OK’d September 28th minutes

1. Dr. Collings’ comments.
   - The committee appreciated Dr. Collings’ willingness to visit with us. In general we feel that his comments supported the approach we are taking to this process and did not contradict what we are proposing.
   - See September 28th minutes for summary of comments.

2. A few words about timing.
   The chair related her experience with working on faculty committees. There seems to be a window of time each semester in which to accomplish things. From about week 4 – week 12. Before and after that time people are too busy with their courses. So, for this semester, that leaves about 4-5 weeks of available time. She would like to see us get our three models out to the departments, the staff senate, the student senate and the administration by the first week in November. At that point, the models can be discussed by the different groups and we could perhaps expect some sort of response from each group before the end of the term. The chair suggested a cover note be put on the model packet that read something like this:

   1. If you had to choose one of these models at this point, which would it be?
   2. What are the strengths of the model you chose?
   3. Are there things in the other models you would like to be considered as additions to your chosen model? Why?
   4. Are there things in your chosen model that you would like to see changed? Why?

   Then, next semester, the committee would use the bulk of the semester to hone in on a model to propose for catalog revision early in Fall 2005 understanding that once we OK it, APC would need to go through their review process and the faculty would, in all likelihood, have to OK at a general faculty meeting.

   If we do not proceed under this timeline, we will not get anything into the 2006-07 catalog and would have to wait until the 2007-08 catalog. We don’t want to do that. So, we will try to proceed as above.

2. Model 1 (with a request from the Fine Arts Faculty)
   The first model is near completion. Since this is the model of little change, we tried to keep the course offerings and categories the same, in general. The fine arts faculty asked that we consider removing the hours for the courses and categories. There was discussion as to what type of effect this might have on the thoughts of people from across campus. Their argument is that they do not want to continue the discrepancy between their class hours and everyone else’s . . . they’d rather see all three hour courses or all two hour courses. After some discussion, the following compromise was reached: The fine arts courses would be listed as 2/3 hours so that when the model is reviewed, it will get people thinking along those lines. Also, each category was given a range of hours instead of a fixed number . . . also to get people to see that the hourly allocation is up for debate . . . even if the model of “little change” is chosen.

   This led us to a discussion of total hours in general and what we are going to do about this very sensitive topic. At this point, we see a range of possible total hours between 34 –47 based on Board policy and transfer agreements. We feel we are somewhat mandated to work within that range.

3. Model 2:
MBI addressed the methods she employed to design this model and gave rational for the inclusion of some new “parts”. Some suggested modifications included were:
- make the hours a range again for each category of skills and concept subcomponents.
- remove any listing of courses in each category so that people see that there is room for new courses … as long as they fulfill the goals and objectives of the category.
- Some changes in the titles of skill and concept categories were suggested and will be changed on the next draft.

NOTE: once again the chair reinforced the idea that these goals and objectives, should this type of model be chosen, will be reviewed by the people who teach in, or aspire to teach in, a given category. Those people will be responsible for making the goals and objectives clear. Any course that is proposed to be taught in a given category will have to meet basic criteria set down by the GEC and will have to include measurable outcomes for assessment.

4. Model 3: Pat Arneson, Lori Nicholson and Jan Dinsmore are going to be working on this over the course of the next few weeks. They have been gathering information on exemplary programs from across the country. The committee had the following considerations to give the team:
   a. Anchor the program in the overall goals and go from there.
   b. Make it entirely interdisciplinary.
   c. Have a Senior Seminar that is a grouping of majors from across campus and is anchored by a theme. Perhaps have both a Freshman seminar and a Senior Seminar.

6. Next meeting: Tuesday October 19th 4:45. in PV Library.
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