



## **General Education Committee**

**Monday, March 25, 2013**  
**10:00-12:00 – Provost’s Conference Room**

### **Minutes- Amended**

**1. Call to Order**

**2. Approval of Agenda**

**3. Approval of Minutes**

**4. New Business**

**a. FIN 200 Proposal (2<sup>nd</sup> Reading) – R. Ulivi, T. Norman, J. Wen**

- i. The Finance department revised the syllabus based on the template provided by the GEC.
  1. The course objectives are now linked to the Area E objectives
  2. The course is more humanistic in content
  3. The references to extra credit were removed

**b. ECO 210 Proposal (2<sup>nd</sup> Reading) – B. Yavas, T. Norman, J. Wen**

- i. The course syllabus was revised to link the objectives to the Area D Objectives.
- ii. The committee asked if it would be better for students to use the Wall Street Journal app available for smart phones and tablets. T. Norman informed the committee that the app has limited free content. It is better for the students to access the WSJ from the University Library where there is a subscription and it is free to use.
- iii. P. Kalayjian moved to approve the course. E. Magruder seconded the motion. M/S/P

**c. ECO 211 Proposal (2<sup>nd</sup> Reading) – B. Yavas, T. Norman, J. Wen**

- i. The course syllabus was revised to link the objectives to the Area D Objectives.
- ii. The weekly schedule was revised to be more specific
- iii. P. Kalayjian moved to approve the course. E. Magruder seconded the motion. M/S/P
- iv. T. Norman thanked E. Magruder for her assistance with the revisions to the syllabi.

**d. CSC 121 Proposal (1st reading) – M. Beheshti**

- i. Computer Science program requests to add CSC 121 to Area E.
- ii. This is a required course for Computer Science majors.
- iii. Dr. Beheshti informed the committee that this course is a GE requirement at other campuses.
- iv. The committee questioned if this would only double count for majors only or will it be available for all students.
- v. The double counting of this course is essential to the reduction of units in the Computer Science major to 120.
- vi. Beheshti has seen this course used in Area E or as a critical reasoning course on other campuses.
- vii. In order to benefit the Computer Science majors the course must be counted in Area E because the program is already able to double count courses in the other areas.
- viii. M. Suchenek informed the committee that the course targets CSC majors and it prepares them for lifelong learning in areas of technology such as cyberspace.
- ix. P. Krochalk recommends that the department revise the syllabus to demonstrate how this course is a fit for Area E. The syllabus should reflect the GE Area E objectives.
- x. M. Maki expressed that there is a concern of the time for approval. Programs are required to reduce units by the end of April. M. Maki asked if the committee would approve the proposal pending receipt of the requested revisions without having to return to another GE meeting.
- xi. L. Fitzsimmons stated that there is a template provided and that the changes could be accomplished within the time frame.
- xii. The committee asked about the differences between double counting for specific majors and offered exclusively to those majors and double counting in general. If a course passes the general criteria and meets area objectives, why can't the course be available for everyone.
- xiii. M. Suchenek stated that he thought the standards should be the same for all courses, even those that would be exclusive to a particular major.
- xiv. E. Magruder stated that the course focused on a narrow area rather than the broad objectives for GE.
- xv. K. Bragg referred to the syllabus. There are two items that speak to GE objectives. She asked where the assignments link to these objectives.
- xvi. P. Krochalk pointed out some issues with the syllabus:
  1. Grading: is 90% an A or A-, 80% a B or B-, etc.
  2. Missing computer literacy statement
  3. DSS statement needs the contact information
  4. Grammatical errors
  5. No points/values for grades
  6. In the section titled Projects there are six; however, something appears to be missing at the end of the sentence. It says "but...."
  7. Suggests using the words "cheating" and "plagiarism" in the Academic Integrity section.

8. Recommends making links to Area E clearer
- xvii. M. Maki suggests providing help from GE committee to work with Computer Science to meet the recommendations of the committee. P. Krochalk, K. Ganezer and L. Goldman volunteered to assist the chair with the revisions.

**e. CSC 301 Proposal (3rd reading)**

- i. A revised syllabus was presented, which included an updated catalog description that was cross disciplines and included concepts such as cyber space
- ii. Additional suggestions were made for the syllabus
  1. Add the words “cheating” and “plagiarism” to the Academic Integrity statement.
  2. Update the SLO’s by including the stem with additional bullets for the objectives
    - a. Make closer reference to GE objectives
- iii. The committee asked about the grading and the final exam
  1. The syllabus includes a midterm in the schedule, but it is not reflected in the grading section. This is a typo. The midterm should have been removed.
- iv. The committee asked about the oral presentations
  1. The oral presentations are being phased out.
- v. J. Badrtalei moved to approve the course pending recommended revisions. P. Kalayjian seconded the motion. M/S/P

**f. CIS 275 (2<sup>nd</sup> Reading)**

- i. Committee suggested copying and pasting Academic Integrity and DSS statements used by other courses in the college.
- ii. The committee questioned how the students would get course materials. The students will download information from the links included.
- iii. P. Kalayjian – suggests revising syllabus to match the template format so that the linkage to Area E is clearer.
- iv. P. Kalayjian moved to approve the course pending recommended revisions.
  1. Discussion:
    - a. P. Krochalk thinks that the department must do more than reformat the syllabus. They need to show how the course meets the objectives.
    - b. K. Ganezer – hard to tie objective 2 from Area E to this course
  2. Kalayjian rephrased the motion: move to approve the course pending reformatting the syllabus and asking the authors to make the relationship to Area E clearer for the students.
  3. J. Badrtalei seconded the motion. M/S/P with 2 abstentions.
  4. This course will double count in GE for CIS students only.

**g. Area F: SMT**

- i.** BIO 490 was approved by the subcommittee with some revisions
  - 1.** GE committee agreed to approve the course pending SMT recommendations.
- ii.** BIO 340 was approved by the SMT committee
  - 1.** P. Kalayjian moved to approve the proposal. M. Suchenek seconded the motion. M/S/P

**h. CHE 450 1st reading**

- i.** For Area E, Chemistry majors
- ii.** Syllabus reviewed
  - 1.** Grammar errors
  - 2.** GE objectives not addressed.
- iii.** Resubmit at next GE meeting

**i. HEA 468 1st reading**

- i.** Submit to SBS sub-committee

**5. Old Business**

**a. FTE Transfer**

- i.** L. Fitzsimmons reported on the document presented by Dr. Maki to the Senate.
- ii.** No representation of the 3 subcommittees
- iii.** No member of the faculty
- iv.** No CFA representative
- v.** L. Fitzsimmons informed the committee that Dr. Maki was asked by the Senate to review the FTE transfer
- vi.** 5 options surfaced with both positives and negatives
- vii.** The Senate asked for an ad hoc committee to continue the review
  - 1.** Small committee to be convened by Senate Executive Committee which will include
    - a.** CFA
    - b.** GE
    - c.** Staff to address technical issues
- ii.** The committee is to report to GE prior to presentation to the Senate
  - 1.** The GE committee asked if this could be a recommendation to the Senate Executive Committee
  - 2.** P. Kalayjian stated that the task force is to present to Senate at the next meeting
  - 3.** E. Magruder expressed that she would like to see [part-time lecturer faculty](#) represented.
  - 4.** M. Suchenek asked how will the task force reach decisions
    - a.** Unclear of the procedures
    - b.** Why is there union representation
- iii.** L. Fitzsimmons informed the committee that the document was not approved by the GE committee. The GE committee was not privy to the

discussion. She reiterated that there was no representation of the 3 subcommittees, the union or adjunct faculty.

- iv. P. Kalayjian reminded the committee that GE is an organizational committee that reports to the Senate not vice versa. She stated that Senate Executive committee would welcome recommendations from the GE committee.
- v. K. Ganezer stated that this grew out of a request from departments. If a committee is going to make a decision there should be some guidelines on how to reach decisions.
- vi. L. Fitzsimmons stated that the committee is not making a decision. Subcommittee coordinators have pedagogical oversight. Fitzsimmons continued that the statement was not approved by GE and it was not reviewed by GE.
- vii. Fitzsimmons stated that decisions of the GE committee are final.
- viii. Fitzsimmons read a resolution to the Senate from the General Education Committee and made a motion for approval.
- ix. P. Krochalk is concerned about representation.
- x. Fitzsimmons said again that the list does not reflect GE; was not generated by GE and not approved by GE.
- xi. P. Kalayjian asked for point of order. If this is to be a formal resolution this should be a first reading. If it is a sense of the committee it can continue.
- xii. L. Fitzsimmons countered the point of order stating that the document presented was out of order and a timeline was imposed on GE.
- xiii. E. Magruder stated that some of the proposals presented to the Senate were not discussed in the previous GE meeting.
- xiv. M. Maki stated that at no point is this a sense of the GE committee. The administration was charged to provide solutions.
- xv. P. Kalayjian stated that this is out of order.
- xvi. M. Maki stated that this discussion is a misrepresentation of the presentation.
  - 1. There were informal sessions regarding the return of the FTE.
- xvii. D. Best seconded the motion:
  - 1. This document was not generated by the GE Committee;
  - 2. This document has not been approved by the GE Committee;
  - 3. The GE Committee requests representation by the area subcommittees (SMT, SBS, HUM), the faculty union, and the adjunct faculty at the task force for addressing this document;
  - 4. The GE Committee requests guidelines for the aims, procedures, and decision-making of the task force;
  - 5. The GE Committee requests that the task force report to the GE Committee prior to reporting to the Senate, as previously agreed by the Senate Chair during the GE Committee at which the Senate Chair agreed to convene a task force (Dec. 10, 2012) and called for the question.
    - 1. 4 aye + 1 proxy (I. Heinze-Balcazar voted by E. Magruder)
    - 2. 1 nay
    - 3. 3 abstention

xviii. M/S/P

**Adjourn: 12:19pm**

Respectfully submitted,

Tracey M. Haney