

GEC Minutes: October 19, 2009

Present: Armstrong, Chen, O'Mansky, McManus, Crist, Miller, Mullins, Munro, Bonhomme, Ritchey, Gergits, Stringer, Horvath, Koneval

Students have been appointed, but not the BCOE representative.



- The GEC members unanimously approved the minutes from September 29 meeting.
- We welcomed the new member (returning member!), Joni Koneval, one of our SGA appointees.
- Nate Ritchey continued his discussion of the University College initiative. What follows is a summary of what he presented to the committee:
 - The committee charged with proposing the University College (UC) is Nate, Jonelle Beatrice, Cheryl Bosley, and Jane Kestner. They worked together on the Student Success committee that submitted its recommendations this past summer.
 - The proposed structure for the UC includes general-education reporting to the new dean.
 - The UC will have a dean and two associate deans; new advisors will be added. The Center for Student Progress will move.
 - The Board has approved the initiative and a budget has been discussed.
 - What, exactly, the new college will be is still under discussion. It began as an initiative to support at-risk and undeclared students; it has evolved to include far more options, including the general-education and honors programs. The University of Toledo includes honors in its UC. The Senate will help to articulate the parameters of this college.
 - Just assuming that at-risk and undeclared students would begin under the UC, more than half of YSU's students would be affected. They don't want to take pre-major students from their colleges (pre-nursing, pre-education, etc.), but those students who are really not going to succeed in their "pre" field should be moved. Transfer students, particularly those who are at risk, should be moved.
 - Some degree programs might be moved: General Studies, for instance. Nate mentioned that some UCs include graduate programs.
 - A proposal that articulates the proposed structure, chain of command, and which groups/programs should migrate will be presented in the next few weeks.
 - The goal is to formalize this partnership between academic and student affairs.
 - The rationale for including honors and general-education is to make the college more broadly based, not a "loser college."
- A fruitful question and answer ensued:
 - When asked if this isn't actually a dressed up "loser college," Nate replied that the overall mission of the UC has evolved from a simple one (to help those at-risk students) to a more complex and hard-to-articulate one. As it has assumed more divisions, its mission has become murky.
 - It was suggested that the UC needs positive reasons for programs and divisions to move—some demonstration of how they'll benefit from the change. Nate said that gen-ed, for instance, suffers from no resources or support. If it were moved to this new college, there would be a staff to help with initiatives, such as freshman seminars. Some changes that aren't possible under the current structure would be possible.
- Members of the GEC wanted to know if they were to vote on this: We haven't been asked to voice an opinion on the proposed changes. Gergits noted that if the administration wishes to make this change, it's in their power to do so. Administration controls the structure of the institution. The faculty controls most aspects of curriculum and some small aspects of administration, but they have little say in structure. If the powers-that-be want a new college, they can create it without our approval.

- discussed and moved on the following courses:
 - Communications 2653—Small Group Communication (OI): Moved for approval by Crist, seconded by Sharon, passed unanimously
 - Economics 3705—Environmental and Resource Economics (WI): Moved for approval by Crist, seconded by O'Mansky, passed unanimously
 - GERO/ Sociology 3755—Theories of Gerontology (WI): Moved by for approval by O'Mansky, seconded by Crist, passed unanimously
 - English 4843—Advanced Professional and Technical Communication (WI): Moved for approval by Munro, seconded by Armstrong, passed unanimously
 - Human Ecology (FNUT) 4874: Community Nutrition (WI): Tabled—Some questions regarding the amount of writing and drafting and the use of group projects, primarily in the syllabus. The overview portion is clear enough but not supported by the syllabus. Gergits will follow up to get clarification and probably a revised syllabus and calendar.
 - Geology 1500 and 1500L (NS and lab): Moved for approval by Ritchey, seconded by Crist, passed unanimously
 - Counseling 1589—Success in Career and Life Planning (PS): Tabled—Some questions regarding the grading system
- GER revision took up the remaining time:
 - Gergits shared her and Horvath's brainstorm for revising the learning outcomes—these are offered purely as brainstorm to get our discussion moving. Neither of us is dedicated to or protective of these brainstorm.
 - Ritchey began a discussion of the University College initiative that will have some (maybe a lot) of impact on how we revise the current model. He anticipates this college proposing changes either to the model itself or for their college alone. It's not yet clear what the role of the GEC will be in this process. He will continue the discussion at the next meeting.

GEC Meeting Schedule Fall 2009

September 1, Provost's meeting room	Tuesday, 3:00, October 27, Stambaugh
September 15, Stambaugh, Kilcawley	Tuesday, 3:00, November 10, Stambaugh
Tuesday, 3:00, September 29, Stambaugh	Tuesday, 3:00, November 24, Stambaugh
Tuesday, 3:00, October 20, Provost's Conference Room	Tuesday, 3:00, December 8, Stambaugh