing, information gathering, critical thinking, and analysis organized around an interdisciplinary theme (base of English **551**).

III. The second and third year General Education courses should **satisfy 2** of the first three goals and at least 2 of goals 4 through **13**. Faculty may submit proposals, but must indicate which goals they intend to achieve. The GER Committee will relate the proposals to goals, rather than to themes or clusters, which may be given as examples, but not guidelines. The Committee may organize course proposals around thematic cluster. Although the Committee will encourage the development of interdisciplinary courses at this level, individual departments may submit discipline-centered courses.

IV. Speech should be included in the second and third year courses.)

V. No GER course will be the exclusive prerogative of any department. Any faculty member or members, department or group of departments may submit course proposals.

GER DECISIONS (FOR NOW) 7-31-97

1. There will be a senior capstone course or courses, preferably in the major. The course should address goals one, two, and three.
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. Students may satisfy the speech goal by choosing a GER designated **course(s) that** meet that goal. Where a major has a required **course(s)** that develop its students' speaking skills, that requirement, subject to review by the GER committee, shall meet the GER goal.
4. Any faculty **member(s)**, department, or group of departments may submit course proposals that address any of the GER goals. A GER committee will periodically review and assess courses for GER credit.
5. Other GER courses will be divided into lower and upper division levels. Upper division admission will depend on completion of the course similar to English 551. These courses must address at least three of the GER goals and include both skill development and comprehension.

sent
8/2/96

GER DECISIONS (FOR NOW) 7-31-97

1. There will be a senior capstone course or courses, preferably in the major. The course should address goals one, two, and three.
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. Students may satisfy the speech goal by choosing a GER designated **course(s) that** meet that goal. Where a major has a required **course(s)** that develop its students' speaking skills, that requirement, subject to review by the GER committee, shall meet the GER goal.
4. Any faculty **member(s)**, department, or group of departments may submit course proposals that address any of the GER goals. A GER committee will periodically review **and** assess courses for GER credit.
5. Other GER courses will be divided into lower and upper division levels. Upper division admission will depend on completion of the course similar to English 551. These courses must address at least three of the GER goals and include both skill development and comprehension.

GER TASK FORCE MINUTES

Date: September 18, 1996
PRESENT: Driscoll, Elias, Funk, Jenkins, Jennings, Maraffa, O'Neill, Palmer, Singler, Tingley, Walker, White.
ABSENT: Mullins
Secretary: Anne McMahon

Bill Jenkins called the meeting to order at 2:35 p.m. in the Cardinal Room, Kilcawley Center. He thanked all the members of the task force for participating throughout the summer months, above and beyond the call of duty. He further reminded everyone of the invitation to dinner next Tuesday at Provost Scanlon's home.

Reviewing the decisions developed during the summer:

Jenkins circulated a list of points that has been discussed and agreed upon during the summer. He asked that we review them again with a view to determining which ones were to be regarded as final decisions reflecting consensus of the task force. After discussing the first of the five items, the task force agreed upon the following:

Any faculty member(s), department, or group of departments may submit course proposals that address any of the GER goals. A GER committee will periodically review and assess course for GER credit. There will be specific criteria that the GER committee will use to assess course proposals for GER credit.

After discussion, the task force agreed to the following:

There will be a senior capstone course or courses, preferably in the major. The course should address goals one, two, and three, among others.

Jenkins asked that members informally check out this point with members of their college to see if it can be expected to generate opposition or problems for programs that we might not anticipate.

After discussion, the members agreed to the following:

The first year should include a learning to write course (similar to English 550) and a course that combines communications, wordprocessing, information gathering, critical thinking and analysis organized around an interdisciplinary theme (similar to English 551).

The task force agreed to this need, but also expressed consensus that we need to provide a description of what such a course might contain, of the training and credentials that might be required, of what common underpinnings will be provided and what follow-up reinforcement might be provided in other courses.

After discussing the item addressing the speech component of the communications goal,

the members decided to hold that item in abeyance until it has a report from the sub-committee. The final item dealt with the structure of the set of GER courses (e.g. distribution over the four years, sequencing of courses). The task force determined that this area required more development.

Jenkins asked that the various sub-committees on speech, writing, critical thinking, and math meet to provide us with guidelines for how to assign GER credit to proposed courses in those areas. In particular, he suggested that they begin the task by defining what should be in such a course. That is, the sub-committee should advise us about what skills/information each student should have in order to graduate. They might also focus on what common underpinnings are needed for future reinforcement by other courses and by the major. They might also address whether a common course is needed, what goals might be addressed, and how the area might be effectively infused across several courses. He asked for the reports from the sub-committees by October 1.

Report on the meeting with the President and Provost:

Jenkins reported on his meeting with the administration regarding the costs associated with administering a new GER system. He reported agreement that there needs to be an individual with separate authority administering the program and that the person would not be a Dean. Such a person would report to the Provost or a Dean. There was some discussion of "lean and mean" structures, meaning that every effort would be made to minimize administrative structure of the system. Jenkins indicated that as a result of the meeting, we should recommend what we believe is needed. The task force members urged Jenkins to communicate its advice to have the GER officer report to the Provost, not to any Dean.

Jenkins indicated that he also discussed the matter of the Writing Across the Curriculum Program as recommended by Virginia Monseau and her committee. Since her estimates were significantly different from the Provost's estimates, he suggested that Virginia meet directly with the Provost to iron out their differences.

Jenkins reported further that there is money from outside support for workshops and training needed for GER.

Report to the Senate:

Jenkins invited advice about what to take to the Senate and whether to call for action by the Senate. After discussion, it was decided to provide the agreed to items for Senate information and feedback. It was felt that more information was needed before the Senate can be asked to take action.

The next meeting: The meetings of the GER task force will be on Fridays from 2 to 4 in the afternoon. The dates of the next meetings are: Sept. 27, October 11, October 18, and every Friday of November except Friday of Thanksgiving weekend.

Adjournment: Jenkins adjourned the meeting at 4:30 p.m. Jenkins asked those members who will be attending the Daytona Conference to remain after the meeting for a discussion about the details of the trip.



GER TASK FORCE MINUTES

DATE: September 27, 1996

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

ABSENT: Driscoll, O'Neill, Singler.

Secretary: Anne McMahon

Bill Jenkins called the meeting to order at 2:05 p.m. in room 2069, Kilcawley Center. He circulated the minutes. After discussion, the minutes were accepted without amendment.

The members **affirmed** that all GER courses will address multiple goals but the details of that criterion need to be developed and clarified.

Palmer gave an interim update on the progress of the Critical Thinking Committee. The two criteria agreed to so far are **a)clarity** of thought and **b)assessability**. They will make a final report to the task force by October 15.

The English people are meeting as a subcommittee on the first year writing requirement courses. **Mullins** reported that the committee on computer skills is beginning an e-mail discussion.

Larry Hugenberg reported to the task force that his group will have a proposal related to the communication competencies that are important by October 1.

Jenkins reminded members of the committees that the first goal is to come up with some sense of outcomes desired. Jenkins also reported that the English Department wants to offer an experimental run of the 551 course. It is seeking to find faculty who would be willing to participate this Spring in the experiment. They will revise the syllabus for GER.

Continuing the review of decisions developed during the summer:

Jenkins asked us to revisit the remaining points on the list circulated at the last meeting. We agreed to delay a discussion of the point on communication until we have a committee report. The discussion turned to the point addressing the structure of the courses and their distribution over time. The following revision of that item emerged:

GER courses are distributed over all years of the student's program. There are entry level courses, some of which address foundational skills. There are intermediate courses for which the foundational courses are pre-requisites. There will be a senior capstone course or courses, preferably in the major; the course should address goals one, two, and three, among others.

The committee will delay listing the foundational skill goals until the committee reports are all submitted. It was also agreed that proposals for intermediate courses will have to **identify** how they are grounded in the foundational skills and how they develop or reinforce those skills.

The task force members then discussed the issues related to clustering courses either for the first year and foundational courses or for the **full** set of GER courses. It was decided to review the points raised at earlier meetings by **Mullins** and by **Singler** about possible ways to cluster courses. Jenkins said he would re-circulate those materials.

Jenkins then asked the members to review the matter of the Freshman Orientation Course and its relationship to what might be in other Freshman orientation experiences. What, if anything, should be in an orientation course that is properly a General Education Course. He listed some items we have discussed earlier: orientation to the University, Introduction to GER, **reading/study** skills, library skills. It was felt that it would be good to have **staff from** related programs on campus involved in this discussion. Jenkins asked each member to develop a list of what should be in an orientation course and send it to him for the next meeting.

The next meeting: The meeting of the GER task force will be on Friday, Oct. 11, **from 2 to 4** in the afternoon, room 110 of **DeBartolo, A&S** Conference Room. The dates of the next meetings are: Sept. 27, October 18, November 1, 8, **15, 22**, and December 6 and 13. All of these meetings are scheduled in rooms in Kilcawley.

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



Youngstown State University / Youngstown, Ohio 44555-3071
The Warren P. Williamson, Jr. College of Business Administration

Department of Management

GER TASK FORCE MINUTES

(330) 742-3071

FAX (330) 742-1459

DATE: October 11, 1996

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

ABSENT: **Jennings**, Tingley.

GUESTS: Fred Owens, **Larry** Hugenberg

Secretary: Anne **McMahon**

Bill Jenkins called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. in the Arts and Sciences Conference Room, Debartolo Hall. He circulated the minutes and suggested that members read them between now and the next meeting. He wanted to get to the subcommittee reports that were available.

The writing subcommittee:

Maraffa reported on the results of the subcommittee on writing. The committee has met and revised the earlier memo of July 14. The issues considered by the committee included the need for a consistent student outcome as a result of the first year experience, the need to develop a writing experience for the **freshman** year, and the need to reinforce that experience in the capstone course. They **affirmed** the need for a learning to write course (such as English 550) and a writing to learn course (such as 551). The latter course would address other goals, such as library skills and critical thinking. The committee also suggested at least two additional writing intensive courses, one of which should be in the major and the other of which ought to be outside the major. The committee also discussed what a writing intensive course ought to include. They also discussed the issues of oversight raised by the requirements, suggesting that there be a committee composed of GER members, English Department faculty, and faculty **from** other disciplines. **Maraffa** summarized the committee's formal report which will be circulated to the members of the task force as soon as it is complete.

The members of the **full** task force raised questions for the subcommittee, including whether or not the learning to write course would address only one goal and whether it would be taught by **English** Department faculty only, and minimal standards for sophomore and junior level writing intensive courses.

Report from the Communication Department regarding new course:

Larry Hugenberg and Fred Owens were attending the meeting to present the report on a new basic oral communication course that the department is developing and pretesting this year.

The recommendation of Larry's report was that this new course be required of **all** first year students, that it be taught by members of the Communication and Theater Department, and that all students take additional **course(s)** that reinforce the skills covered in the basic course. Larry answered questions about the design of the course and about the resource requirements of the report's recommendations.

Larry's report was referred to the subcommittee on this goal.

Report from the Mathematics faculty on meeting the math goal.

Jenkins had circulated the proposal from Bernadette **Mullins**, mathematics, regarding meeting the math goal. The members had already read the report, which recommends a course, Math 523, as the freshman level course. The course outline was developed in response to a survey of the faculty and a search of the literature on other such courses. The members of the task force discussed the course outline. They wondered specifically how it exceeds requirements for the high school **sufficiency** requirements.

General Discussion:

The task force discussed issues raised by the reports. Some members were concerned about the movement in the direction of a strong core for the freshman year. Additionally, there were concerns that we were not getting criteria for approving courses nor outcomes of such courses, but proposals for particular courses that were discipline specific. There was also concern that we are not involving faculty at large in our process of getting advice from subcommittees on goal areas. Jenkins pointed out that our initial step was to request expert suggestions from those on campus whose disciplines are most aligned with the goal areas.

It was agreed that we need to a) broaden the feedback we get to include guidelines for course development and outcomes, rather than course proposals; b) involve more faculty from other disciplines on the subcommittees for specific goal areas; and c) increase communication with the **full** campus about our progress. We need to take these steps to create participation, to give us better feedback, and to make sure that even those whose expertise is not central to a particular goal area are not excluded from the debate about what all college graduates should have in that goal area. Subcommittees shall also include discussion with **and/or** members who are not experts in that goal area. Course development proposals shall wait until after we receive feedback from the subcommittee activities.

The subcommittees that currently exist include ones to deal with: critical thinking, speech and oral communication, writing, computer technology. In addition, we have the beginnings of a subcommittee for the sciences and for quantitative outcomes.

The next meeting: The meetings of the GER task force will be on Fridays, from 2 to 4 in the afternoon, on October 18, November 1, 8, 15, 22, and December 6 and 13. All of these meetings are scheduled in rooms in **Kilcawley**.

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



Youngstown State University / One University Plaza / Youngstown, Ohio 44555-3317
Department of Geography
(330) 742-3317

GER TASK FORCE MINUTES

DATE: October 18, 1996

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

Recorder: Tom Maraffa

Meeting was called to order 2:00 p.m. at Room 2036 Kilcawley Center. Minutes of the meeting of October 11 were discussed. Dan O'Neill objected to the word "strong" preceding core in the first paragraph of General Discussion. The word was removed.

Freshman Enrollment

There was a brief discussion of freshman enrollment figures in relation to the number of students who would have to be served in required courses of the GER. Many students would likely take "freshman" courses over two or more years because of their part time status.

Writing Across the Curriculum

Bill Jenkins reported that Ginger Monseau had informally investigated costs of Writing Across the Curriculum Programs at various universities. Her conclusion was that a WAC program could be administered for a cost of \$25,000 to \$30,000.

Credentialling of Faculty

The rest of the meeting time was devoted to a lengthy discussion of credentialling of faculty for GER courses, particularly as it relates to process courses such as Writing, Speech and Critical Thinking. Bill Jenkins stated that the Task Force had previously agreed to the principle that any faculty member, group of faculty or department could propose a course for the GER. Proposed courses must meet GER goals and faculty must demonstrate qualifications to teach the course. The question was then put to the Task Force as to what constitutes "qualified."

Brainstorming produced a preliminary list of criteria which included **Ph.D.** in the discipline, teaching experience in the area of the course, training, approval by an advisory screening committee, extensive graduate course work in the area of the course, Masters Degree in the discipline of the course.

The brainstorming activity was followed by a discussion of the desirability of limited service faculty and graduate assistants teaching GER courses. The Task Force affirmed that the most desirable situation was for GER courses to be taught by **Full-Service Faculty**, but recognized that **funding** and staffing constraints may require courses to be taught by others.

Questions were raised in particular about the level of Full-Service commitment by the English department faculty to the current freshman composition sequence. Stephanie Tingley was directed to determine 1) How many sections of English 550 and 551 are taught by Full-Service English Department faculty, limited service faculty and **GA's** per academic year? 2) What proportion of the teaching load of English Department faculty is devoted to composition courses and 3) How many sections of Freshman Composition classes are taught by Full-Service English Department Faculty at comparable institutions? She agreed to report the above information to the Task Force.

The discussion returned to the issue of credentialing. The Task Force developed the following criteria for faculty qualifications.

1. **Ph.D.** in discipline in which the GER course is taught
2. Completion of NCA minimum graduate course standards in the discipline in which the course is taught plus training in pedagogy
3. Previous teaching experience in the area of the course, subject to the approval of a screening committee
4. Full-Service Faculty Status in discipline out of the area in which the course is taught plus training in pedagogy, subject to approval of the screening committee.

There was general agreement on Numbers 1,3 and 4. Some Task Force members expressed reservations about Number 2, preferring that the Masters Degree as the minimum educational qualification. This issue will be discussed at a **future** meeting.

Quote of the Meeting: "You gotta be able to fly the plane." D. O'Neill

Other Items

Several members of the Task Force will attend a GER conference October 24-26. The next Task Force meeting will be on November 1.

Meeting Adjourned 3:50 p.m.

TO: GER TASK FORCE
FROM: BILL JENKINS
DATE: 10-29-96
SUBJECT: GER MEETING ON FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 1996

- AGENDA
- ✓ 1) Welcome new committee member, Jim Pusch from Foundations of Education, who is replacing Randy Hoover.
 - ✓ 2) ^{ENG 551} Discussion of committee about identifying individual members as the source of a particular decision. See Palmer's letter.
 - ✓ 3) Credentialling - report on what was learned about it at AGLS conference. Discussion of North Central standards (see accompanying document from C. Jennings)
 - 4) Report on AGLS conference from attendees -- highlights only please.
 - ✓ 5) Discussion of appropriateness of having each committee member prepare **his/her** own GER plan as way to provide a sense of the total picture while debating the details.

faculty workshops
David Warner + Ohio Wesleyan

community service
Accreditation + transfer

Samuel, Paul + Dan, Clara

Tom, Darla + Rick

Stephane, Jim, Jan

meet with Writing Subcommittee

GER TASK FORCE
MINUTES
11/1/96

Present: D. Funk, B. Jenkins, C. Jennings, T. Maraffa, P. Mullins, D. O'Neil, G. Palmer-Fernandez, C. Singler, S. Tingley, R. Walker, N. White, J. Elias (recorder)

Writing pilot course

.A draft request for faculty from other disciplines to teach a pilot English 551 course in Spring '97 was reviewed. The committee had questions and suggestions. If there are specific selection criteria, that should be made clear. Perhaps there needs to be an application and a statement that the number of experimental sections is limited so not all that express an interest will be selected. Applying faculty need support of their department chairs - can they be released to do this?

Group process

.The group discussed the importance of free discussion within a community of mutual respect. Members need to feel free to speak without concern that they will be individually blamed for decisions that are unpopular. The University community will have an appropriate opportunity to comment on proposals and influence the results.

Credentials of sen ed faculty

Graduate teaching assistants: guidelines from the North Central Accreditation Handbook were discussed.

J. Elias will seek clarification from North Central regarding the statement that gen ed faculty should hold graduate degrees. How does that apply to teaching assistants in master's programs? Also she will get data from Institutional Research and/or departments about the proportions of gen ed courses taught by full-service faculty, limited-service, graduate students.

P. Mullins reported that Pitt uses master's students in lower division courses. N. White will check with Portland State. B. Jenkins will check at Ball State. Stephanie Tingley will check the literature on graduate students and teaching effectiveness.

Other faculty: impressions from AGLS sessions were that gen ed committees do consider faculty credentials in the course approval procedure and in reapproval.

Important points: course proposal forms already ask who is going to teach the course; we want to do what is best for students, not just meet minimum requirements

Next steps

The group agreed to try another strategy in developing the model. Individuals or small self-selected teams will create a complete model of the general ed program. There will be no meeting next week so teams can work. The proposals are due to Bill on the 12th. He will duplicate and distribute. On Friday the 15th we will begin discussing the positive attributes of these models with a view toward eventually merging them into a manageable number. A few could then be sent out to the campus community for critique. This feedback could be used in developing the final version.

Teams should keep in mind the following guidelines that we have tentatively agreed to:

60 q.h. limit

incorporate all 13 goals

capstone course - probably in the major

freshmen experience

Writing I

Writing II - probably multiple goals (e.g. computer use) and may involve faculty outside of English

lower division and upper division

must be some gen ed without prerequisites

writing across the curriculum w/ writing intensive courses both in gen ed and the major

AGLS Conference

Attended by B. Jenkins, D. Funk, S. Tingley, R. Walker, D. O'Neil, J. Elias. They reported on items relevant to the work of the committee. Printed reports will be distributed. Members of the committee should start thinking about what YSU could present next year.



GER TASK FORCE MINUTES

DATE: November 15, 1996

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

ABSENT: Driscoll, **Jennings**, **Maraffa**, **Mullins**, Palmer, **Singler**, White.

Secretary: Anne **McMahon**

III Jenkins **called** the meeting to order at 2:05 p.m. in room 2069, Kilcawley Center.

Two sub-groups of the task force brought their suggested models to the meeting. At least two others are in process but were not ready for this meeting. The members present read the two suggested models that were submitted and discussed them briefly. In particular, the committee discussed the suggestion that there be a capstone course required for GER outside the major, or some other capstone experience at the end of the four years. The members also discussed the similarities between the two models. It was felt that extensive discussion should await the **full** set of suggestions.

Jenkins reminded us of the **A&S** College's GER hours required for a degree:

8 hours composition

6 hours health and PE

16 hours Science & Math

16 hours Humanities

20 hours Social Studies.

This is higher than the **minimum** required in our various colleges, which is 48 hours.

The task force members suggested that we begin the next meeting by discussing the similarities among the models and base our alternative models on their differences. The goal is to present more than one model for feedback to the larger campus community. The members asked Jenkins to get the models before the meeting and send them out ahead of time. Jenkins set a due date of Wednesday.

The next meeting: The next meeting of the GER task force will be on Friday, Nov. 22, from 2 to 4 in the **afternoon** in Kilcawley.

Adjournment: Jenkins adjourned the meeting at 3:15 p.m.



GER TASK FORCE MINUTES

DATE: November 22, 1996

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

ABSENT: Funk, Mullins, Palmer..

Secretary: Anne McMahon

Bill Jenkins called the meeting to order at 2:05 p.m. in room 2069, Kilcawley Center. There was one clarification of the minutes for the November 15 meeting; Elias pointed out that the total number of 48 hours excluded the hours assigned to PE and Composition credits. Jenkins reported that the GER requirements by college were more variable than reported at the last meeting.

Jenkins circulated subcommittee proposals for discussion. The committee discussed what the goal of our deliberations were to be today. The aim was to **identify** things in common across the proposals about which we seem to have agreement. Additionally, we are to use the **differences** as bases for alternative models. It was agreed that we ought to aim for as few number of alternatives as **possible**. It was **further** agreed that we were in a voting mode, not a consensus mode during these deliberations. We hope to have 2, or maybe 3, specific models for our GER program; we will share the models with the faculty and other interested parties.

It was agreed that the alternatives seemed to have the following things in common:

- Foundation Courses including writing I and II and a quantitative skills course;
- Clusters that are grouped by goals;
- A capstone course in the senior year;
- A writing across the curriculum **sequence** that consisting of the two foundation writing courses, two additional courses and a writing intensive capstone course.

The proposed models differed with regard to a **freshman** orientation course, speech, and how to structure the clusters. It was agreed that we should use goals 6 through 13 to come up with clusters for the next meeting. Jenkins reminded us that we also need to deal with some administrative issues. He said that we have agreed that the program shall have a coordinator and an advisory committee who reviews the course proposals. We have not defined the course proposal format or process.

Jenkins announced that Cecilia Lopez **from** NCAA will be on campus to meet with many groups on December 12. There will be a meeting with the GER between 1:30 and 2:30 and there

will be a session on assessment between **10:30** and **11:30** in the morning.

Jenkins hopes to meet on Friday of Final's Week (December **13**) for an extensive meeting. The final decision about when our extensive meeting will occur will be settled at the December 6th meeting. Jenkins also announced that the North Central Accreditation Team will meet in the Provost's office about GER issues on Monday, December 2, at **4:00** p.m.

The next meeting: The next meeting of the GER task force will be on Friday, **Dec 6. from 2 to 4** in the afternoon in **Kilcawley**.

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

TO: GER Task Force
FROM: Bill Jenkins
DATE: November 25, 1996

The next meeting of the GER Task Force will be on Friday, December 6, from 2:00 - 4:00 p.m. in Room 2069, Kilcawley Center.

Agenda: Discussion of specific models.

- a) cluster courses**
- b) speech - Hugenberg proposal**
- c) freshmen orientation**



GER TASK FORCE MINUTES

Youngstown State University / Youngstown, Ohio 44555-0001

DATE: December 5, 1996

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

ABSENT: **Driscoll**, **Jennings**, **Mullins**, Palmer, Tingley, White, Kengor, Martin.

Secretary: Anne McMahon

II. Jenkins called the meeting to order at 2:55 p.m. in room 2057, Kilcawley Center. The minutes of the November 22 meeting were accepted as submitted. Jenkins circulated a subcommittee report **from** Elias, McMahon, Pusch, Tingley & White. He also circulated copies brought by Elias of GER clusters at James Madison University; Elias has coded our goals onto the list. In the absence of a quorum, the members discussed the subcommittee report for information and clarification only. In particular, there was discussion about the number of units that might be **left** as electives for students, the groupings under the science category, several points of clarification, and the implications of the proposal for class size.

Jenkins reminded us that we still need to discuss the issue of speech goals and the orientation seminar. The group discussed the merits of delaying those two issues by treating them as alternatives about which we seek faculty input. We should strive to complete our analysis of items about which we have consensus, and list these two items as "not yet decided" alternatives to the larger university community.

Jenkins expressed concern over the absence of our student members. He offered to discuss with the provost the possibility of supplementing our student participation by inviting students in addition to the ones appointed by student government. Members present supported that suggestion.

The next meeting: The next meeting of the GER task force will be on Thursday, December 12 at 1:30 with Ms. Lopez of the NCAA team, Room 2057 Kilcawley. **We will continue with our meeting in the same room immediately after our discussion with Ms. Lopez.**

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



Youngstown State University / Youngstown, Ohio 44555-0001

GER TASK FORCE MINUTES

DATE: December 12, 1996

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

ABSENT: Driscoll, Mullins, Kengor, Martin.

GUESTS: Cecilia Lopez from NCA; Bege Bowers, editor of YSU's NCA Report

Secretary: Anne McMahon

Bill Jenkins called the *meeting* to order at 1:30 p.m. in room 2057, Kilcawley Center. Jan Elias introduced Cecilia Lopez to the GER Task Force members. Lopez was present as part of a visit to campus by a team from NCA for our accreditation. She entertained questions from task force members about how general education requirements fit into accreditation by NCA and about relevant accreditation guidelines. The job of the task force is to identify the learning outcomes, to set up a model that delivers those outcomes, and to assess how well the system delivers the outcomes. Lopez indicated that in addition to goals, we need a philosophy statement that is published to students and to others so that everyone understands what general education means on this campus. We also need to articulate how the curriculum reflects the goals and philosophy. Discussion focused on the following criteria: integration of general education throughout the curriculum; appropriate credentials for faculty teaching in the general education program, faculty ownership of the curriculum, integration and coherence across the majors, and effectiveness in terms of the learning outcomes goals. Lopez left at 2:45 p.m. The GER Task Force continued to meet.

Jenkins announced that he hoped to meet during Winter quarter on Friday's from 2:00 to 4:00 p.m., beginning on January 10, 1997.

Maraffa handed out a chart he drew up summarizing points from the several sub-committees.

The committee dealing with the speech goal also reported. They want to invite dialogue with DACs on the speech course; they are investigating satisfying all the different requirements for different colleges in a single course. They will communicate to the DACs that this course is just one option that the GER task force is considering.

Jenkins identified other issues that are not settled: the critical thinking committee's report was discussed. The report suggests a minimal skills course followed by a second optional course. That was one option; however, the report does offer criteria that anybody could use to design a course that developed critical thinking skills. The issue of an orientation course was also raised as yet to be settled. We also need to finalize such issues as: professional development workshops, criteria for courses, procedures for proposing courses for GER credit, and what

needs to be in the model(s) sent to the Senate.

Jenkins updated the members on the writing across the curriculum program; the Provost has authorized a \$25,000 budget for such a program.

Jenkins reminded everyone that the Assn. Of Colleges and Universities will be meeting in Texas on February 20, 21, and 22. Interested members should let Jenkins know.

The next meeting: The next meeting of the GER task force will be on Friday, January 10, 1997.

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