

General Education Committee

McKenna Conference Room

October 4, 2010

1:30 pm

Present: Bob Drovda, Kathleen Braden, Cindy Price, Katie Kresser, Chris Henshaw, Andrew Ryder, Mike Hamilton, Elaine Scott

Agenda

- Opening prayer
- Recap by Cindy
- Go over agenda topics for the quarter
- Reporting to Senate on Thursday on behalf of the Committee

Split vote on the proposal in June 2010

- Humanities were the largest group of faculty who responded
- Ways of Engaging – people were most unsure
- We have a lot to work with; feedback received in June was helpful and showed where the model was not as accepted

Overall, it seems faculty like exposure to disciplines (without preferential treatment towards certain disciplines), and wish to reduce number of GE credits.

The President acknowledged that the proposal was not accepted, but will not accept the status quo.

Possible agenda topics for the quarter

1. How should we respond to faculty concerns (objections?) that were not aimed at the conceptual nature of the proposal itself?
 - a. Need to have a more complete model
 - b. Anticipated difficulties implementing model
 - c. Need for new model not persuasively argued
2. Given we are asked to present a revised proposal, what general parts of the proposal should be retained and what parts should we look to revise? Is there anything we missed in the 2009-10 proposal that should be included in the revised proposal?
3. How should the Common Curriculum be addressed in a revised proposal? A number of faculty stated that revision of the Exploratory Curriculum should not proceed without review of the Common Curriculum. We don't know if that was a primary factor in opposing the proposal or simply an expression of concern. The 2009-10 GESC did review the Common Curriculum and made recommendations to UPEC, but they were "internal" to the CC, not changes to the structure of the CC and therefore not included in the proposal placed before the faculty.
4. How can faculty voices beyond the committee be included in the revision process?
5. What needs to be done to present the revised proposal in the best light possible?

Proposed agenda topics for quarter: Questions, reflections, and gaps

- How will this happen?
- Flaw from last year: the vote. How will we deal?
- Split between CAS and professional schools
- UPEC give the green light?
- Listening to the major sources of opposition – develop a plan that is affirmed with enthusiasm
- Substance of plan; communication of plan to faculty
- Some believe the solution did not match the problem trying to be fixed
 - Be extremely clear with what we're trying to accomplish, and the rationale behind it
 - What and why we are trying to accomplish
- Semesters: commitment from administration that we will not change to semesters after spending time on a new GE proposal
- Solicit input along the way and have less specificity in the model phase

Framework of model

- What do we do if things don't work
- Recourse to make adjustments
- More of a phase-in process (automatic drop out point if it's not going well)

Initial vote (what we need to accomplish): tweak current model OR go with ways of knowing/engaging

Was the conceptual model accepted by faculty?

The Common Curriculum

Communicate clearly why it's a separate issue, or will UPEC say you cannot do one without the other?

- Be clear on what the objectives for CC are (where things overlap or do not overlap)

There were negative votes because people didn't know how to put the two together

- Support for CC was soft to CAS chairs
- They think the real problem is the CC (USEM, UCOR, etc)
- Do both or focus on CC as the problem
- Issues related to UCOR 1000 (structural, teaching issues, or...?)
 - Faculty will vote no if we don't address CC

We will dedicate a meeting session to point number three on agenda topics.

How can faculty voices beyond the committee be included in the revision process?

Announcement to Senate this Thursday

- Attend dept meetings this fall?
- Emphasize that we're listening and here is how...

Pose questions to departments to focus their thinking, ie: would you consider supporting changes to EC without looking at CC? Thoughts on the current distribution structure versus ways of knowing structure?

- Committee members act as a scribe at a department meeting to get their thoughts and ideas – just listen

- Don't offer leading questions – just let faculty talk and ask, “why?”
- Offer reminders (faculty survey, Faculty Retreat topic, etc)
- Here are issues that have arisen in evaluation (no leading questions)
- What do you think about it, and why?
- Affinity groups - Department Chairs can influence their faculty
- Attend to issues in CAS before professional schools

Tweaking current distribution model versus developing and implementing a new model

Create a list of five things we want to do with EC

Can what we want accomplished be done by tweaking the existing EC model?

- There is no rationale for the existing model
- Compare the two models side-by-side

If we stick with distribution model – we need to clarify:

1. Learning objectives
2. Goals
3. Identity
4. What else?

What do we want Gen Ed to do? What are we not doing and what is the best way to do this?

GE Website

- List issues
- Venue to post comments on issues
- List of what we want to accomplish
- Reminder of accreditation requirements (model is changing – new model requires rationale to be mission driven)

Meeting adjourned.

JKS