

**Minutes of the Gen Ed Retreat
Friday, October 20, 2006**

Minutes from Information Literacy Discussion (taken by J. Hawthorne)

Matt provided an explanation of the information literacy proposal. In view of the previous discussion of Quantitative Reasoning, Wilbur proposed an amendment to the original proposal, adding information literacy to the list of general education goals although with no designated course requirement. Instead, any instructor/department validating or revalidating a course for general education credit would have information literacy as one of the gen ed goals from which to select (so, like critical thinking, information literacy would be “infused” in the gen ed curriculum rather than existing as a free-standing course requirement of X number of credits). All sub-committee members supported Wilbur’s amended proposal, and it came to the floor in that form.

In discussion, the point was made that the written version of the proposal task force members had received included awkward connections to some of the gen ed goals. Making information literacy a free-standing goal would remove the need to include it within other goals, reducing the wording challenge and clarifying meaning.

Two votes were taken, with outcomes highlighted below.

1. On the question of whether to include information literacy as a goal or a subgoal, the vote was **14 for information literacy as a goal** and 3 for information literacy as a subgoal (within the other goals) – so information literacy was added to our list of proposed goals.
2. In a follow-up vote on whether or not to have a specific course requirement (no requirement means depending on the “infusion” method within courses validated for gen ed credit), the vote was **16 against the course requirement** and 1 question mark – so no course requirement will be proposed at this time.

Minutes from Senior Capstone & Freshman Experience Discussion (taken by A. Walker)

Senior Capstone:

Discussion included the following items:

- What about students with double majors: They would take two capstones.
- Possibility of integrating advanced writing requirement into senior experience?
- General consensus that capstone should thoroughly integrate and assess 2 or 3 gen ed goals.
- Should capstone be a place to assess gen ed outcomes?
- An Office of Gen Ed could keep track of how many departments offer capstones and how many interdisciplinary capstones would need to be offered each semester.

- Issue of distance students – would we need online capstone courses?
- Need to have pre-requisites in place so only seniors can enroll in capstone
- Why a senior capstone rather than a senior experience or seminar? To better reflect that it is a culminating course, not a career preparation course.

Votes:

1. Senior Capstone should be 3 credits. (12 yes, 3 no, 1 don't know)
2. At least two general education goals must be thoroughly integrated and assessed in each capstone. (15 yes, 1 no, 1 don't know)
3. Senior capstone is restricted to senior status students only. (unanimous yes)

Freshman Experience:

Discussion included the following items:

- Provost and President have not mentioned resources. Have said to design the best gen ed program possible, the “Cadillac” of Gen Ed.
- Optimal class size: Fair amount of discussion and dissention between 15 being optimal for a freshman experience and the ability to have discussion-based courses of larger sizes.
- Transfer students: If they have completed their 36 gen ed credits, they do not have to take Freshman experience. If they have not finished their gen ed requirements, then they are required to take freshman experience.
- Freshmen seminars have been proven to increase student retention.
- Should freshmen seminars be focused on one big theme or multiple themes? Consensus was that there would be limited multiple themes (i.e. 6-8) that would be linked to one big theme.
- Freshman experience should focus on general education goals.
- Sustainability of a freshman seminar?
- How to attract and train professors to teach a freshman seminar?
- An Office of General Education could plan the theme of the year, recruit instructors, etc.
- Too many unresolved details for the proposal to pass

Votes:

1. Freshmen experience would be 1,2 or 3 credits. (13 said 3, 1 said 2, 5 said 1 credit)
2. Should freshmen experience be for a letter grade or Pass/Fail? (15 letter grade, 4 pass/fail, 1 abstain).
3. Should enrollment be capped at 20? (16 yes, 4 no)
4. Should UND have a 3 credit freshman experience? (14 yes, 10 no, 2 abstain)

Minutes from the Quantitative Reasoning and Communication discussion (taken by L. Rankin)

Quantitative Reasoning Proposal

The subcommittee presented its proposal as having two separate issues: whether there should be a separate goal for Quantitative Reasoning and what the curricular requirement should be.

The Task Force first voted **in favor of a QR requirement of some kind.** (19 yes votes)

In a second vote, the Task Force voted 17-4 **in favor of a separate goal** for QR.

In a third vote, the Task Force voted 14-5-2 **against designating a particular level at which QR classes could be offered** (i.e., 200 level or above, 300-400 level, etc.)

In a fourth vote, Task Force members voted 19-1-1 **against setting an enrollment cap on QR courses.**

In a fifth vote, the Taskforce considered the question of whether there should be a **pre-requisite beyond admission** to the University for the QR classes. 12 people voted yes for a pre-requisite, 6 voted no, and 1 indicated uncertainty. Due to time considerations, we agreed to leave the matter unresolved and **in need of further discussion.**

Communication Proposal

The subcommittee suggested that the Task Force consider this proposal in 3-4 separate parts.

In the first vote, the TF voted 17-3 **in favor of retaining the current 6-credit-hour Comp I – Comp II/Tech. & Bus. Writing requirement.**

In a second vote, the TF 14-4-2 **in favor of an oral communication requirement.**

In a third vote, the TF voted 15-5 **against allowing only pre-designated courses (such as Comm. 110 and Comm. 212) to satisfy the requirement.** (Instead, courses could be approved to fulfil this requirement if they meet specific criteria to be spelled out by the Gen Ed Committee.)

In a fourth vote, the Task Force **did not support the proposal that the required oral communication course should be designated as lower division.** The vote here was 7-10-1.

In a fifth vote, the TF voted 14-4 **in favor of a required 3-credit advanced writing and/or speaking intensive course requirement.** (This requirement could overlap with other required courses in gen ed or the major.)

Finally, in a sixth vote, the TF voted 16-1 **against allowing any course to fulfil more than one component of the Communication requirement.**