Minutes of the General Education Subcommittee  
March 30, 2015  
LI 2250  
2:00 pm – 3:50 pm

Present: Julie Glass, Linda Ivey, Rita Liberti, Sally Murphy, Diane Satin, Aline Soules, Mitchell Watnik  
Absent: Lawrence Bliss, Jennifer Eagan, Zach Hallab, Yi Karnes.  
Guests: Jason Singley, Donna Wiley.

The acting Chair (Glass) called the meeting to order at 2:05.

1. Approval of the agenda. (M Murphy/S Satin/P). Murphy asked to present information regarding the “native” students before the GE Discussion (4a).

2. Approval of the minutes of March 3. (M Soules/S Murphy/P).
   a. Approval of the minutes of March 3. (M Soules/S Murphy/P).
   b. Approval of the minutes of March 9. (M Soules/S Murphy/P). Glass noted that she was absent.

3. New Business
   a. ES 3557 Asian American Film Festival (M Murphy/S Satin/)
      During the discussion, a subcommittee member indicated that there is a growing amount of “too much of the same thing”. Murphy noted that this was brought up in the GE Five Year Review. Something that would be part of the “renewal” process that is supposed to be addressed and that one could see whether the courses are all living up to the GE outcomes. The Chair noted that the discussion was going away from the motion. There was discussion about the oral communication component, but it was noted that video presentations are required to be posted on the online course. There was also a question about whether there was sufficient writing density. 
      Motion to table (M Soules/S Watnik/P) to invite Ethnic Studies to discuss the course with the subcommittee.

4. Discussions / Presentations
   a. Discussion of potential GE models. Murphy showed data regarding freshman, including remediation values. She noted that, by policy determined in 1998, students are allowed a second chance at remedial courses at all levels of remediation (potentially allowing a student to continue for 6 quarters before dismissal), which is not the system-wide norm (wherein there is no second chance or limited second chances). This
policy, according to Murphy, may be something that CIC should reconsider. In the late ‘00s, there were numerous “exception admits” (meaning admissions allowing under-qualified students to be admitted to the University). When Provost Houpis came, some funding for clusters (which had been lost in 2005) was restored. Last summer, Houpis funded collaboration within faculty over the summer while preparing for clusters. This year, retention for freshmen is 80.5%, which is amongst the highest in the system. Murphy noted that the demographics (particularly “first generation college”) of our students are vastly different than the one most faculty members saw when they were in college. Students are under-equipped for college, according to Murphy. The combined average SAT score is 980 (amongst those who take it), with the language score lower than the math score. Murphy noted that her proposed GE model includes 3 1-unit courses under Area E. There is funding from the Chancellor’s Office (though it requires additional support from CSUEB) for the Peer Mentor Program, which is affiliated with GS. Murphy also proposes that C3 be specified as “creative expression”; in a sense, this would account for the loss of area F. The GS courses are, according to Murphy, intended to be associated with the clusters and to have full-time faculty involvement.

The conversation turned to the model structure. There was concern about “B3” being left off some of the models. B3 is officially a “zero-unit” requirement, meaning it could be incorporated into the B1 or B2 course (the lecture would be 2 hours and the lab would be 1 credit hour).

5. Adjournment. (M Soules/S Murphy/P). The meeting was adjourned at 3:58.

Respectfully submitted,
Mitchell Watnik, subcommittee secretary