Minutes of the General Education Subcommittee  
April 21, 2015  
LI 2250  
8:30 am – 9:50 am  

Absent: none.  
Guests: Tom Bickley, Dennis Chester, Helen Ly, Sarah Nielsen, Glen Perry, Jason Singley, Donna Wiley.  

The Chair (Eagan) called the meeting to order at ???.  

1. Approval of the agenda. (??).  
2. Proposed GE plan. Glass presented the proposed GE model from last time. Eagan noted that the next CIC meeting is May 4 and the goal is pass a plan for the units before then. Glass noted that one of the online comments was asking why there couldn’t be multiple GE models. She indicated that she would have answered that it is not practical. Ivey said that there were some concerns about whether the code requirements would be restricted to double-count. She noted that History and Ethic Studies tend to fall in area C and Political Science tends to fall in D. There were questions about enforceability. Perry said that this is achievable, but questioned the spread in area D. Murphy responded that currently the lower division area D must be in 3 different disciplines and that there must be spread by EO 1100, though the spread is not as prescriptive as previous EOs. Eagan said that she prefers the current model of 3 different disciplines. Soules suggested that the lack of prescription may be part of the graduation initiative and said that mandating 2 distinct areas might be better for students. Murphy said that the 3 discipline spread is not frequently a problem for students. Ivey said that graduation rates should not be the priority. Glass said she favors downplaying complexity. Eagan argued for breadth. Murphy noted that prefix is a proxy and that the subcommittee might need to define “discipline” somehow. Liberti pointed out that Kinesiology, as an interdisciplinary department, has courses in areas B, C, and D. Move to approve the GE framework (M Murphy/S Soules/P). During subsequent discussion, it was noted that the “advanced writing requirement” should be specified as replacing 1002, doesn’t have to be upper division, and would not satisfy the writing skills requirement. Watnik suggested using the term “second comp” instead of “advanced writing”. Ivey said that some departments have expressed concerns over the writing course in the disciplines. Nielsen and Ly suggested discipline-specific versions of ENGL 1002. Glass said that the second comp course should be focused on instruction on writing and not just “writing a lot”. Soules added that the writing should be corrected (or some mechanism for improvement). Bickley suggested that the campus consider
ways to address team teaching (in the context of the second comp course, this would allow the subject matter expert to collaborate. The subcommittee established that second comp cannot be a GE course. Watnik suggested that second comp courses should be paid for by the corresponding programs/colleges so as not to foist costs upon CLASS and the English Department, in particular. Murphy re-emphasized that the second comp courses would have to be approved by the writing skills subcommittee. The subcommittee suggested using “writing II” in place of “second comp”.

3. Adjournment. (M Watnik/S Eagan/P). The meeting was adjourned at 9:55.

Respectfully submitted,
Mitchell Watnik, subcommittee secretary