

Core Task Force Meeting- Tuesday, October 13, 2009

Members in attendance: Michael Barry, Don Burkholder, Margie Coleman, Claire Crabtree, Jeanne David, Nancy Gibney, Greg Grabowski (Co-Chair), Ken Henold, David Koukal, Judy Kwapis-Jaeger, Tony Martinico (Co-Chair), Donna Roe, Katy Snyder

Members excused: Kathy Bush, Alexa Rihana-Abdallah, Mitzi Saunders

- I. Call to order and approval of agenda. Agenda approved unanimously.
- II. Approval of minutes from October 6 meetings. As amended, minutes approved unanimously.
- III. Announcements – None
- IV. Subcommittee Reports (2 minutes each)
 - a) None
- V. Business
 - a) RFP Draft – Interdisciplinary Course Models

The wording of the RFP draft was modified. There are 3 core models so far constructed: the October 23, 2007 model, the model that was presented to the board and the model Snyder constructed. The latter uses the October 23rd model and moves the choice courses out to a new section that could accommodate interdisciplinary courses. It is the same number of credits as the October 23rd model but left open ended as to which objectives they would fulfill. This could offer some flexibility. The courses could be theme based and linked together. A theme based core structure could run across the existing core and not be tied to interdisciplinary courses. There is also the Oljar model if anyone would like to submit that.

Discussion about whether to “open it all up again” by requesting core proposals when the rfp was for course proposals not core proposals. Provide examples but state these are not the only things in which we are interested. If we do not give them an idea of how interdisciplinary/cross disciplinary and theme based courses will fit into the core, we are not answering their questions. Having the ideal core debate all over again is counterproductive. Present the October 23rd core with modifications and call on faculty to ask how they would use it so we are not closing and foreclosing but opening a little. We are still working on the October 23rd format. Now we are calling on you to provide info on how you would use. As long as it does not imply that interdisciplinary courses are required. They can satisfy the core without being required. This portrays a truer idea of what we have been doing. One reaction will be we are not saying enough and there is a lack of commitment. We do have to take the temperature because if the core is recommended and there is so much opposition it will be dead in the water. The core is criteria and outcomes driven. An obvious point is philosophy and religious studies may have a real problem taking the third elective away. Until there is context, some in CLAE will not buy because some have said there is no way we looked at the professional schools accommodating more core courses. Choice courses are courses attached for reasons that are not arbitrary. This will not be an easy sell. The privilege of religious studies and philosophy with three credits is not fair to other disciplines. Departments that are suffering with low majors are not a reason to have them in core. It gives good incentive to come up with ideas for great courses. Philosophy and religious studies are examples because you do not have to take specific courses. The hard part is history or English when not every course is listed and if it is not in the core you can't take it. It would be great for diversity if all courses satisfied. Diversity is the only weakness that the majority has identified that needs strengthening. People think there are weaknesses in the core and we are not addressing weaknesses but moving to

integrated courses. Less choice in the core is better as part of it is to provide general education. The vast majority just wants to know what to do to satisfy core and very few students are taking upper level courses. Now with electives they are satisfying minors. Minors will get rid of hodge podge core and take pressure off core to be all things to all students. All grads getting minors would put us on the map as a university, but the core would have to be smaller. Some of us have no time for minors. We need to form a consensus on this document and we are running out of time. Snyder will rewrite intro and Grabowski will create Oct 23rd schematic and incorporate modifications. An invitation for faculty to choose among models may be useful. Trying to establish consensus by maximizing options is problematic.

Below is the remainder of the agenda left unfinished when the meeting adjourned at 1:50. Next meeting is 12:45pm on October 20 in Peter Peirce Room.

- b) Open forum feedback discussion
- c) Subcommittee formation
- d) Meeting time schedule change