

## GERTF Minutes 1/3/07:

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

Meeting opened at 1:10 p.m.  
Agenda and minutes were passed out.

Moved to approve the minutes. Minutes of Dec. 6, 2006 were approved.

### 1) Subset review discussion:

Committee looked at examples of Degree program semester displays to see how general education requirements are being met and the diversity between different programs

- a. Many programs are doing a great amount of subsetting. The committee had said no to allowing subsetting before. Does the group still see that this is appropriate? How can the committee be more clear in explaining this?
- b. Rather than talk about subsetting, make it clear that there will be double counting.
- c. Discussion of degrees and how subsetting affects students and the transferability between colleges and programs.
- d. The portability factor is a lot more complex than at first glance. How will the reduction in gen ed hours affect program requirements? How can gen ed hours and major requirements be made more clear to the student?
- e. The committee looked more closely at the degree audits and discussing what majors require and how gen ed requirements are double counted. How can the time to graduation be reduced?
- f. Students who transfer between colleges & programs find the most difficulties with how programs specify gen ed requirements for that specific program.
- g. The taskforce looked at BS Environmental Science – Statistics; BS in Elementary Education: Science Concentration; BS in Environmental Technology; BS in Mathematics Education.

### 2) How to structure lists for categories:

- a. The task force examined the category objectives for GER and discussed how the courses are put on the lists. (CUE process and requirements for courses listed as GER courses)
- b. Take the objectives (current) and allow CUE to have some input on how category lists would be defined and what could fall into the category. Allowing CUE to revisit these objectives.

- c. Motion: *“To retain the current category objectives; invite CUE to revisit the objectives in light of the “new” rationale, in consultation with appropriate faculty members.”*
    - Passed unanimously.
  - d. Appoint a group to look at defining the objectives for the proposed co-requisites and interdisciplinary classes in the format that is used by CUE. (Jose Picart, Mike Carter, Laura Severin, Jacqui Hawkins-Morton). Bring back to next meeting.
- 3) Theme discussion:
- a. The task force needs to examine and clarify an explanation, with a possible example, of what a theme might look like. This would be very helpful to show the faculty. Need to consider what a theme could look like, what the process for getting themes approved or maintained would look like.
  - b. Need to develop criteria for the themes: address some of those issues involved with how students get involved with a theme.
  - c. Members agreed it is important to let faculty know the task force recommends thinking about themes, with faculty consultation, in the future. It is not something that’s developed at this time.
  - d. Need to further clarify and define the “co-requisites.”

Action Item: Jose Picart, Mike Carter, Laura Severin, and Jacqui Hawkins-Morton will bring back objectives for the proposed co-requisites and interdisciplinary classes in the format that is currently used by CUE to the next meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 3:15 p.m.

Minutes respectfully submitted:  
Melissa McConnell