Minutes of the General Education Subcommittee
May 26, 2015
LI 2250
8:30 am – 10:00 am

Absent: Lawrence Bliss, Yi Karnes, Rita Liberti, Sally Murphy.
Guests: Eileen Barrett, Susan Gubernat, Sarah Nielsen, Jason Singley.

The Chair (Eagan) called the meeting to order at 8:38.

1. Approval of the agenda. There was no formal agenda. The Chair requested a summary of the last meeting and the Senate meeting in which the framework was discussed. Glass spoke about the previous meeting, in which there was some consensus about the overlays. Ivey spoke about the Senate meeting, noting that there were questions about the second composition course, as well as concerns expressed about B5 and area F. Nielsen asked about whether the subcommittee wanted to go with the term "second composition", as opposed to the “advanced composition / writing in the discipline” course listed on the proposal. Eagan indicated that there was no such consensus. Gubernat asked whether this subcommittee would certify advanced writing courses. Eagan responded that she felt that those courses would be the province of the writing skills subcommittee. Glass expressed concern with this subcommittee handling non-EO 1100 requirements. Ivey spoke about using a lower division requirement even for transfer students. Soules mentioned “trying to do too much with too little.” She mentioned that it is not a good idea to have non-composition teachers teach composition. Gubernat said that the current English 1002 might meet A3 requirements. She noted that many majors offer too little writing, and that she was concerned with this subcommittee being charged with evaluating the worthiness of courses to satisfy a writing requirement. Nielsen argued that second comp should be separate from A3 and recommended second comp as a sophomore course (and perhaps a capstone course). Ivey asked rhetorically whether writing in the discipline is possible. She asked the English Department representatives to distinguish between objectives between ENGL 1002 and a writing skills course. Barrett had sent learning outcomes for the former. Nielsen noted that the first-tier courses did not have any research component, but second tier courses allow for research within the discipline. Singley reiterated Ivey’s note by saying that it sounds as though the writing component could be added to existing courses or whether it would be a brand new (set of) course(s). Gubernat referred to “writing as knowing” and said that adding writing to existing courses is not enough. Soules said that nobody writes enough. Eagan spoke adamantly about not combining second comp and A3. Satin spoke about case studies in
her accounting courses. She noted that MKTG 3495 used to be required of all students, but that is not the case anymore. Also, her courses have too many students to grade valuably. She believes that writing should be in the English Department. Nielsen said that she is supportive of writing in the discipline, but that professional development would be necessary. She said that she feels it would be appropriate for CIC, Writing Skills Subcommittee, GE, and/or ILO subcommittee would be appropriate to have purview. Gubernat said that she suspects that most of the (8) other CSUs that require second comp probably allow it to double-count with A3. Eagan asked about the graduate writing assistant program. Barrett responded that the program was funded with assigned time to faculty, as well as graduate students. There were about 12 courses per quarter that used the program. Now that program is being managed in the Library. Nielsen said that Helen Ly (the writing center director of the SCAA) is getting the program back up. Eagan questioned the feasibility of this. Nielsen said that someone with a writing in the discipline / writing across the curriculum expert funded full-time to really make this happen. Soules reminded the subcommittee that the support structure is likely to dissipate quickly. Hallab argued that writing across the curriculum is not sustainable. Barrett argued that the graduation requirements should be 51 units. Hallab discussed writing issues in his online courses. Eagan suggested that ENGL 1002 can be protected, even if exceptions would be permitted for high unit majors, such as Engineering or Nursing. Singley said that, if the ENGL 1002 outcomes are maintained, then the high unit programs could argue that they have a class that meet the outcome. Gubernat said that, system-wide, high unit majors such as Engineering majors are getting exemptions from A3. Glass asked whether A1 could include writing. Gubernat said that they were able to do so at University of Iowa, but they also had a rhetoric department. Eagan repeatedly expressed concerns about combining numerous outcomes into one course.


Respectfully submitted,
Mitchell Watnik, subcommittee secretary