

## **GERTF Meeting November 4, 2005**

**Members:** John Ambrose, Allen DuPont, Dan Robison, Sarah Ash, Michael Shearer, Chris Kessler, Jordan Wallace, Andrew Barnes, Karen Helm, Laura Severin, Marian McCord, Michael Carter, Jose Picart, Louis Hunt, Jacqui Hawkins-Morton, Joni Spurlin, March Krotee, Samara Burnette, Phil Moses, Thomas Conway, Kathy Wallace.

Associate Dean John Ambrose opened the meeting at 8:00 a.m. with a brief update from last meeting's minutes to prepare for the direction of the November 4, 2005 meeting. The previous taskforce meeting on 10/21/05 examined a proposed GER model (Fallback Model). Several committee members requested the chance to create and compare other models.

Four more proposals were brought to the meeting from Marian McCord, Sarah Ash, Michael Carter, and Dan Robison in addition to the previously discussed proposal.

Michael Carter also gave an update on some changes in the rubric including: A) In 1,2, & 3, changing the phrase "opportunity" to "framework that guides" students and B) In 5, using the term "easily portable."

The members gave a brief overview of each proposal (designated by letter, A-E)

Overview of Proposals:

Allen Dupont: "Proposal A" – also Fallback Plan

- Allen summarized the Proposal A brought forward from the previous GERTF meeting. Reminded committee members that the proposal was conservative, course based, and looks very similar to what is already in place at N.C. State.

Marian McCord: "Proposal B"

- This proposal looks at giving an alternative approach to GER through two main parts, skills and experiences. One, students will be able to satisfy certain proficiencies in certain skills and be evaluated through testing or some other measurable method. Two, students would have experience based courses or events centered around themes whether it be ethics, service, multiculturalism, etc.
- Assessing the skills parts of the GER for accreditation purposes and having other ways of assessing the experienced based portion.

Sarah Ash: "Proposal C" (Composed by multiple committee members)

- This proposal includes some of the same ideas as Marian's proposal. It tries to include the notion of connecting the GER ideas/courses instead of just having students choose from "Column A, B, C, etc."
- Promotes the idea of creating thematic concentrations with a first year and end capstone experience through courses. These would include establishing a set of service and leadership activities, events, and experiences surrounding these themes. Use of the example "Stem Cell Research."

- Be similar to the Scholars Forum.
- Have a core which makes up the basic structure model with the themes being a subset of these core hours.

Michael Carter: “Proposal D”

- This proposal includes a relatively manageable course based approach similar to Proposal A but has more reduced hours. It allows for choices between Humanities & Social Sciences and Physical and Mathematical Sciences General Ed Electives. Seeks to have cooperating departments, creating a set of courses related to a them with teachers from different curriculums.
- Includes 3 Theme based Perspectives.

Dan Robison: “Proposal E”

- This proposal plans to have a sequence of four courses through the freshman & sophomore years offered by different colleges. Students would choose a course sequence outside their college/major. This would comprise 12 credits towards GER. There would then be 18 more credit hours (bringing it to 30) to complete the GER.

John Ambrose reminded committee members that many of the courses listed on the GER are also courses used in many majors’ curriculum and that there is a conservative number of GER courses outside the major that a student might typically take.

At this point, the committee broke into small groups to discuss the four Proposals (B-E) with instructions to discuss designated proposal in terms of the rubric.

The committee was called back at 9:15 a.m. The group assigned to “Proposal B” presented their discussion in regards to the rubric.

Proposal B: Rubric evaluation

1. Mostly yes, few maybes
2. Maybe
3. Yes
4. Maybe
5. Maybe
6. Yes (depending on what was put into the program).

Other comments concerning this proposal included:

- It was difficult to evaluate this proposal using the rubric because of the rubric’s specific mindset.
- Student Andrew Barnes pointed out one good idea for this Proposal would be to incorporate building experiences into a course based framework.
  - o Freshman seminar with focus on values the community desires
  - o Sophomore seminar with focus on developing a framework for “exploring” these values
  - o Senior seminar with “reflective” focus and with writing/reflective evaluation on the experiences through the seminars.

- Laura Severin asked if the proposal could be built within a framework that would integrate the specific proficiencies and experiences proposed by the Proposal for instance “building proficiencies into required categories.”
- Debate on how building these proficiencies into a program would be accomplished.

For next meeting:

- Student government would like to bring a proposal to the table to be evaluated next meeting.
- Discuss Proposals B,C, D, and E, including any overlap. Groups from today’s meeting feel free to get together to discuss the Proposals more.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Melissa McConnell