

General Education Committee
WH D-442
Monday, March 12, 2012
10:00am - 12.00pm
Minutes

Present: D. Best, Marie Palladini (proxy for E. Kulikov), P. Krochalk, M. Suchenek, E. Magruder, L. Fitzsimmons, I. Heinze-Balcazar, S. Pawar, M. Maki, C. Dales, C. Turner

Absent: L. Hutton, L. Goldman, D. Belu (L. Fitzsimmons- proxy), L. Skiffer (L. Fitzsimmons- proxy), K. Ganezer, J. Bersi, N. Palacios, B. McLelland

1. **Call to order:** 10:13am

2. **Approval of Agenda:**

- a. E. Magruder asked that the committee start to look at the STAR Act. She expressed concern and wants clarification about this topic and has questions about criteria for high unit majors.
- b. Motion to add the topic of discussion of STAR Act and exception for high unit majors to the agenda.
 - i. I. Heinze-Balcazar seconded. M/S/P
 1. Approved.
- c. I. Heinze-Balcazar moved to postpone discussion of BUS 445 until the SBS subcommittee can meet and discuss the proposal.
 - i. P. Krochalk questioned the timeline for review and approval of the proposal.
- d. I. Heinze-Balcazar- SBS was contacted indirectly about the proposal's review; proposed the SBS subcommittee will hold an emergency meeting to review the proposal; they have not been given a timeline.
- e. S. Pawar- this course is being proposed as a GE course, not as an SBS course therefore does not require review by the SBS subcommittee.
 - i. Timeline has been established so that all proposals for the STAR Act need to have completed the entire curriculum review process by April 30th.

- f. P. Krochalk-point of information- Business is not being raised as a high unit program.
- g. I. Heinze-Balcazar moved to postpone the discussion of agenda item BUS 445.
- h. D. Best- for sake of consistency wants to hear the SBS subcommittee's opinion on the proposal.
 - i. D. Best seconded the motion to postpone the discussion of the BUS 445 proposal. M/S
- i. P. Krochalk- friendly amendment- questioned if GE would be able to meet over spring break to review the courses prior to the April 30th deadline.
- j. M. Maki- the next scheduled GE meeting would not be until April which is the earliest that the committee would be able to review the proposal which also still needs to go to UCC for review. Questioned another avenue for review so that the proposals can go through the process.
- k. S. Pawar- questioned why the SBS committee is going to review a Business course that does not have an SBS prefix. The GE objectives are what need to be reviewed by the GE committee.
 - i. L. Fitzsimmons – there is a need to check for the expertise of cultural purview.
- l. S. Pawar- Business Administration needs the GE committee to check the GE objectives, not the cultural part for SBS; this is what is being asked by the department.
- m. L. Fitzsimmons- there is a motion and a second to the motion on table.
- n. I. Heinze-Balcazar – the course will still count as a SBS course.
- o. S. Pawar – questioned the reasoning for the SBS subcommittee's review of the course if their purpose is to review courses with the SBS prefix.
 - i. I. Heinze-Balcazar – it is procedure for the committee to review the course; not for an approval.
- p. P. Krochalk- questioned if the department has the expertise to offer the course.

- q. S. Pawar – commented that committees do not have an official approval over proposals.
- r. L. Fitzsimmons- commented to S. Pawar that she has gone on record at Academic Senate that (Academic Affairs) will go by official procedure for review of proposals related to the STAR Act.
- s. M. Suchenek- raised issue that it's important to be particular that who offers the course has the expertise to teach the course.
- t. M. Palladini (Public Administration) - proxy for E. Kulikov- questioned what the general goal or mission of GE committee is.
 - 1. L. Fitzsimmons- the charge of the committee is to review the curriculum.
- ii. M. Palladini - questioned where the issue lies with the BUS course since the committee has the proposal with the grid of outlined GE objectives. She asked why the committee can't approve the BUS course proposal in question.
 - 1. L. Fitzsimmons – the issue is that procedure has not been followed.
- iii. M. Palladini – questioned if the course doesn't meet the GE objectives.
 - 1. L. Fitzsimmons - it has not gone through the procedure.
- iv. I. Heinze-Balcazar – the SBS subcommittee will meet on an emergency basis to follow timeline.
- v. M. Maki- asked if GE will review the proposal assuming the SBS subcommittee will approve the course. We are delaying this process over a month and willing to work to have it reviewed by appropriate subcommittee.
- u. D. Best- stated she feels uncomfortable reviewing the course without the SBS subcommittee's review. Suggested an emergency meeting in 2 weeks.
- vi. I. Heinze-Balcazar – questioned if GE could come back on April 2nd to meet for an emergency meeting.

v. M. Suchenek- commented it is important to hear other body's comments. GE makes informed decisions based on subcommittee's review.

w. S. Pawar - objects to the SBS review of this course. There's nothing in university curriculum guide that says these courses need to be reviewed by these subcommittees; they are reviewed by the departments. They do not have SBS prefixes. This review is not a rule and makes it out of procedure.

1. Also for SMT and HUM.

x. P. Krochalk- commented that GE is an interdisciplinary group; GE may have the expertise with their representation currently around the table.

y. I. Heinze-Balcazar - called to question.

z. L. Fitzsimmons - motion to hold review of BUS 445 until SBS subcommittee meets, reviews and gives recommendation on the course.

i. E. Magruder seconded. M/S

ii. L. Fitzsimmons holds 2 proxies- 5 pro; 2 oppose; 1 abstention

1. Motion passes

aa. M. Maki- we have a charge to get this done in terms of STAR Act. Wants to be true to what he said in Senate (about procedure). Questioned a way to complete review this week; option of GE having an emergency meeting next week.

i. I. Heinze-Balcazar - the SBS subcommittee will try to meet this week.

bb. D. Best- moved to hold an emergency GE meeting next week.

cc. L. Fitzsimmons- Motion on the table to hold an emergency meeting next Monday, March 19th at regularly scheduled meeting time.

i. I. Heinze-Balcazar will bring a report from the SBS subcommittee.

ii. S. Pawar - this is not normal procedure for the subcommittee to submit a report; asking for separate supplemental approval is not normal procedure.

- iii. P. Krochalk- strongly questions area review when not under the prefix.
 - iv. E. Magruder – questioned the procedure with short timeline; does not want to vote on something without knowing the full implications and its impact on the GE curriculum.
 - v. M. Suchenek- part of the process is to look at who can be affected and ensure that high quality standards are met.
 - vi. P. Krochalk- commented make sure that someone from Business department is at the GE meeting.
- dd. L. Fitzsimmons- motion on the table that GE will meet next Monday (March 19th) at regularly scheduled time. (10am-12pm)
- i. P. Krochalk seconded. M/S/P
 - 1. Approved; 1 abstention
 - 2. L. Fitzsimmons- advised the committee to send a proxy if they are not available to attend the meeting.
- ee. M. Suchenek moved to approve agenda as amended. I. Heinze-Balcazar seconded. M/S/P
- i. Amended agenda approved.

3. Approval of Minutes:

- a. M. Suchenek moved to approve. D. Best seconded. M/S/P
 - i. Approved; 2 abstentions

New Business

- 1. STAR Act and exception for high unit majors
 - a. L. Fitzsimmons - High unit majors are designated by the system.
 - b. E. Magruder – questioned why our high unit majors may not fit the 120 unit requirement and majors at other universities can.
 - i. M. Maki – universities employ different strategies.
 - ii. S. Pawar – some universities double count American Institutions, waive American Institutions, double counting courses, and reduce

number of units in major. Business cannot reduce units because of accreditation.

- c. E. Magruder – questioned if exceptions will be allowed for high unit majors; would exceptions be driven by finances.
- d. C. Turner- all TMC (Transfer Model Curriculum) that have come out are not for high unit majors yet.
 - i. M. Maki - the assumption is that all proposals that are coming through at this time will be approved because they are not high unit majors.
- e. E. Magruder - does that mean those students in high unit majors stay longer?
 - i. P. Krochalk- No. Students take more units. It's driven by accreditation to certification and licensure.
- f. S. Pawar - this is about pathways to provide a way for students to get them graduated in 60 units.
 - i. C. Turner- the goal of the STAR Act is for students to be able to transfer to any CSU. The TMC streamlines lower division requirements making them acceptable to all CSU's.
- g. M. Palladini- circle back to agenda item CJA 340 course. She teaches in that department; there were learning outcomes focused on cultural pluralism. When she read the proposal, she also read the goals for SBS 318 course and thinks CJA 340 would be a very enriching course as it's presented. The textbooks and discussions would be enriching.
 - i. M. Palladini had an updated course proposal and syllabus for CJA 340 which was not available to the GE committee.
- h. D. Best moved for the SBS subcommittee to consult about CJA 340 in addition to BUS 445.
 - i. E. Magruder seconded.
- i. M. Suchenek- suppose they approve it as substitution for SBS, why can't other students take it as well. Requested the committee think about that and bring the topic back to the table.
 - i. His read is that they can substitute for all students. This committee can approve for both.
 - ii. M. Maki - friendly amendment. New syllabus for CJA 340 will be sent to GE and I. Heinze-Balcazar for review.
 - iii. M. Maki - clarify that it's not going to be a 6 unit course.

- j. P. Krochalk- point of clarification for restrictions of double counting of BUS majors.
 - i. S. Pawar- can restrict enrollment to BUS majors only.
- k. Motion to postpone review of CJA 340 until full revised document is distributed and GE meets again. M/S/P
 - i. Approved
- l. E. Magruder – asked if there is a model SBS 318 syllabus similar to the HUM that they can use as an example to compare courses to.
 - i. Yes there is.

Old Business

1. Area Review Update

- a. Psychology has been submitted. Their report will need to be distributed to the subcommittee.
- b. Computer Science- need to confirm with T. Haney if it has been received by Academic Programs.
- c. P. Krochalk is not able to stay on the HUM 200 subcommittee. L. Fitzsimmons called for volunteer to replace her.
 - i. I. Heinze-Balcazar volunteered to serve on the HUM 200 area review subcommittee.

Announcements

- 1. M. Maki- on behalf of the Physics department, requested that GE address the issue of Physics waiving the SMT requirement for one of their options.
 - a. L. Fitzsimmons- this item can be added to the emergency meeting agenda.
 - b. Physics department chair John Price will be invited to the GE meeting.

Adjournment: M. Suchenek/D. Best 11:30 a.m.