

General Education Committee Meeting
March 14, 2011
9:30am-11:30am
WH- 442- Provosts Conference Room
Minutes

Present: M. Eyman, E.C. Dales, L. Pu, L. Skiffer, M. Suchenek, F. Fitzsimmons, P. Krochalk, D. Belu, C. Turner, P. Kalayjian, B. Gomez

Absent: Ken Ganezer; Jamie Dote-Kwan; Ivonne Heinze-Balcazar

Call to Order: 9:44am

Agenda: M. Suchenek moved to approve. D. Belu seconded. M/S/P

- a. Agenda approved.

February 28, 2011 Minutes: M. Suchenek noted a misquote under the 5th paragraph under HIS 121 minutes.

- a. He submitted correction to M. Banda to read: "M. Suchenek is against telling the department what changes to make and approve or reject the proposal when it's ready."
- b. M. Suchenek moved to approve with correction. L. Skiffer seconded. M/S/P
- c. Minutes approved as revised.

HIS 120 and HIS 121

1. P. Krochalk questioned if there had been correspondence regarding the confusion with the courses.
 - d. L. Fitzsimmons shared that the original concern has been resolved. There was some confusion with the History courses because the two were not received by Academic Programs at the same time.
2. P. Krochalk expressed concern regarding the wording of the SLO's noting that they are not measurable as stated.
3. L. Fitzsimmons commented that the SLO's for HIS 120 are not measurable and poorly written. The only concern with the courses is that the SLO's are not measurable.
4. C. Monty and K. Fawver attended to present the History proposals.
 - e. M. Suchenek commented that the course syllabi do not reflect history of Eastern Europe. Suggested the department may consider including history from that region.
 - f. With the course title as World Civilization, he feels it suggests there may be more focused topics in the course. With the title change to World History, he believes the course should offer more comprehensive world coverage in the curriculum.

5. C. Monty stated that since these are general education survey courses, it is not possible to cover everything in one course. The purpose is to move to a global scale of analysis and less focus on every cultural community.
 - g. The focus is on how cultural communities have contributed to the changes in the global world, including economic and political changes.
 - h. M. Suchenek suggested the department consider including “survey” in the course title or course description to clarify the course content for students.
 - i. C. Monty stated that unless others on committee think it is necessary, then it is not a major problem therefore does not require modification.
6. L. Fitzsimmons expressed concern regarding the phrasing of the Student Learning Outcomes stating the course syllabi do not follow a standardized format and the SLO’s are not written in the contemporary trends of measurable terms.
 - j. HIS 120, #1- The statement seems to be a typo and cut off.
 - k. C. Monty acknowledged the error and will bring it to the attention of course instructor J. Jeffers for revision.
7. P. Krochalk questioned if there should be an outcome that involves evaluation, integration or comparison.
 - l. C. Monty stated that #2 satisfies that.
8. L. Fitzsimmons commented that the phrasing of “value appropriately” and “sense the need” on under Affinities learning outcomes, #1 and #2 on HIS 120 needs to be rephrased. They are not measurable as stated and wanted to bring that to the department’s attention.
 - m. C. Monty questioned how Affinities can be quantified.
9. K. Fawver questioned if the courses meet the objectives for GE Area D.
 - n. L. Fitzsimmons agreed the courses do meet the objectives.
10. C. Monty noted to the committee that he is on the Program Review Panel (PRP) and in touch with UCC/USLOAC Chair Cathy Jacobs.
 - o. It has not been his understanding that SLO’s have to be in certain terms.
11. K. Fawver thanked GE for drawing this topic to their attention and wanted to know if the original concern that had been brought up regarding the courses had been rectified.
 - p. L. Fitzsimmons shared that the original concern had been discussed and clarified. There was confusion when the courses were originally submitted because they were not received at the same time due to some hold up at the college curriculum committee level.
12. P. Krochalk stated that it is not the GE committee’s job to dictate the content and how they need to be stated.
13. P. Krochalk moved to approve the courses with the raising of the concern of the wording of the Student Learning Outcomes and that the wording of the outcomes complies with USLOAC and be brought into measurable terms
14. L. Skiffer seconded. M/S/P- Approved.
15. M. Suchenek abstained.

Area Review SMT Report Subcommittee Formation

1. L. Fitzsimmons informed GE that a subcommittee needs to be formed to assess the SMT report. She is working on getting an outside representative from the College of

Natural and Behavioral Sciences to be a representative on the subcommittee. She called for volunteers or comments for the SMT subcommittee.

- a. None at this time.

Announcements

P. Kalayjian as Senate Executive representative also informed that committee that she sits on the Chancellor's GE Advisory Committee. She offered to accept any questions and/or comments to bring up at their next meeting.

M. Eyman suggested she bring up the topic of the requirements of 2nd baccalaureate students with the request to put out a memorandum on General Education, upper division and statutory course work. GE is different among the CSU's regarding 2nd baccalaureate students and questioned if they are they required to complete upper division GE?

The university needs clarification of what needs to be done and suggested it would be nice to have the requirements standardized among all CSU's.

This includes 2nd baccalaureate students and upper division transfer students. Having a formal requirement will help with a decrease in student petitions regarding GE.

Adjournment: 10:37am