

General Education

Open Meeting

12-12-07

9 am Union 213 (due to weather, we started at 9:20)

Task Force: Vicki Clegg, Greg Eiselein, Judy Hughey (education--new to task force), Sara K. Kearns, Pedro Leite, Karen Myers-Bowman, Cia Verschelden

Notes prepared by: Sara Kearns

Guests:

Mick Charney (architecture), Rebecca Armstrong (Aviation-Salina)

Myers-Bowman gave summary of the task force's work and what we built on.

Armstrong/Aviation:

Going to take some thinking and review to determine what courses they are offering that will fit. However, Aviation is looking at their programs. They need to have federal government approval of their program and are seeking AVI accreditation. They operate off of Part 147 of Aviation Regulations, which is old and needs to be brought up to date. Right now, they don't know what kind of hurdles this will create for them. But thinks it is pretty much in line with what they are doing.

Not sure about the assessment. Learning every day about new ways to assess.

Myers-Bowman: We are trying to make this flexible so that programs that are fairly prescriptive can work with it.

It can be difficult to envision before courses tagged.

Charney (architecture)—teaches history courses dealing with aesthetics.

Focusing on content areas-- Past/Future—how did we get that title? As a historian he can see a content area for the past and the present, but not past and the future. He is concerned that the descriptions leaves the impression that lessons from history could predict the future. "Education guesses" is problematical.

Include more language about the continuum of human experience. What we've done in the past lays the foundation for the future. "Legacy" and "posterity," and "collective cultural experiences" are alternate terms that we may consider incorporating.

Clegg-- Explained that we started with senses, including "sense of history" but wanted a different label so that we could get away from association any of the content areas with specific departments. We did not want to give the impression that we expected students to be able to predict future.

Myers-Bowman—We want students to recognize that current activities have consequences.

Kearns—Didn't want to discuss the future in a predictive way, but that students are part of creating the future. We can definitely revisit this description to clarify our intent of the "future."

Charney—Aesthetic experience "Artistic works can heighten . . . intensify one's aesthetic and observation capacities . . ." Is that backwards? Need the ability first to understand the context before you can appreciate it.

Eiselein et al—yes, we can rephrase that.

Charney—Do we still want small seminars for first year experiences? If we want 3 credit hour courses, there's no way they can handle that in architecture. 180 in freshman class now, plus another 25 on wait list.

Eiselein—the math isn't that architecture is going to need to find within architecture a class for every student. According to the way the first year experience seminars will be designed, architecture would need to supply one seminar serving mostly non-majors. Architecture students will mostly be taking seminars other places. For the smaller colleges, it's one section. Education/Business may be four per semester. Arts and Sciences will hold the most of the seminars.

Charney under impression from initial report that it would be tied to the discipline.

Eiselein—could be. But it would be to student's advantage to take the seminar in another general education area. Many programs do have some kind of first year experiences already, but we're looking at small general education first year seminars that would be tied in some way by common experiences--not necessarily content.

Hughey—so would programs like University Experience fall under the first year experience seminars?

Eiselein et al—No. University Experience offers a college skill set for incoming students, the first year seminars would offer a college mindset.