Minutes of the General Education Subcommittee  
February 8, 2017  
SF 466  
2:00 pm – 3:50 pm

Absent: Caron Inouye, Christian Roessler.  
Guests: none.

The Chair (Glass) called the meeting to order at 2:01.

1. Approval of Agenda. (M Bliss/S Calvo/P).
2. Approval of minutes.  
   a. 2/1/17. (M Liberti/S Bliss/P).
3. Reports  
   b. Report of General Education Director. At the end of the meeting, Scharberg mentioned that there may be an issue with the Writing II requirement for transfer students who did not take it at community college, because it has been specified as a lower division requirement.  
4. Business (courses available in Curriculog):  
   a. Courses for review.  
      i. ART 225. There was discussion about the social justice overlay application. The overlay application was posted after it was considered by the C group. It had been rerouted for C1 consideration in the Fall, but the department did not change the proposal in response. (M Bliss/S Liberti/P) to reject the application.  
      ii. ART 226. Similar to previous course, there were no changes to the original proposal that was rejected in the Fall. The proposal was just for GE. (M Bliss/S Liberti/P) to reject the application.  
      iii. ART 320. Similar to previous courses, there were no changes to the original proposal that was rejected in the Fall. The proposal was just for GE. (M Soules/S Liberti/P) to reject the application.  
      iv. ES 120. The issue here was with US 2 outcome; there was consensus that the overlay proposal was acceptable. There was discussion about it. The learning outcomes seemed to address the concerns, but the subcommittee requested that
Ethnic Studies modify the proposals. (M Watnik/S Bliss/P) to reroute the proposal so that the US 2 proposal can be edited; once the edit is made, it will be approved.

v. ES 121. As above, the issue was the US 2 outcome. (M Watnik/S Bliss/P) to reroute the proposal so that the US 2 proposal can be edited; once the edit is made, it will be approved.

vi. HIST 388. The issue here was with the C4 proposal. In particular, the “demonstrate an understanding of and ability to apply principles, methodologies, values systems, and thought processes employed in the arts and humanities” was very brief. There was a note that the course learning outcomes give an indication of how the question above might be answered. It was suggested that a comment be made while rerouting to recommend that the department incorporating the learning outcomes. It was also pointed out that the course characteristics about the writing should have more detail. (M Scharberg/S Soules/P) to reroute.

vii. HIST 472. The issue here was with the C4 proposal, area learning outcomes 2 and 3. The response to both was “small group discussion as significant aspect of the course, on primary sources from across time. In-class debates adopting historical personae.” There again was the suggestion of incorporating the course learning outcomes. The course characteristics about the writing needs more details. (M Liberti/S Soules/P) to reroute.

viii. PHIL 311. This was taken off of consent due to the sustainability application. There were no course-specific responses about meeting the sustainability outcomes. (M Watnik/S Nielsen/P) to reroute for overlay, but consider C4 approved.

ix. PHIL 312. This proposal was taken off of consent to address the overlay application. There were also concerns about the generality of the C4 proposal. (M Liberti/S Watnik/P) to reroute.

x. PHIL 313. With the C4 proposal, there were concerns about the first learning outcome in 2a. Some members were concerned about all the outcomes and it was noted that the course learning outcomes were the GE outcomes and did not correspond to the course description. There were issues with whether ethics in business is analogous to “processes employed in arts and humanities.” (M Soules/S Nielsen/P) to reject the C4 proposal.

xi. PHIL 321. This proposal was taken off of consent to address the social justice overlay application. There were numerous typos, as well as redundancies. There was generous use of the
phrase “social commentary”, but almost no use of "social justice". The C4 application seemed acceptable. (M Bliss/S Scharberg/P) to reroute the proposal to address the social justice application.

xii. PHIL 375. This proposal was taken off of consent to address the social justice overlay application. Here the second outcome was the issue. The C4 application seemed acceptable. (M Watnik/S Soules/P) to reroute the proposal to address the social justice application.

xiii. THEA 246. The C1 application was of concern. The first outcome was of particular concern. (M Liberti/S Scharberg/P) to reroute.

xiv. THEA 247. The C2 application was of concern. Members were more critical about this proposal. (M Nielsen/S Liberti/P) to reroute. Since rerouting was not possible, this was listed as rejected in Curriculog.

b. Workgroup. Not addressed due to time.

5. Adjournment. Before adjournment, Glass noted that work group members should complete their comments on the 2/1 and 1/25 agenda items. Also, the buckets will be supplemented. The subcommittee was declared adjourned at 4:04 pm by Glass due to time.

Respectfully submitted,
Mitchell Watnik, subcommittee secretary