Minutes of the General Education Subcommittee  
November 2, 2015  
LI 2250  
4:00 pm – 6:00 pm  

Present:  Lawrence Bliss, Luz Calvo, Julie Glass, Zach Hallab, Yi Karnes, Rita Liberti, Sarah Nielsen, Diane Satin, Aline Soules, Nancy Thompson, Mitchell Watnik.  
Absent:  none.  
Guests:  Glen Perry, Sophie Rollins, Donna Wiley.  

The Chair (Glass) called the meeting to order at 4:02

1. Approval of the agenda.  (M Soules/S Nielsen/P) The Chair asked to add a discussion about some area A issues brought up by philosophy. Wiley asked that item 5a be brought up earlier.  

2. Approval of the minutes (M Calvo/S Nielsen/P). Perry asked for clarification regarding the area C limit to 3 disciplines. The subcommittee amended the minutes to explicitly state C1-C4.  

3. Reports  
   a. GE Director. Thompson noted that her office is looking to clarify the external equivalencies with national tests, such as AP, IB.  
   b. Semesters. Perry said that he is working with consultants about GE issues on semester conversion.  

4. Old Business:  
   a. Area A outcomes. The Department of Philosophy recommended a different phrasing for the second learning outcome for Area A3. The subcommittee did some wordsmithing then adopted the new phrasing. Students will demonstrate the ability to distinguish among different sorts of claims, such as statements of opinions, reasoned judgements, proofs, and articles of faith.  
   b. Area C outcomes. Soules added a comment about the second outcome for Area C2 and the subcommittee discussed this. There were additional comments about the phrase “studying great works of the human imagination.” For now, the subcommittee left the outcomes as is. It was pointed out that the ILOs should be identified with the outcomes.  
   c. Area D outcomes. There was discussion about separating area D into D1-D3. Watnik noted that Cal Poly SLO does that (and D1 is necessarily a code course). This might facilitate the idea of “separate disciplines”. However, many felt that the constraints faced by the subcommittee did not give the group time to deal with the issue in a thoughtful way. This caused some to question whether Area C should have been subdivided. Glass noted that the EO specifically noted C1 and C2 as separate, while it does not do so for area D. (M
Thompson/S Soules/P) to accept the four learning outcomes for lower division area D.

5. New Business.
   a. Process for course submissions including forms, sample syllabus requirements, etc. Wiley is drafting a form to unify the GE form request. Some subcommittee members expressed preference for different forms for different areas (as is status quo). The subcommittee agreed to consider this at the top of old business next time.

6. Adjournment. The Chair declared the meeting adjourned at 6:02 due to time. The next meeting is November 9 at 2 at which point area D4 will continue and handle area E. Time permitting, discussion of overlays will begin. Also, there will be discussion of the forms, per 5a above.

Respectfully submitted,
Mitchell Watnik, subcommittee secretary