2/22/16 Minutes
General Education Subcommittee

Present: Luz Calvo, Eric Fricke, Julie Glass, Zach Hallab, Yi Karnes, Sarah Nielsen, Aline Soules

Guests: Nick Baham, Eileen Barrett, Michael Hedrick, Linda Ivey, Dianne Rush Woods, Julie Stein

1. Agenda
   Motion to approve the agenda (Nielsen/Calvo/approved)

2. Listening session for overlay discussion (Diversity this week)

Julie Stein distributed our diversity rubric and spoke to the synergies between the rubric and the overlay student learning outcomes. Also, during the development of the diversity rubric, so much was included that some of the material was taken out of the diversity rubric with a view to including it in a future social justice rubric. Julie is interested in gathering information from discussion at this meeting to take back to discussions about these two overlays.

It is possible that a course could apply for overlay approval without necessarily going through the SLO/PLO/ILO process.

There was a discussion of assessment and its slow inclusion into the Senate process; however, there was some reluctance to see more assessment creep into the Senate process.

There was discussion of the Senate structure and who will officially review GE, diversity overlay, social justice overlay, sustainability overlay, and so on.

How does the assessment of ILOs connect to the work that the GE Subcommittee is currently doing?

There was a discussion of required artifacts. Should the overlay outcomes contain a statement asking for sample student artifacts to assess overlay courses in subsequent reviews?

Who will ask for artifacts and who will assess the overlay courses?

There was discussion about WASC’s requirements and the level of proof/evidence they expect. WASC expects that an institution will assess their ILOs. Yet, there is concern that some “diversity” courses are, in fact, insubstantial in terms of meeting diversity rubrics.
The ILOs and overlays look in alignment, yet the ILO Subscommittee is still working out its process, and the overlay courses don’t have a formal role in looking at ILO attainment for students.

Because the ILOs can involve courses, extracurricular work, and other elements, it’s good that the overlays are more rigorous and specific.

GE Subcommittee will review overlays prior to conversion. Post-conversion is, as yet, unclear.

Specific Overlay Discussion

The Subcommittee will add a statement about assessment

Nick Baham raised information regarding clarification of “historically oppressed groups”. The group agreed to a slight rewording of the sentence to clarify the intent of the sentence.

The next issue was about ensuring that the course was fully directed to whatever overlay was approved. The GE Subcommittee will add a statement about embedding outcomes in courses.

The GE Subcommittee reviewed suggestions provided via email.

A concern was expressed regarding how these outcomes will fare as they go through ratification. One possibility is that they’ll be watered down; the other is that they’ll be intensified by those who have a strong connection to a particular set of outcomes.

Discussion then ensued about the specific wording of the first outcome. It was decided that it should be shortened, but it was not yet clear how to word a shortened version. This will be addressed post-meeting.


Calvo/Fricke/approved.

4. Report from Semester Conversion

   Everyone has received their assigned time/stipend information. A re-application/change form is available.

5. Sociology 3530 application for approval

Motion to approve for two-year approval, prior to conversion (Hallab/Nielsen). There was discussion about the approach to answering the questions on the form and the fact that there was no attached syllabus. This led to a discussion about
future forms and ensuring that they are clear about what is wanted. That said, in light of the two year limited term for this course, the committee members decided to approve pending inclusion of the syllabus for our records. Approved.

6. Late minute updates on GE Area Outcomes Feedback

No updates are required; however, we discussed the need for some new motions regarding modifications.

7. Listening session follow-up

The Subcommittee reviewed the overlay document one more time and made some final changes to the diversity overlay outcomes.

There was discussion about how to provide revisions to the community again. Once all three overlays have been discussed, they will be sent out as a group.

8. Code requirements

A small amendment was made to the American Institutions outcomes. Calvo/Nielsen moved/seconded a motion to forward these outcomes to CIC.

9. Workload

Ivey introduced the idea that Dr. Morishita is not willing to reduce workload, but he is willing to re-imagine it to enable a structure similar to SFSU, which would be done through the deans. However, he did point out that, at SFSU, these structures didn’t work in Humanities. In light of Humanities’ burden, which cannot be alleviated easily through grants, Ivey raised the issue of lowering the cap to 30. Yet, that approach is not budget neutral. Ivey is concerned about a link between that and the work of this Subcommittee. If conversion causes a move from 3 classes of 35 to 4 classes of 30, making things better for students will be undermined.

Another discussion centered around the developing role of the new Dean of Undergraduate Studies and how GE courses might be handled in future.