

**LPWG-GEC  
Meeting Notes  
September 28, 2007**

**Present:** Bill Friedrichs, Jim Hayes, John Pauley, Lora Friedrich, Lydia Sinapova, Stephanie Krauth, Maria DiPalma, Murphy Waggoner, Sal Meyers, and Steve Griffith  
**Absent:** Since all members of the LPWG are invited to attend the meeting of the LPWG-GEC group, my meeting notes will not include absent members.

The meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m. by Steve Griffith. Griffith began by providing the working group his thoughts on the purpose of the group and his expectations of the members of the group.

Griffith said that he believed that the group should remain focused on what is best for our students and that it was likely that the work of the group will be the most significant contribution members will make to the college in their careers. Each student is impacted by general education. He said that he expected the group to work collaboratively in an honest and respectful way. Griffith said that although ten of the LPWG were elected or appointed from the divisions, each person in the group should be focused on the goals of the project and working together to create recommendations that the entire faculty could support. Each of the members of the group brings disciplinary expertise to the discussion, but should not be thinking of their work as simply representing a division, department or faction of the faculty. He asked the group to think of themselves as much representatives to their departments and disciplines as representing a specific constituency. He asked faculty members to come to the discussions with an open mind and a willingness to work together towards the common goal of improving the education of our students. Griffith said that although it was likely that differences of opinion existed and would continue to exist among participants, it was important that the group work together to create an academic program that a significant majority of the faculty could support. He felt that was important for all members to feel comfortable expressing her or his opinion and that all opinions were important. Griffith believes that it is the responsibility of every member of the group to help the group work together to accomplish the tasks ahead.

In addition, Griffith said that the role of the chair or co-chairs is to help the group come to consensus. The leadership provided by the chair is organizational. He said that although he would likely chair most meetings, he has asked John Pauley and Murphy Waggoner to serve as co-chairs. The chair will help the group come to agreement, summarize what it has done or wants to do and make sure that all members have been included in the discussion and debate. The group will work by consensus, but not be paralyzed by seeking unanimity on every issue. Griffith asked that if a member of the committee felt she or he did not agree with the group's recommendation that the person would be vocal about the disagreement, work to change the recommendation but in the end support the work of the group and be able to articulate the rationale for the position taken by the group. If supporting the recommendations of the group was not possible, he

suggested that that faculty member continue to remain with the group but consider “standing aside” and not work against the will of the group.

A discussion was held about the need to involve the wider faculty in the decision-making. It was agreed that this was important and that the goal is to bring forward proposals that have the support of the faculty. It was agreed that the LPWG needs to be open and transparent in its working and hold meetings with constituents who will be affected by any proposed change. Several methods of communicating the work of the group were discussed. It was agreed that Shelley Priebe would be asked to take notes and that a synopsis of each meeting would be sent to all faculty with a link to the complete set of notes should they wish to review them. In addition, Griffith said that he would make regular reports to the faculty at the monthly Faculty Meeting. He also said that the Working Group would have to help educate other faculty about the issues that will be addressed.

A question was asked about the Strategic Thinking/Planning Report and how it would fit into the work of the Working Group. Griffith said that he believed that the Report should inform the work of the Group, but not bind it. He feels that the Working Group must respond to the recommendations in the Report, but understand that its recommendations come from a variety of sources and constituencies. A concern was expressed regarding the timeline and having one group work on the structural issues and one group work on the general education issues. Griffith said that he believed that the Structures Group would be bringing its recommendations back to the full LPWG in time to inform the final stages of the discussion on general education. It is his hope that the structural issues can be brought forward by January/February. The whole LPWG will have to decide how to present their recommendations to the faculty.

It was agreed that the next meeting would focus on the work of the summer group. Other members of the summer groups would be invited to the meeting to share their experience and what they learned. The conversation will focus on the process of the summer and not be a full discussion of the models produced by the summer group. As the strategic planning documents and the AAC&U documents were important in the summer discussions, all members of the LPWG-GEC are asked to review them before the next meeting.