Minutes

General Education Council
Friday, November 20, 2009

Attendance:
Maurianne Adams, Bruce Baird, Martha Baker, Genevieve Chandler, John Cunningham, Alexandrina
Deschamps, Isabel Espinal, Ginger Etinde, David Fleming, Judy Goodenough, Claire Hamilton, Gary Kamen,
Kevin Klement, Mark Leckie, John Lenzi, Pamela Marsh-Williams, W. Brian O’Connor, Amilicar Shabazz,
Martha Stassen, Jimmy Cheung

Minutes:
The minutes of October 16, 2009 were PASSED by the Council.

Old Business:
Status Report: Martha Stassen briefly reported on the 4th credit approval process. She said that 78 (which
equals 44%) of the proposals originally set forth have been approved. GERICO has reviewed 140 proposals,
56% of which have been approved; 44% is still awaiting approval from the subcommittee members. The
subcommittee reviews have raised questions about whether several courses should be GenEd courses.
Maurianne and Brian agreed to form a small subcommittee to review the courses in question. Overall, there
was an impressive turn out for the 4th credit proposals. It was also suggested that some sort of
acknowledgement or ‘thank you’ notes would be appropriate to send to the proposers.

NEASC: This committee wanted to be assured that the GenEd Council was taking the importance of the fourth
credit increase seriously. The Council is awaiting the NEASC report to be completed.

Integrative Option: The Council anticipates that the ‘nuts and bolts’ of the program can be reviewed, finalized
and approved from Spring 2010 through AY ’10-’11; the startup can be put in place during AY ’11-’12 and the
program will officially be launched beginning September 2012 (for Fall 2012 transfer students). Ernie May
encouraged the Council to get preliminary plans in place as soon as possible in order to evaluate budgetary
needs. He also suggested that the Council ask for iterative campus feedback by mid-spring 2010 and submit the
program proposal for Faculty Senate approval by the end of Spring 2010. Brian O’Connor suggested that the
College Curriculum Committees be invited to “get down into the trenches’ in assisting with the local
developments of these options. GERICO was also suggested as an appropriate group for feedback and approval
of the proposal before going to the Faculty Senate. Maurianne Adams asked whether Council should review
existing capstone courses (499’s) and see whether they met the Integrative Experience criteria that the Council
was considering.

Learning Goals:
The Council reviewed the four learning goals for the Integrative Option (found on pages 12-13 of the ‘GenEd
Task Force Report’ from June 2009) and deliberated over whether the four learning goal statements extricated
from that report could be used as criteria for the Integrative Experience. The draft language from the GenEd
Task Force Report used for Council discussion include the following four learning outcomes::

1) MAKING CONNECTIONS, SYNTHESIS: Students make “connections among seemingly disparate
sets of information and experiences” [discussion notes: bodies of knowledge within major or broader
exploration of interdisciplinary sources of knowledge];

2) INTEGRATION, APPLICATION: Students practice “integrating and applying their learning to new
situations, challenging questions, and real-world problems”;

3) REFLECTION, ANALYSIS: Students “reflect on their own learning and explore the connections
between the broad exposure provided by General Education and the more focused exposure of their
4) COMMUNICATION, COLLABORATION: Students practice “oral communication, collaboration, and interdisciplinary perspective taking, at a more advanced level” [discussion concerning incorporation of “leadership” within this criterion]

Council members had many responses to the substance and the phrasing of these ideas and suggested different ways of framing and/or linking these four criteria. The discussion of (1) & (3) focused on student reflecting on the tools, methodology, and broad exposure developed in their General Education programs of study, in relation to their disciplinary area, major, or focused program of study. There was some discussion of the difference between an “integrative” experience and an “interdisciplinary” experience – the second is desirable, the first is core.

We agreed to return to this discussion during the first meeting of Spring 2010. Maurianne will revise the four proposed criteria to better reflect Council discussion, and Council will shape the language for Integrative Experience criteria in preparation for broader campus discussion.

**Logistical issues:**

1. Expect that Integrative Experience requirement will be met through a range of options, such as research seminars, integrative seminars, team projects, independent projects.
2. Expect that most IE options will be proposed at the level of the major, departments or concentration.
3. Highly encourage cross-departmental, cross-major IE’s
4. Expect that IE will be senior year (either semester)
5. IE can be paid for the way we currently pay for Junior year writing, at $210 per student (approximately $1,000,000.--). Many courses exist that could be revamped into IE. Not the expectation that an entire new set of courses or experiences need to be delivered.
6. Discussion of whether the Junior Year model for approval of IE options should be followed, or whether approval remains in hands of GenEd Council, perhaps through a standing subcommittee, parallel to standing approval subcommittees.

Ginger handed out packets of QQ-reviews, along with review rubrics. Council members were asked to prepare these reviews for discussion at the next (Dec 18th) meeting.

**Next Meeting:** Friday, December 18, 2009 at 2:30 PM, in the Chancellor’s Board Room, 370 Whitmore.