

Minutes of the Faculty Assembly
October 20, 1992

Assembly President Helsabeck called the meeting to order at 4:35 pm. He first requested that the assembly discuss the extended class schedule since he was interested in faculty input prior to the committee's determination of a permanent schedule. This Fall is the second trial semester and following this, a proposal will be submitted for consideration. While a request was made for longer class periods for finals (3 hours), Helsabeck noted that the reason for only adjusting three-day-a-week classes this semester was due to numerous complaints after the two-hour classes were doubled last Spring semester. Options other than what has been set for this semester and what was used last semester include a tailored system (schedule each module for two hour period) or not adjusting the schedule for finals at all. The assembly was asked to provide feedback regarding this semester's schedule after we have experienced it.

Helsabeck then yielded the floor to Dean Colijn for his presentation of the analysis of the General Studies data which was submitted to the faculty earlier this Fall. Prior to discussing the data for particular objectives, J. Colijn reminded the assembly of the 13 goals that we had established for our general education program in 1988. He stressed the necessity of addressing these goals in program and general studies courses alike.

The overall data for Obj. I (commitment to life-long learning) indicate that rather than the 40% expected, most students get this experience in 25-30% of their courses. Our four-year students approximate the 40% to a greater degree than transfers. In the data for Obj. II (commitment to citizenship) the difference between four-year and transfer are more obvious. It was suggested that this may be due to tension between education for the general good as opposed to education for private interest, the latter being the focus of two year institutions. For Obj. III (ability to reason logically) and Obj. IV (understanding numerical data), the data suggest that we appear to accomplish these goals reasonably well however, due to their nature we may want to consider a minimal numerical threshold of courses here. The data for Obj. V (writing and speaking effectively) and Obj. VI (reflective reading) are inconclusive as yet. We know that our writing program works but we are not certain that we have enough public speaking courses. Regarding Obj. VI, Dean Colijn noted that the transfer data concerned him. The data for Obj. VII (ability to adapt framework as necessary) appear satisfactory, we must remain flexible enough to incorporate any necessary changes. A cause for concern can be found in the data for Obj. VIII (artistic experience). A full one-third of the sample had none of these courses and a much smaller subset of the sample has had up to twenty. The latter suggests contamination by the major and the former that our students generally do not get enough exposure to the arts.

Due to time limitations, J. Colijn was not able to cover all the objectives individually, but instead ended with a consideration of what needed to be done on the basis of these preliminary data. He requested that each program discuss these goals and consider any manner in which we can ensure that the general education needs of our students are met. The General Studies Committee is still analyzing and interpreting these data prior to forwarding them to the Steering Committee. Any suggestions or ideas should be directed to Maria Teski, Chair of the General Studies Committee.

Helsabeck reiterated J. Colijn's concerns noting that the most significant task faculty faces is the general education of Stockton students. He announced that the next order of business was the Honors Proposal. An error in the proposal was corrected as Helsabeck noted that two words had been deleted while preparing for distribution. Please add 'be recorded' to the last sentence on page 1.

L. Sowers addressed the assembly concerning the Honors Proposal. She noted that these changes had been prompted by the problem that a student could be Dean's List for a number of semesters without receiving honors. L. Sowers discussed the two major changes stemming from this proposal. First, it is a more liberal policy, 9% of students would receive honors as opposed to the 5% shown for the last five years. Second, the current