Minutes
General Education Council
Friday, March 14, 2008

Attendance:
Mokhtar Atallah, Cindy Boissenneault, John Cunningham, Isabel Espinal, Ginger Etinde, David Fleming, Amanda Walker Johnson, Gary Kamen, Kevin Klement, John Lenzi, Randall Knoper, Mark Leckie, Pamela Marsh-Williams, Ken Scriboni, Constantinos Stivaros

Minutes:
The minutes of February 15, 2008 were passed by the Council with an addition about Information Literacy.

Report from Gen Ed Task Force:
There was a lengthy discussion concerning the General Education Task Force’s draft of Gen Ed “Goals and Learning Outcomes.” The Council deliberated over the areas that needed to be reworded, such as stressing at the start the need for sharper critical thinking and the opportunity for shared educational experience, and including a third section that would link to courses and/or provide exemplification of the Gen Ed goals. A question arose as to the protocol for such a restatement of Gen Ed goals: Would it need Faculty Senate approval? The sense of the meeting was that as long as the restatement abided by the original Faculty Senate legislation, a vote from the Gen Ed Council after the task force completed its revision would be sufficient. Randall will send the goals and outcomes statement to the Council members electronically and solicit further comments/suggestions. He will then report these to the Task Force.

Randall requested that the Council take five minutes and fill out the task force survey on Gen Ed goals and outcomes. He will bring tabulated results to the next meeting. The students were asked to share their observations about how well Gen Ed goals and outcomes were fulfilled in the Gen Ed courses they’ve previously taken. Ken and Constantinos agreed that the courses offered a portion of the requirements; however, student engagement was still lacking, they said, and was not reinforced by the faculty who taught the courses. Constantinos added that not only did there seem to be no definite structure to the courses, but they also did not include “working with diverse groups.” Gary Kamen asked the students whether the survey sheet helped them understand what Gen Ed is trying to accomplish or helped them feel better about Gen Ed. They both responded that it does impart understanding, but it doesn’t inspire motivation within them for Gen Ed. Mark Leckie also asked them if there was any discussion from faculty within their courses about why Gen Ed existed and what it hoped to accomplish. Both students said that this did not occur within their Gen Ed courses.

Mokhtar suggested that each Gened course should list competencies, then in the end of the semester evaluation, request comments from students as to how they were fulfilled. This would not only help the faculty understand student competencies, but also help the student see the relevance of the course.

General Education Academy:
There was a brief discussion regarding the ‘Academy’ or “Re-Boot Camp’. The Academy’s outcome of reinvigorating Gen Ed was emphasized. The next step will be to call for applications from faculty who are teaching Gen Ed courses. Incentives for the program will include a laptop and a $4,000 stipend.

Q-Reviews:
Randall commented that the recent attempts to gather Q-review information from those who had reached the ‘3rd & 4th Notice’ list were unsuccessful. He requested that the dates on all Q-reviews passed since the last review, be gathered by Ginger Etinde; afterward, the Council will have the list of those courses due for review.

Next Meeting:  Friday April 18, 2008 at 2:30 PM, in the Chancellor’s Board Room, 370 Whitmore.