

**General Education Committee**  
**WH D-442**  
**Monday, December 12, 2011**  
**10:00am - 12pm**  
**Minutes**

**Present:** D. Best, E. Kulikov, L. Hutton, P. Krochalk, M. Suchenek, L. Skiffer, E. Magruder, L. Fitzsimmons, K. Ganezer, S. Pawar, M. Eyman, C. Turner, R. Welch (Nursing), K. Chai (Nursing)

**Absent:** D. Belu, I. Heinze-Balcazar, J. Bersi, C. Dales

1. **Call to order:** 10:13am
2. **Approval of Agenda**
  - a. M. Suchenek moved to approve. L. Hutton seconded. M/S/P
  - b. Agenda Approved
3. **Approval of Minutes- November 28, 2011**
  - a. M. Suchenek moved to approve. L. Skiffer seconded. M/S/P
  - b. Minutes Approved

**Old Business**

**GE Charge: Updating**

1. Rose Welch and Kathy Chai attended to represent School of Nursing (SON) regarding the issue of having a representative from SON on the GE Committee.
2. R. Welch- Stated that representation from SON is essential on the GE committee. C. Shea was their representative in the past.
  - a. 100% of their students are transfer students. SON should have a representative so they can act to ensure GE conforms to legislative mandates.
  - b. SON programs are offered through distance learning, therefore there is an issue in finding an on-campus representative to serve on GE.
  - c. R. Welch- Shared that Acting Dean of the College of Professional Studies Anupama Joshi supports her notion that each school within the college should have representation on GE.
  - d. L. Fitzsimmons requested R. Welch will be added to the GE email distribution list until a representative is selected.
3. L. Fitzsimmons presented the revised GE Charge to the Academic Senate. They had the following questions and suggested/required revisions:

- a. Academic Senate questioned if the current GE charge was being reviewed and updated. L. Fitzsimmons checked and confirmed that GE has been updating the current charge presented by the administration.
- b. Voting Members- Natural Sciences
  - i. Remove "Pre-Health Professional Programs"
- c. Voting Members- Arts and Humanities
  - i. Change "Art" to "Art and Design."
4. Ex-officio (non-voting Members)- Change to Liberal Studies "Department"
  - a. There was question if the Liberal Studies Department has a Chair or Coordinator over the department.
  - b. L. Hutton will take the question back to the department and Associate Dean Cindy Grutzik for clarification.
5. Academic Senators questioned why the Liberal Studies representative is not a voting member and why representatives from Area F are voting members.
  - a. Lois Feuer was the original author of the GE charge. She responded to these inquiries via memorandum giving the rationale and principle for making these which was forwarded to the GE committee by L. Fitzsimmons per L. Feuer's request.
6. UNV 101 is offered through the University Advisement Center and Academic Programs/Academic Affairs; however both representatives are non-voting members.
7. P. Krochalk- In principle she supports and appreciates the input from a broad-based voting committee.
8. L. Fitzsimmons - The principle that the GE Committee is going by is that every college/school has a vote and areas offering GE courses get another vote.

**Comment [I1]:** Lois Feuer and Associate Vice-President Linda Pomerantz were the original authors of the GE charge. Lois Feuer responded to these inquiries via memorandum giving the rationale and principle for making these voting members, which was forwarded to the GE committee by L. Fitzsimmons per L. Feuer's request. In the memorandum, L. Feuer stated: "The basic principle is that faculty members who oversee "chunks" of GE curriculum...are voting members because they "manage" . . . a large list of courses each term, and thus have a constituency to represent. "

**Comment [I2]:** Managing

### GE Program Review: Updating

1. L. Fitzsimmons has updated the GE program review report.
  - a. Included the most current GE description from the university catalog.
  - b. Updated the report on the assessment that has been continued this year.
  - c. Inserted the strategic planning with budget reduction on how to save money in the area of GE.
2. GE will move forward in the program review process. L. Fitzsimmons sent recommendations for two evaluators both willing to serve as external reviewers. One evaluator for the sciences, one for the non-sciences.
  - a. P. Krochalk questioned if there should be an evaluator for the social sciences.

3. S. Pawar- There is a budgetary issue; the university may not be able to pay two reviewers.
4. L. Fitzsimmons – Questioned the possibility of splitting the \$1000 stipend between the two reviewers.
5. L. Fitzsimmons – Recommended Dr. Quinn if only one external reviewer can be selected.
6. S. Pawar- Will inform M. Maki and J. Bersi that GE is requesting funds for two selected external reviewers because of the scope involved for program review.
  - a. P. Krochalk- Suggested requesting funding for a third external reviewer.
  - b. There should be broad expertise for GE review.
7. M. Suchenek –Suggested requesting a cost amount and split among the evaluators.

#### **Area G Review Update: Sociology**

1. A subcommittee assessed this area last semester. Sociology was called upon to make revisions for GE objectives and minor modifications. Sociology has responded.
2. L. Fitzsimmons - They included all the requirements for syllabi requirements and GE requirements. In her opinion the syllabi are up to standards.
3. L. Fitzsimmons moved to accept all Sociology course syllabi. D. Best seconded. M/S/P
4. Approved

#### **Transfer FTE to F departments**

1. The need to support breadth in upper division Area F by smaller units.
2. Transfer of FTE to the serving unit will encourage the units to be more involved in GE.
  - a. Asian Pacific Studies is an example.
3. If they had upper division courses, there would be a growth of the unit. More access to university population, encourage population growth of minor/major.
4. P. Krochalk- All FTE refer to the department offering the course. It follows the instructor.
5. M. Suchenek- Suggested stating it as a principle; the units should not go to the unit, they should go to the area.
6. K. Ganezer- It is better to have a coordinator among those students that will speak for all the different departments with the voice of the requirements. The transfer of FTE is an incentive.

7. E. Magruder- Questioned the argument against transferring FTE.
  - a. L. Fitzsimmons - FTE competition among the departments could put a cap on the number for GE. The idea of transferring is to increase the breadth of offering.
8. P. Krochalk- Advocates that the FTE go with the department that offers the course.
9. M. Suchenek - Motion to support this particular issue and principle that FTE should be transferred to the departments that offer the courses.
  - a. P. Krochalk seconded. Friendly amendment that FTE follow the department that is offering the GE course.
10. D. Best- A broader resolution should be done by Academic Senate.
11. S. Pawar- This is a matter for deans because it involves workload. Anything broader than Area F is out of GE areas.
12. K. Ganezer- Friendly amendment: While maintaining current SBS and SMT structure and functions of the coordinator and committee.
13. Motion to approve statement as amended: We support the transfer of FTE to the departments serving Area F while maintaining the current SMT/SBS structure.
14. 1 Abstention
15. Approved. This is the statement for the deans.

**Comment [13]:** Could deteriorate the quality and reduce the range of offerings.

**Comment [14]:** SBS, SMT, HUM

**Comment [15]:** SMT, SBS, HUM

16. **Announcements:** none
17. **Adjournment:** 11:31am