

**GE Council Meeting
September 3, 2009**

Minutes

Attendance: Kathy Malanga, Mahmoud Watad, Sandie Miller, Alejandro Anreus, Frank Pavese, George Rob, Ron Verdicchio, Esther Martinez, Jim Hauser (visitor), Sandra DeYoung, Kara Rabbit, John Peterman, Kathy Silgailis, Lynne Orr, Nancy Weiner, Rob McCallun, Lorra Brown, Jean Levitan, Balmurli Natrajan, Giuliana Andreopoulos, Christine Kelly, Kara Rabbitt

1. Agenda approval
2. Minutes of August 4 mtg; discussed and approved
3. JL: GE council needs to be recharged. Will do it soon.
4. USP Presentation: JP: Introduces USP cover letter to council → started a long conversation on the appropriate length and the need or lack thereof of chart (#7 on charge).
 - KM: From our charge: Could have 1 page rationale + 1 page plan
 - CK: Discussion needed on #7: We had an email exchange on this issue. It seems to have a cherry-picking feel about it. We did not have a conversation on how such a chart shapes discussion of criteria.
 - KM: I think it provides equal presentation of both models to the senate.
 - GR: We are each giving a model. So cover letter needs to be short introduction to argument.
 - JL: From charge → general goals and principles: both models have lot of agreement
 - JP: lets have 1-pg cover letter, then summary, then model
 - FP: Should rationale come first? Get to program first
 - GA: Need short executive summary for senators. Comparison is OK and needed. Maybe we need to also have comparison here.
 - JL: Agree. Should not be divisive.
 - CK: The criterion #7 is arbitrary and repetitive. The material submitted by each group is enough.
 - RM: People want details. Agree with GA. Would have liked senate to vote on a conceptual framework. We have to have this by the end of the year.
 - JP: Perhaps we could have #7 labeled not as a list of criteria, but a list of questions people have asked.
 - SD: It is too reductionist to put all this information in a chart. So cover letter and plan is enough.
 - BN: Second SD on #7.
 - JP: These questions have been raised and they need to be in.
 - CK: Need to get them to engage with models.
 - BN: Fear is that senators will only read charts.
 - FP: Let's get to the point right away.
 - RM: Need to provide chart and details (as appendix).
 - JL: We need to get back to the models.

5. USP summarization:
 - JP: Reduction of credits, 3 cr to FYE, double counting; On the question of how many credits: there is no single way to explain how many credits; attention to section 4 last paragraph. Graphic still in draft.
 - GR: Need to clarify.
 - SD: Put the number of credits on graphic, maximum credits too.

6. Alternate Model summarization:
 - CK: cover letter + visual + plan. Held focus groups. From graphic: Diversity – 200 level course at suggestion of focus group participants. Approach to writing and techno-intensive course; double counting to address Mid State concerns without increasing credits for GE. Still open to learning outcomes for both, technology and writing intensive courses. Tutorial on assessment plan development with institutional research folks helped us to change some of the SLOs. Assessment plan is in prospectus (pp. 5-6). Description of 3 assessment approaches and where applicable – rubric, roll-up-from-course, student survey.

7. Discussion
 - JL: Clarity of models needed.
 - LB: Both models are flawed on the teaching / oral presentation assessment??? issue. Where is the faculty trained to teach oral presentation effectively?
 - CK: This is at level of course and program assessment implementation. It is only made clear that communication skills are critical.
 - LB: English and Communications need to come out with what do writing intensive courses assess? What does it actually mean to teach reading and oral communication? Like WAC?
 - JH: If writing intensive is explicit, then need to not make this an add-on. This is not yet explored. Not what we teach but how we teach. The real issues is pedagogy.
 - KR: The overall point is made by the council. This is a resource issue tied to a goal. Need training support if writing intensive courses are required.
 - SD: The faster English and Comm can come up with criteria the better.
 - CK: We had list of recommendations that speak to the implementation process. How far does our charge go? E.g., we recommend 5-7 faculty for each committee. Maybe they can assign a workshop.
 - JP: The criteria should not be restricted to departments. Lots of people need to be involved.
 - GA: Let's get back to agenda. Main goal is to present 2 models. Outcomes must be standard as much as how we teach the course. If we go back to number of courses then pandora's box opens.
 - RM: We definitely need more than 1 math course.
 - GA: Does math include statistics?
 - SD: Yes
 - GR: But this needs to be specified.
 - JL: Our entire council needs to come up with implementation plan. We have lot of shared interests. Need to table implementation.
 - BN: Last year the senate asked for implementation and would not proceed without it.
 - KM: Yes, it is needed and is in our charge.
 - SD: Cannot be incremental. Senators will not vote.

RM: Agree and disagree. Can put implementation plan but only ask senate to approve conceptual part. Need some direction before implementation.

CK: We need the Executive Council here to clarify procedure to deal with the 2 models.

JP: Issue of capitalization → can we have all lower case?

CK: OK.

8. Point 4 from agenda – recurring issue committee rpt.

RV: 1,2,3 approved. Need to flesh them out.

1 – small department issue

2 – prerequisites issue

3 – credit intensive majors issue

Discussion:

KM: How to measure small departments? On prerequisites – where does the information go, and concerns over hidden prerequisites.

GA: Why is council concerned with prerequisites? The term inflation is very negative. Seems like lot of negativity about prerequisites. Business has lot of prereqs.

RV: The issue is prerequisites that require prerequisites –this in turn inflates GE courses required

JL: If choice is available in an area?

SD: But we have to be concerned with prerequisites that are hidden

KR: Need to distinguish major courses vs. GE courses.

CK: Could be better phrased.

At this point BN had to leave.