

Implementation Task Force Subcommittee on Core Courses and Global Awareness March 17, 2006—FH-128

Members Present: Chris Blackwell, Tony Caterisano, Kate Kaup, David Morgan, Derek Parsons, John Shelley, Kevin Treu, Paul Wagenknecht

Members Absent: Anthony Thompson, Will Walker

Call to Order and Introductions

- The meeting was called to order by Chris Blackwell.
- Each member present introduced himself or herself to the committee, each with some lighthearted speculation as to why she or he had been chosen for this auspicious assignment.
- The committee agreed to refer to itself by the acronym CGA (Core and Global Awareness).

The Business of CGA

- The members agreed to rotate responsibility for recording minutes.
- The committee agreed to weekly meetings for the foreseeable future on Friday afternoons, 2:00-3:30 p.m.
- The committee agreed to invite the ITF members assigned to our subcommittee to meet regularly with our committee.
- The committee agreed that its work should be fully transparent to the university community and will seek to insure transparency by posting minutes of the committee and by talking openly with colleagues about what the committee is doing.
- The committee adopted four acronyms to be used in the minutes and documents generated by the Subcommittee on Core Courses and Global Awareness:
 - GER: Pre-reform requirements
 - CGAR: Post-reform requirements
 - CGA: Our subcommittee
 - ITF: Implementation Task Force Steering Committee

General Discussion: What exactly is our job?

The committee raised and discussed several issues regarding the tasks assigned to CGA.

- Is CGA responsible for insuring that there will be sufficient numbers of course offerings in each of the CGAR categories? Generally speaking, the old GERs were departmentally based, and each department was responsible for insuring a sufficient number of sections. Who will be responsible under the new curriculum? The committee reached the consensus that, unless otherwise instructed, this is not a job of CGA.
- What kind of application forms must we create to facilitate the assignment of specific courses to one or more of the core or global awareness categories? The consensus was that existing courses will need only a form specific to each CGAR category. New courses will need a form combining the current course proposal form (used by

the Curriculum Committee and APC) and the criteria for CGAR assignment. The CGAR forms will be created from the criteria given in the final version of the CRC document.

- Will new courses require approval by the Curriculum Committee and the faculty before applying for CGAR assignment?
- Is CGA responsible for developing a permanent mechanism for assigning courses to CGAR categories? Our consensus: Once the transition to the new curriculum is completed, proposals for assignment to CGAR categories will go directly to Curriculum and APC and then to the full faculty.
- Will faculty have to go through their respective departments to apply for CGAR assignment for their existing courses?
- How many courses are likely to be submitted for CGAR assignment? How many new courses are likely to be created specifically for the CGAR categories? There was some consensus that departments will feel pressure to offer CGAR courses that appeal to whole university community. It seems likely, therefore, that neither gateways to the major or nor upper-level courses filled primarily by majors will be a majority of CGAR courses. But this question cannot be answered with certainty until formal applications for CGAR assignment come to CGA.

Proposed Re-definition of CGA's Job

- To prepare a new course-proposal form, including "schedules" for courses proposed to satisfy one of the CGARs
- To insure that one of these forms is filled out for every courses to be taught beginning in the Fall of 2008
- To make recommendations to ITF and APC regarding CGAR assignment

Response to ITF Draft Schedule

- The "mock draft" (7c). The committee needs clarification from ITF regarding the nature and purpose of the "mock draft" of 7c. The committee sees little need for a "mock draft," which suggests a sketch of CGAR assignments before we receive formal applications from departments. A "mock draft" at this stage of the process may create expectations that will not survive the formal review of proposals for course assignments.
- The committee proposes the following schedule:
 - 7a—Draft guidelines, create course proposal forms, and send to ITF by May 31, 2006.
 - 7b—ITF reviews guidelines and forms by July 31, in time for Department retreats in late August (2006)
 - 7c—Eliminate the "mock draft"
 - 7d—APC recommends procedures for assigning courses to CGAR categories by September 30
 - 7e—Full faculty adopts procedures for assigning courses to CGAR categories at October faculty meeting
 - 7f—Departments propose courses for CGAR assignment by December 15, 2006

- 7g—CGA recommends courses for CGAR assignment to ITF by February 28, 2007
- 7h—Full faculty approves course assignments to CGAR at April or May (2007) faculty meeting

The meeting was adjourned at 4:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

John C. Shelley