General Education Committee

Monday, April 8, 2013
10:00am-12:00pm – Provost’s Conference Room

Minutes

1. Call to Order: 10:05am

2. Approval of Agenda
      i. Chemistry courses- Revised syllabus will be submitted when requested changes are complete.
   b. P. Krochalk- recommended adding “Open Forum” as a standard component to the GE agenda after “Announcements.”
   c. P. Kalayjian moved to approve agenda as amended. D. Best seconded.
      M/S/P
      i. Amended agenda approved.

3. Approval of 3/25/13 Minutes
   a. E. Magruder and L. Fitzsimmons will send their requested revisions to M. Medina.
   b. A. Pu moved to approve minutes as revised. L. Goldman seconded.
      M/S/P
      i. Amended minutes approved.

Old Business
1. BIO 490
   a. L. Fitzsimmons- Department Chair John Thomlinson was asked to create a clear link to GE objectives and to the course SLO’s. This has been addressed in the revised syllabus and the link is clear in the document.
   b. P. Krochalk- Asked if the course catalog description should be included on the syllabus. The course description does not match the catalog description.
      i. P. Kalayjian- There is a PM that lists the items that are required in a course syllabus. The catalog description is not required.
      ii. L. Fitzsimmons will consult with UCC chair C. Jacobs.
   c. P. Kalayjian- We do not award an A+ grade; that was noted last course was reviewed but the grade is still in there.
   d. DSS Statement- Revise to change the room location to WH 180.
   e. M. Maki- Noted the course was approved at the last meeting on the condition of the revisions.
   f. GEC agreed to L. Fitzsimmons consulting with Biology.

2. BIO 340
   a. L. Fitzsimmons – the course SLOs need to be linked to the GE Area Objectives.
   b. P. Krochalk- DSS room number needs to be updated; office has relocated to WH 180. Exams language “curve individual exams” may not be clear; considering revising language.
   c. P. Kalayjian- It is not clear how the outcomes will be assessed in the course. Suggested the description of the Area F2 objectives be moved above the SLO’s. This will imply that the objectives are met by the outcomes.
d. L. Goldman- assignments are Oral presentations; don’t seem to cover the objectives just by looking at the guidelines.
e. A. Pu- Insert a statement in the syllabus that this meets SMT? Could be misleading if it’s restricted to majors.
  i. M. Maki- Approval to meet SMT is not limited to majors; students have to meet prerequisites.
f. M. Suchenek- Genetics has lots of intersections in science areas including computer science. Whatever small deficiencies that can be fixed, can be extremely beneficial for all that can use it to fulfill GE.
g. J. Badrtalei- Concerned about the different grading scales within the department.
  i. L. Fitzsimmons- That is beyond the domain of GE, it is a departmental issue. GEC can raise the issue of concern to the department.
  ii. M. Suchenek- It is up to the department /instructor on how they’re going to grade.
h. M. Maki- Pointed out that the GEC had already approved these courses at the last meeting. Committee is here to review that the department has made the changes that were recommended.

3. CIS 275- Myron Sheu

a. The revisions addressed based on the recommendations by GE:
  i. Revised course description and LO’s.
  ii. Made the LO’s more consistent with the content and pointed out the linkages line by line to Area E.
  iii. Added extensive assessment procedures and how the LO’s will be assessed.
iv. The Academic Integrity was added about the grading.
b. L. Skiffer- The Computer Information Literacy Statement and Academic Integrity Statement are listed twice.
   i. Delete repeated statement.
c. P. Krochalk- Comment regarding Area E- It has become a ‘catch-all’ because of the 120 issue. Would like a comment to assure the committee that if the course is going to deal with health issues/information via Internet, that the person teaching knows this information re health issues. What are key data sources and are they legit and valid within the field? Feels this needs to be indicated.
   i. M. Sheu- Course taught by interdisciplinary instructors. Course addresses more of the protocol for online health intervention, not the substance of health itself. Pointed out in the infrastructure of the course to help improve life quality; focus on process of communication, platform, and cultural environment; how to look into this information.
   ii. Department is looking to expand the course. It is a good opportunity to collaborate more closely with other departments.
d. Course proposal was approved.

4. **Music-** David Bradfield
   a. Proposal submitted to comply with the mandate from the CO to put programs at 120 units. There accreditation concerns for all 3 programs/options. To maintain the program’s accreditation, the degree needs to offer a rich curriculum. All 3 options are over the 120 units. The extra units are what give a rich program.
   b. P. Kalayjian- Asked about the department applying for an exception.
i. M. Maki- An exception is going to be submitted to the Chancellor’s Office. The CO usually grants exceptions for a Bachelor of Music (BM) degree; we have a Bachelor of Arts in Music. This proposal is a backup plan if they don’t get the exception.

c. D. Bradfield- Music Theory- program will lose accreditation if students do not take the units.

d. Fulfill Area C2; waive Area D; waive Area E; waive integrative studies.

   i. M. Maki- Proposal should state “substitute” not “waive.” He met with chair Richard Kravchak on Thursday.

e. L. Fitzsimmons has forwarded proposal to SBS subcommittee for review.

f. D. Bradfield - Lifelong Learning Aspect for music ensemble- Students have to be in a performing ensemble throughout the program.

   i. It is a physiological discussion of music and health; stress related injury, breathing.

g. D. Best- Encouraged proposal of MUS 210 as a GE course even if Area D waiver does go through; it will also have to go through Senate.

h. M. Suchenek- MUS 175-Noted a minor, critical item- “Academic Dishonesty.” People may get idea that academics are dishonest.

i. E. Magruder- Re Area D, since I. Heinze-Balcazar has not been in attendance to report on the SBS subcommittee’s discussion on Area D, she asked if L. Skiffer could update the GEC if the subcommittee has discussed this issue.

   i. L. Skiffer- What issue? Not sure if the subcommittee has talked about it.
ii. L. Fitzsimmons will email L. Heinze-Balcazar and ask that the GEC get a report back from the SBS subcommittee. She will include that with her GE report/recommendations to Senate.

j. P. Krochalk- Noted a consistent statement in syllabi for students with disabilities to go to the instructor then to Disabled Student Services. Concerned that this statement violates confidentiality to disclose to faculty and could raise issues.

k. A. Pu- Course description missing for MUS 171 and MUS 172.

l. L. Skiffer- DSS room number needs to be updated.

m. L. Fitzsimmons- GEC understands this proposal is a backup plan to the CO’s exception.

n. K. Ganezer- Double counting should be done with utmost of caution.

5. Area Assessment update

a. L. Fitzsimmons- No responses to her email request for a volunteer to assist A. Pu with Math review were received. Call for volunteer.

i. K. Ganezer volunteered.

6. Announcements

a. None

7. Open Forum

a. M. Suchenek- As a follow up to P. Krochalk’s comment on Area E, suggested the GEC come back next year after the pressing issues and spend time on general policy. Area E has changed; it is not the same as it was 5 years ago.

b. L. Skiffer- Asked where all the approved changes are documented.

i. M. Maki- After GE approval, proposals go to UCC. Changes are documented in the university catalog.

GE Course Assessment
a. E. Magruder- The GEC does not know if the courses are going to assess the GE objectives.
   ii. L. Fitzsimmons- GEC could put in a request for a portfolio.
b. M. Suchenek- What standards would apply?
c. P. Krochalk- Give programs and departments time to evolve to the changes.
d. L. Fitzsimmons- Call for a portfolio in a year for substitutes. There could be unexpected compromises.
e. P. Krochalk- How many times should the course be offered before GEC wants to assess?
   iii. M. Suchenek- Faculty are loaded to their capacity; this is adding to that. Be cautious to add another layer of assessment to what they already have. It takes quite a lot of workload to do assessment. Question is do they have extra capacity to do it.
   iv. M. Suchenek- Suggested an “Oversight” rather than an assessment. Once in a while request some information to make sure that what’s being approved is covered.
f. L. Fitzsimmons- Suggested the formation of an Area E subcommittee. Departments submit a syllabus that was distributed to the students so the GEC can see it is the same course that was approved.

GE Advisement

a. J. Badrtalei- Received an outdated GE worksheet from the University Advisement Center (UAC) revised in 2009. Every advisor should get the revised information.
b. P. Kim- The UAC does not randomly give out GE worksheets; it has to be accessed online. This is part of quality control within the UAC.
i. All department advisors should be accessing/advising on programs, upper division only. Students who need Lower Division/GE advisement should be going directly to the UAC.

   c. E. Magruder- Sees opportunity for faculty development. Need to do a better job of informing faculty to advisors.
      i. M. Maki- It is a complex topic. Some faculty resist notion of doing lower division advisement; there have been problems with unintentional ill-advisement by faculty.

   v. All FT faculty have been invited to attend CMS training.

   c. K. Ganezer- Attended a CMS workshop. It is hard to find time to attend all sessions; difficult to get all faculty members to be proficient.

8. **Adjourn:** 12:00 pm