

**Gen Ed Task Force
Minutes
April 13, 2007**

Present: Steve Light, Ray Lagasse, Joey Benoit, Pamela Kalbfleisch, Joan Hawthorne, Anne Kelsch, Tom Steen, Jenya Kozliak, Lori Robison, Anne Walker, Pat O'Neill, Helen Melland, Lisa Burger, Matt Cavalli.

Anne and Tom summarized the presentation to the University Senate. Joan described the conversation at the General Education Requirements committee. Anne and Tom had also met with the Provost and were intending to meet with the Executive Committee of the Senate. The Provost reported to them on preliminary feedback from discussion he'd had earlier in the day with Executive Committee members. Comments and suggestions were as follows:

1. The Essential Studies name may be contentious for some faculty.
2. There is a concern among Indian Studies faculty about UND's special, state-created mission in Indian studies.
3. More rationale for the capstone idea may be needed.
4. Catalog copy should be expanded to emphasize the importance of general education.
5. Civic engagement should be mentioned somewhat more fulsomely.

Doug also offered comments of his own to Tom and Anne:

1. He expressed the same concern about Indian Studies.
2. He carried forward a concern about civic engagement.
3. He agreed that the ES name may be a problem.
4. He believes that consensus on the GER committee in support of the proposal is very important.
5. He is concerned about reaching a quorum at the May Senate meeting, and he is also concerned about having Senators read and think through in advance so they come prepared to take action.
6. He says there may be a motion to table until impact is entirely calculated.

We began discussion of the name issue but then moved to the question of strategy. How do we manage a strategy so as to avoid on-the-spot amendments? Can amendments be offered from the floor if the document comes through the gen ed committee? Tom and Anne will check with a parliamentary authority.

The proposal would be to accept or reject our proposal, and someone from the Senate needs to make the motion. But procedural questions need to be resolved in advance, as well as strategy. Should there be an open letter ("please read this – it's important") coming from the provost? He has been supportive but is very clear that faculty agreement needs to be reached for a new program to be adopted. Should the process be delayed until fall? Would it be a good idea to have discussion meetings for question-answering yet this spring? After extensive discussion of all these issues, we agreed that Anne and Tom would resolve the parliamentary issues through discussion with a

parliamentarian. And we further agreed that we should go forward now, while discussion is buzzing on campus and there's a certain momentum for further conversation about the proposal.

We went through the portions of the draft highlighted by the Provost or by Doug and made changes, where we agreed by consensus that the change was acceptable, in response to their suggestions. [Most of the changes were not substantive, and all are reflected in the 4/16/07 document that is now being circulated.]

Two changes received special attention. We agreed by consensus to add "civic" in several places. We also agreed not to add the suggested sentence in descriptions of capstones. However, we did agree, on a 13 to 1 vote, to add make a page one change that adds "experiential learning courses" to the sentence about special opportunities, with other minor rewording as necessary to make that fit.

We agreed that we are willing to concede the Essential Studies name, but will see what happens on the floor.

Finally, a question was raised about Languages courses. They can be validated as humanities, probably with critical thinking or diversity as the appropriate goal, and some Languages courses may qualify for special emphasis designation for global diversity.

Joan will do a clean copy of the draft by Monday. Anne W. will make sure the information gets sent to the ULetter. Everyone is strongly urged to attend the May 3 Senate meeting (4:05 p.m., Gamble 7) at which the proposal will be discussed. Task Force members reviewed names of Senate members and will try to contact each person individually to be sure information is provided, questions are answered, etc. so that people feel prepared for a vote. Joan distributed information about faculty development dollars that are available for "model gen ed projects," which would be a good fit under the proposed gen ed system but would also be useful even if that system is not adopted or is modified.

The next task force meeting will be April 20, and the final meeting of the semester will be May 4.

Submitted by
Joan Hawthorne