General Education Committee
WH D-442
Monday, October 22 2012
10:00am – 12:00pm
Minutes- Amended

Present: D. Best, L. Goldman, P. Krochalk, P. Kalayjian, M. Suchenek, L. Skiffer, A. Pu, E. Magruder, L. Fitzsimmons, K. Ganezer, I. Heinze-Balcazar, M. Maki, T. Philo, P. Kim, C. Turner, J. Hill (guest)
Absent: J. Badrtalei

1. **Call to order:** 10:08am
2. **Approval of Agenda**
   a. P. Krochalk moved to approve. D. Best seconded. M/S/P
   b. Approved
3. **Approval of Minutes**
   a. M. Maki- since GEC approved to implement the practice of $1^{st}/2^{nd}$ readings at the last meeting, suggested restructuring meeting agenda format with the inclusion of "1st Reading/ 2nd Reading" vs. the currently used "Old/New Business," then include "Discussion Items."
   b. An amended agenda format with $1^{st}/2^{nd}$ readings together will bring more clarity.
   c. P. Krochalk moved to approve the restructuring of GE agendas.
      i. Not suggesting changes between Old and New Business. New Business may be a discussion item, idea presented to GEC; not a topic for 1st reading/decision reading.
   d. M. Maki: Friendly amendment to agenda- Under Old Business- Add "2nd Reading" in parentheses after Item 4a.
      i. "GE Committee Charge Amendments: Voting Dean on GE Committee (2nd Reading)."
         1. This will help to reflect the $1^{st}/2^{nd}$ readings of items on the agenda.
         2. L. Fitzsimmons- this seems reasonable to insert after title.
   e. L. Fitzsimmons- Old Business- AFS 205- amend the motion to make it clearer.

         i. "Motion to move course forward with the contingency of resubmission of syllabus."

   f. Motion to approve minutes as amended. E. Magruder seconded. M/S/P

      i. Approved as amended.

4. **Old Business**

   a. **GE Committee Charge Amendments: Voting Dean on GE Committee (2nd reading) - M. Maki.**

      i. There has been resistance to having a dean as a voting member on the GEC. Proposed an amendment of having a dean as an ex-officio member; they would provide input and inform the GEC of administrative decisions.

         1. J. Hill- "Ex-officio" is not the proper language for the position. Formal terminology is "non-voting member."

      ii. L. Fitzsimmons- There are concerns about which dean would be selected to represent the whole university. Suggestions were deans that serve GE, then all the deans.

         1. M. Maki – The practice of the university is appointment of deans on committees at the Provost's discretion. Do not intend to break that practice.

      iii. M. Maki- The dean's term of service has not been determined. It could be 1 year or 2 years.

         1. The current GEC charge does not clearly state the length of term of service of other nonvoting members.

      iv. L. Fitzsimmons- Called for any motions.

      v. P. Krochalk – moved to include a dean as a non-voting member on the General Education Committee. Seconded. M/S

         1. M. Suchenek- commented it would be wise to specify who decides which dean would serve on the committee.

      vi. Pat Kalayjian- Speaking in favor of having a nonvoting dean because there are some issues that will be coming to the GEC for which a dean's opinion will be valuable. Issues going to Board of Trustees regarding lowering majors to 120 units.

      vii. L. Fitzsimmons- Commented that some deans have knowledge of GE and some do not; ~~it is a monopoly~~.

      viii. J. Hill- Reminded the GEC that a change of their charge will need to go to Academic Senate also.

ix. E. Magruder- In favor of adding a dean to the committee. Commented on functionality of GEC; more concrete decisions to be made.

x. M. Maki- Suggested the motion on the table would be more explicit to include that the dean would be appointed by the Provost.

xi. M. Suchenek- Friendly amendment to the motion: "2 representatives appointed by the Provost"…

xii. J. Hill- Commented on inclusion of terms of service.

xiii. I. Heinze-Balcazar- Monopoly of representation; dean's appointment should not be more than a year to get different perspectives.

    1. Recommended a friendly amendment: The dean is appointed annually by the Office of the Provost.

xiv. M. Suchenek - Friendly Amendment: "2 representatives appointed by the Provost…"

xv. L. Skiffer- Most deans are currently interim deans; defeats purpose of continuity.

    1. M. Maki- They still represent their colleges.

xvi. L. Goldman- Suggested clarifying "Academic Dean."

xvii. P. Krochalk- Suggested listing as a separate line in the GE charge to identify: "1 academic dean appointed by the Provost."

xviii. "1 academic dean appointed by the Provost"

    1. M. Suchenek – suggested including language that will distinguish the dean's term.

    2. M. Maki- Recommended the term not be included. There are a number of factors that go into determining the length of service; should leave it to the Provost.

xix. D. Best- Call to question.

    1. Favor- 5; Opposed- 4; Abstained- 1

xx. M. Suchenek- Motion needs a majority vote of total committee members, not only those in attendance.

xxi. L. Fitzsimmons called to vote again: Favor- 6; Opposed- 4; Abstained- 1

xxii. The Motion passed.

xxiii. L. Fitzsimmons will forward the amended charge to Academic Senate.

b. GE Committee Membership Terms

    i. M. Maki- We have 8, 3, 2 split among membership terms.

    ii. Proposal to move CBAPP, SOE and Area F Humanities to Group B (2012-14 term). This will create a 7/6 split among committee member terms.

        1. J. Badrtalei- CBAPP representative was not in attendance.

        2. L. Fitzsimmons- Proposed she contact him; inform him the term would be extended.

    iii. M. Maki- recommended they move forward contingent that the 3 areas agree on the adjustments.

        1. The areas will be informed of this.

    iv. Reality is it is the position, not the individual person that will be extended.

    v. A. Pu- Motion to move forward contingent that all areas agree on the adjustments to membership terms. D. Best seconded. M/S/P

    vi. Approved.

c. CSC 301 Proposal

    i. K. Ganezer- Got responses from other SMT subcommittee members John Price and John Keyantash. Both noticed some ambiguity if course would be open to all or just CSC students.

    ii. Commented there are a lot of prerequisites for a 301 level course.

    iii. Concern that this is supposed to serve a double duty for GE; there are some reservations.

        1. Course created as a disciplinary topic; not broad enough for GE (J. Keyantash).

    iv. A. Pu- Depends on why the department wants the substitution. It is to be in compliance for STAR Act. She is supporting the proposal.

    v. M. Suchenek- The course covers a number of interdisciplinary topics; computer, theoretical issues related to computer technology. Every field that is used in computer technology.

    vi. L. Fitzsimmons- Concerned the course is interdisciplinary with social sciences, but not with natural sciences. Needs to be addressed.

        1. Natural sciences, math, social science all need to be covered. It is not clear, the level of interdisciplinary this course needs to be to be approved.

      vii. P. Krochalk - Need to see how they're interrelated and develop creative thinking skills.

     viii. K. Ganezer- Surprised there was resistance in the SMT committee. Thinks with a bit of thought and some clarification, they can come back to it.

      ix. D. Best- Looks to be an ethics class related to computer technology. Not sure how interdisciplinary that is.

       x. L. Fitzsimmons- This is more Social Science than Natural Science. That is the concern. Recommended the Computer Science department come up with a defense or modify the course.

      xi. M. Suchenek- Computers and society is required for their accreditation. They can do some modifications, but they can't change the course much if department want to keep accreditation.

      xii. A. Pu- Suggested they double count for their SBS instead of SMT.

          1. I. Heinze-Balcazar- SBS was opposed the double counting of the course because of integrity of the course.

          2. Opposed to the rationalization for using 3 units to count for 6 units. They feel very strong about this.

     xiii. P. Kalayjian- Is cultural pluralism required for SBS? Yes.

     xiv. L. Fitzsimmons will send M. Suchenek emails so that he can relay suggestions back to his department.

  d. Transfer of FTE to Area F units (2nd reading)

      i. Questioned if topic would take up rest of the meeting; agreed to move on to other agenda items.

  e. GE Representation on UCC and PRP

      i. E. Magruder will be the representative on UCC.

5. New Business

  a. EPC 11-05 Computer Literacy Statement on Syllabi

      i. M. Suchenek- Believes computer literacy is basic skills. There's nothing in GE or mandatory requirements that covers those skills. They tried to include basic computer skills in GE but it did not go forward.

          1. J. Hill- The resolution under question is about stating what the requirements might be. There's no expectation of what the skills might be.

      ii.   Need something more institutionalized to teach students how to use services: library databases, Blackboard, etc.

      iii.   L. Fitzsimmons- Can ask Senate Exec/EPC ask for support; locate support services and recommend language for syllabi.

b. Area Review- Computer Literacy- A. Pu and L. Goldman

      i.   L. Goldman- Overall the report was well done. Some areas were not clear.

        1.   Requirements for what is a good paper; no grading criteria/grading not clear. They need that information for students.

      ii.   Confused about Area A5. Does not specify where this course falls. A5 is optional.

      iii.   Need to update information and update materials.

        1.   References made to Microsoft 2003, XP. Textbooks are outdated. Published in 2004.

      iv.   D. Best moved to approve subcommittee report. L. Skiffer seconded. M/S/P

        1.   L. Fitzsimmons will convey results of the report to department.

          a.   Recommend to resubmit syllabus with the 2 points highlighted.

c. Area Review- Theatre Arts Resubmission: L. Fitzsimmons

      i.   Commented that the Theatre Arts department has worked hard and put a lot of work into report. Department should be commended on their resubmission.

      ii.   L. Skiffer moved to approve the report. D. Best seconded. M/S/P

d. P. Krochalk- Asked if there was going to potentially be discussion about schedule of review.

      i.   J. Hill- There has been discussion at Senate about "streamlining" the review schedule so there is no redundancy in review process.

      ii.   L. Fitzsimmons- Sheela Pawar had recommended departments put GE review at the same time as their Program Review. The intention is to lessen the load for the department.

      iii.   A one sentence speech went out at Senate but the message did not get out to all departments. When L. Fitzsimmons goes back to

Senate, she'll make it clear and reiterate the importance of the review.

1. The GEC is open to rescheduling Area Review reports to lessen the load of the department; the GEC wants departments to turn in their best work.

6. **Adjournment:** 11:57 a.m.