

GERTF Minutes 10-25-06

Members present:

Chair J. Ambrose, A. Dupont, J. Picart, J. Cohen, M. Carter, K. Esbenshade, D. Robison, S. Ash, J. Spurlin, J. Lavelle, M. Krotee. C. Zelna, L. Severin. A. Barnes, J. Hawkins- Morton, C. Freeman, M. McConnell

The chair welcomed members as the task force returns to the table for review of feedback from campus. Thank you to Dan Robison, Sarah Ash, and Jerome Lavelle for helping with presentations on campus. During the meeting, the mission statement objectives will be reviewed to decide if any modifications are needed – want to stay true to original objectives/outcomes as much as possible. Examine feedback and look at how to address concerns. If the committee decides, an optional GEP can be proposed.

Handouts:

Handout dated 10/20/06 with the Provost's feedback to the GEP was presented and includes the Provost's statement of confidence in the GER Task Force as the TF moves forward. Dr. Ambrose has assurance from the Provost that he will find resources to fund new items in proposal. Monies will remain in the college.

Handout was provided to members that tallied the responses from Colleges regarding the different aspects of the new GEP. There was no response from CED and COT.

Discussion:

Correction to handout - PAMS does not oppose diversity but does oppose free elective.

Feedback:

- ❑ Concern that the memo that proposed what the new GER will look like may not have been adequate – not sure if GERTF did the best job communicating to community. Perhaps did not do adequate job explaining the different parts of proposal. Let people have their say – still at public hearing stage in this. Not enough detail was provided to allow members to understand full scope.
- ❑ FYE Course is not very supported – campus is not ready- too much opposition across campus. Have to be very committed to make FYE course work.
- ❑ Opposition is skeptical because they don't trust the process and what was put forward was not intelligible to them.

- ❑ Concern about details when speaking to folks. Folks want more details. Opposition is being driven by concerns such as job security, teaching pattern changes, and implementation.
- ❑ Takes time and demonstration over time before consensus of approval on areas.
- ❑ We need to move forward. Students and campus are ready to reduce hours. Programs are looking at how they can adapt their programs and improve retention rates. Major push by GA and University. Areas that we are having issues with are those that were not unanimously supported by GERTF. Need to put timelines in place to move forward.
- ❑ Smaller GER still needs to have structure, coherence, assessability and transferability.
- ❑ PAMS is supportive of a diversity co-requisite.

Mission Statement discussion:

- ❑ Mission statement OK or need to be changed? One item of concern is the integrative disciplinary perspective. Folks did not agree on FYE as the area to address integrative disciplinary perspective – how do we integrate this approach? STS courses can do this.
- ❑ The philosophies and ideals of the Mission Statement are still good; objections are to the implementation.
- ❑ Mission statement, how do we be true to rationale – GEP was how to implement.
- ❑ In Mission Statement – disciplinary education was not developed. Mission Statement (MS) focus is on interdisciplinary. Nothing in MS about disciplinary The Chair proposed that Ken Esbenshade come up with a broad MS about discipline approach.
- ❑ Ken Esbenshade, Mike Carter and Allen Dupont will prepare disciplinary statement/paragraph for Mission Statement. (*see also Action Item*)

Feedback/Proposal Concerns discussion:

- ❑ Nov 16 - meeting with Deans Council scheduled- GERTF will meet with Associate Deans. Perhaps have GERTF meet a couple of times with the Deans Council.

- ❑ Provost pleased with October 1st deadline and is ready for period of feedback.
- ❑ Provost wants a proposal that is well thought out – no deadline at this point.
- ❑ Proposal has to go back out to campus to Colleges, CUE, UCCC, etc.
- ❑ For areas of the GEP that are most opposed – perhaps groups need more detail, more explanation. Areas we need to try again to communicate to groups and then if still meet opposition, we will know that area may not work out at this time.
- ❑ How do we show how disciplines come together in an interdisciplinary approach to FYE?
- ❑ Try to find approach that will finally be acceptable – compromise without losing objective.
- ❑ Proposal to look over GEP in pieces and feedback received– start with FYE.
- ❑ Our particular solution was met with opposition; rethink how we propose to incorporate these ideals within the freshman year.
- ❑ May need more interdisciplinary programs. There are already programs and places that are naturally interdisciplinary.
- ❑ Trying to encourage interdisciplinarity in our undergraduate education – graduate school has started to do this.
- ❑ Themes are a way of getting folks to look at things thru interdisciplinary focus – capstone in jr./sr. year from list of courses ex: STS, disciplinary capstones that already exist.
- ❑ Good to hear objections from groups/colleges but what about recommendations from groups. Some groups are waiting to see the details. Not all recommendations received from colleges meet objectives.
- ❑ FYE implementation is big concern and not surprised by opposition.
- ❑ Transferability is issue. Not clear at this point – what does this mean?
- ❑ The subsetting of courses and how courses will be required in major is point of concern. Doublecounting vs. subsetting - discussion on how to make it clear, how would it look for students?

- ❑ What are some specific ideas and examples to address the different area of GEP?
- ❑ Some groups felt the GEP is too prescriptive in how things would have to be done – what are other choices to fulfill requirement?
- ❑ Capstone may have been a bad word choice.
- ❑ Multidisciplinary courses – have to have content from both HSS and Math/Nat Sciences perspective.
- ❑ Suggestion to take revised proposal to focus groups to find out if we are communicating this well to campus/colleges.
- ❑ Trouble with disciplinary instruction and interdisciplinary instruction. Struggling with how to get true interdisciplinary education... take baby steps on this concept... STS, FYE, Capstone are attempts to provide opportunities for interdisciplinary instruction within education at NCSU. Perhaps should roll all them into one to allow students to begin process and campus comm. to think about interdisciplinary activity. Perhaps take one of these items and focus as interdisciplinary.
- ❑ Discussion on process dimension and content dimension
- ❑ Process and large-scale change processes... process is very important. – may want to consider having campus – by creating subgroups of faculty/staff - to work on a dimension of this. Have subgroup go forward on campus and tell us how we can implement a FYE or diversity piece better. Idea is to share this broadly with colleges/groups to meet the rationale or mission and then the task force synthesizes those and presents to campus.
- ❑ Strategically, what would make the campus ready? Discussion on how to bring campus along.

ACTION ITEM: Ken Esbenshade, Mike Carter and Allen Dupont will prepare disciplinary statement/paragraph for Mission Statement

Meeting adjourned at 10:02 am.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Catherine Freeman.