

**General Education Committee
Minutes**

February 18, 2002

Present:	Mark Hardt George Benedict James Nowlin	Randall Gloege Michael Dennis
Absent:	Barbara Zuck Squy Wallace – <i>excused</i> John Cech – <i>ex-officio</i> George White – <i>ex-officio</i> Janie Park – <i>ex-officio</i> Dan Zirker – <i>ex-officio</i>	Randy Rhine – <i>ex-officio</i> Joe Michels – <i>ex-officio</i> Curt Kochner – <i>ex-officio</i>
Guests:	Sandie Rietz	St. John Robinson
Presiding:	Mark Hardt, Chair	

Mark Hardt called the meeting to order at 3:42 p.m. in CEHS 216.

The February 11 meeting minutes were approved.

I. Matrix (filled out) from Department of Communication and Theatre

It was noted that this is a learning document, because no clear directions were included with the matrix, and this is one possibility of what may come back from the faculty.

II. Further Discussion: Mission Statement and Objective

It was stated that some vocabulary changes are needed. It was noted that Potential Dignity implies that dignity has to be earned. It was cited that Academic Foundation (Gen Ed) should start students on a path that leads them to dignity.

It was noted that using “Man” is gender-specific. “Human kind” will work much better.

It was noted that the title and object statement are very species-specific. They are only focused on the value of humanity—rather than the value of the entire planet. There are implications of human superiority in the statement. It was cited that Academic Foundation is, in the end, all about people and what they have done and not done.

It was stated that specifics are already noted in the structure, so they do not need to be stated in the object statement as well.

It was noted that the statement seems to be very arrogant and superior. The question was then raised as to how it *should* be stated.

It was noted that in this object statement there should be clear guidelines for departments to follow when submitting their courses for the Academic Foundation Program.

It was stated the title should mean we are teaching them to question. It could be called a critique of civilization.

It was also noted that understand is a very vague, hard to measure verb. Perhaps consider should be used in place of it for the goal of the program.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Rita J. Rabe Meduna