This GE proposal seems to be in direct conflict with recent NDSU and Higher Educational mantra’s: 

NDSU - We serve our citizens; Ed - More hands on interactive learning. “Experiential”

Our state’s most productive economic sectors (Agriculture, Energy, and Technology in the Eastern part of the state) are based upon or bolstered by science. We are not serving our citizens by reducing the exposure to and training of young people in the sciences. Similarly, laboratory classes are among the most hands-on learning opportunities available in science courses. What was the rationale behind reducing the sciences credits, particularly eliminating the lab credit? And, why was the word “science” not used? Are we to be ashamed of teaching science?

The media and some political leaders are currently engaged in an assault against scientific knowledge and those who generate it. This is partly due to the complexity of thought required for modern scientific understanding. When ideas about the natural world become too complex for people, they have a tendency to resort to superstitious systems of knowledge and dogmatic points of view. The “Forest Gump” or “Robert Fulgham” effect. Now is the time within our state and nation for the science requirements in general education curricula to be increased in order to fight against ignorance and superstition. Why would the faculty at NDSU endorse this attack on science by reducing the science requirements in the GEC?

Could you tell us the timeline and procedure for acceptance or rejection of this Proposal?
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