

General Education Council

Minutes

10/22/09

Call to order: 12:35

Present:

Members: Kathy Malanga (co-chair), Giuliana Andreopoulos, Peter Griswold, Christine Kelly, Rob McCallum, Balmurli Natrajan, Lynne Orr, John Peterman, Kara Rabbit, Robert Rimmer, George Robb, Kathy Silgalis, Ron Verdicchio, Nancy Weiner

Visitors: Kevin Martus, Donna Potacco

The minutes from the previous GE Council meeting were approved without correction (Nancy Weiner moved; Peter Griswold seconded).

Christine Kelly moved that we spend no more than 20 minutes in discussion on defining the differences between the USP and the Alternate Proposal. Nancy Weiner seconded the motion, and the motion was approved.

George Robb moved that we consider the chart prepared by John Peterman and Lynne Orr and edited by Kathy Malanga and a list that Kathy Malanga had prepared that compared the two programs. Ron Verdicchio seconded and the motion was approved.

Discussion regarding the two proposals included the following comments

- Christine Kelly noted that the Alternate Proposal includes a commitment to offering writing intensive courses
- Rob McCallum advocated offering financial incentives to faculty teaching writing-intensive courses and noted that smaller departments could begin to offer writing non-intensive courses. He noted that smaller departments had promoted themselves earlier by offering upper level Non-Western courses.
- Kevin Martus asked if the USP can be changed (the response was that the GE Council cannot change either proposal at this point since the proposals are now on the floor of the Senate).
- Kara Rabbit noted that caps could be lowered for writing intensive GE courses.
- Christine Kelly noted that the Review Panels can be urged to accept more courses that can be double-counted. She also noted that while her first list of differences contained 10 points, there was no reason to have that exact number.
- Ron Verdicchio expressed concern about submitting two documents, one from each subcommittee that outlined what each subcommittee saw as the differences. He suggested that the table is the best document to help the representatives to the Senate make up their mind.
- Giuliana Andreopoulos noted that the Senate had expected two very different models. Since the two plans are similar, the Senate has asked for clarification and

she suggested that the differences be reduced to one page, with two sentences for each item.

- Kara Rabbit noted that condensing the differences to one page masked complex philosophical differences between the two proposals and how they were conceived.
- Rob McCallum expressed optimism that we can arrive at a consensus in how to represent the differences.
- Christine Kelly asked if we had time to modify the table to reflect the differences in philosophy. She added that she had wondered why the Senate did not react more vocally to the proposals.
- John Peterman noted his interest in revising 3-4 items on the list of differences that Kathy Malanga has prepared, beginning with Item #9.
- Balmuri Natrajan suggested that the list be reduced from 10 to 6 items by combining #4 and #8, #9 and #10 and eliminating #1 & #3.
- Guiliana Andreopoulos asked John Peterman if he would consider changing the term “dimensions” to “areas in #1.
- Balmuri Natrajan asked for some additional clarification on the Alternate Proposal on the list, and asked how the USP was more developed than the Alternate Proposal.
- Kathy Malanga responded that some people see the USP as more structured.
- Christine Kelly noted that #1 and #2 should be kept on the list because they are prerequisites to #3 and #4.
- Balmuri Natrajan suggested the term, “double-counting,” be removed, since both proposals contained that provision.

There was general agreement to revise the list of differences along the following lines: revise #1, #3, #4, #6, #7, #8, and #10 and remove #2, #5 and #9. Kathy Malanga will send the revised list to the GE Council for comment and then to the Senate Executive Council.

The Implementation Plan was taken up for discussion. Editing changes were made to Goal #1, Goal #2 was accepted, and revisions were made to Goal #3. There was extensive discussion over the range in the number of Review Panels. An initial four-year assessment of the GE in Goal #5 was suggested, but the consensus was to stay with a seven-year cycle since it would take two years to get the GE program implemented, and the seven-year cycle would coincide with Middle States visits. In any event, assessment will be on-going.

The GE Council applauded Kathy Malanga’s efforts to produce documents that illustrated the differences between the two proposals.

Ron Verdicchio moved that the list and table be sent to the Senate Executive Council. George Robb seconded and the motion was approved. Kathy Malanga noted that once the GE model is adopted, the GE Council can begin working on implementation (e.g. establishing the review panels). The GE Council co-chairs will set up a meeting after the

Senate has met on 10/27. Rob McCallum predicted that there will not be a Senate vote on 10/27.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:47.

Respectfully submitted,
Peter Griswold