Minutes of the General Education Subcommittee  
January 24, 2018  
SF 329  
2:00 pm - 3:50 pm

Present: Eileen Barrett, Larry Bliss, Julie Glass, Zach Hallab, Caron Inouye, Rita Liberti, Sarah Nielsen, Filippo Rebessi, Aline Soules, Mitchell Watnik, Chongqi Wu, Meiling Wu

Absent: Derek Kimball.  
Guests: none. 

1. **Approval of the Agenda.** Glass called the meeting to order at 2:01. (M M Wu/S Liberti/P)  
Glass asked that discussion of 4a be limited to 10 minutes without objection.

2. **Approval of the minutes.** (M M Wu/S Rebessi/P). Watnik will add Kimball to the attendance list.

3. **Reports.**  
   a. **Chair.** Glass reported the GE Resolutions were passed by the Senate at yesterday’s meeting. She noted that “more and more” proposals are coming forward. Watnik noted that the Senate did not address the B4 outcomes. 
   b. **GE Director.** Inouye said that there are “a lot” of cluster proposals, most of which amount to pairs of courses. She will try to ensure that the courses were already approved for GE. There were at least of couple of cases wherein the courses weren’t even proposed. The statewide GE Task Force might propose dramatic changes to GE, but those are forthcoming and details are not available yet. She did say that LEAP outcomes might be incorporated, which might offset Overlays.  
   c. **Semester Conversion.** Nobody was present.  
   d. **Working Group.** This group is currently defunct.

4. **New Business.** (Approvals are unanimous unless stated otherwise.)  
   a. **Revisions of 16-17 CIC 62.** (M Soules/S Bliss/P) Glass asked the Subcommittee to strike the language mandating “not for major credit”. Soules speculated that there will be inconsistencies in application of this. So, some departments might allow the GE to count for the major, others would not. Glass said that this was the department’s decision.  
   b. **Diversity Overlay.** (M M Wu/S Soules/see below) to pass the document proposed over email by Soules. M Wu spoke about “diversity” and “being inclusive” and argued that the current outcomes are too narrow and limiting. Barrett recalled this as coming up “again” and that it was discussed by the Cultural Groups and Women Overlay Subcommittee. The CGW Overlay was “one of the first”. During that subcommittee’s discussion the issue of the US focus came up and the subcommittee spoke with other stakeholders. They then created the other overlays (social justice and sustainability) to allow global focus. She noted that, in the current climate, these US focus is needed more than ever. Soules noted that there were and are numerous faculty members who were ignorant of the US focus. She noted that there are global diversity issues that have nothing to do with social justice or sustainability. M Wu reiterated that diversity is misleading. Barrett said that allowing for “Diversity in the US” might be a reasonable compromise. Nielsen noted the immigrant populations in the US are included, refuting
an earlier speaker. Rebessi said that expanding the scope would not exclude US diversity courses. Glass spoke for the name change so as to preserve the outcomes, which are embraced by the University and against changing the outcomes. Glass encouraged CIC to reconsider “in its time”, as everything is in evolution. M Wu noted that the Diversity ILO is broader than the US. Nielsen agreed, but argued for preservation of the outcomes as is. Hallab felt that broadening would be in the University’s interest, due to students’ ties to international people and cultures. Barrett argued that Social Justice is the outlet. Though the discussion went 15 minutes, rather than 10 as proposed, Glass truncated discussion at this point. (M Bliss/S Liberti/P 9-1-1) to table until Fall 2018 GE courses are approved.

c. Course Proposals.

i. COMM 266. (M Nielsen/S Bliss/P 10-0-1) to approve as C3. Nielsen said that previous concerns were sufficiently addressed.

ii. HOS 235 (M Hallab/S M Wu/P 8-0-3) pending solution of the course classification. Watnik noted that C5 seminar does not allow for the supervisory community engagement that is called out to addressing the Area E outcomes.

iii. HOS 435 (M Inouye/S M Wu/P 11-0) to reject due to it being upper division.

iv. HOS 298 (M M Wu/S Hallab/see below) to approve for D1-D3. Liberti asked how the course meets any of the outcomes. Hallab said that customer service inherently relates to D1-3. Hallab said that it is possible that more elaboration is needed. (M Hallab/S Bliss/P 10-0-1) to table with Hallab as consultant.

v. HSC 130 (M Inouye/S Liberti/) to approve as C2. There were comments about the repetition of the answers. (M M Wu/S Bliss/P) to table with Inouye as consultant.

vi. INDE 390 (M Rebessi/S Bliss/see below) to approve as B6. Watnik expressed concern about the upper division INDE 330 course (within the major) and how the general education is obtained. Inouye was concerned about the third outcome. (M M Wu/S Liberti/P) to table with Inouye as consultant.

vii. KIN 315 (M Liberti/S Inouye/P 10-0-1) to approve D4 and Social Justice. Liberti will ensure that 2b adequately notes the characteristics will be addressed.

viii. MLL 121 (M M Wu/S Liberti/P 10-0-1) to approve as C2. Nielsen said that she expects that much of the composition will actually be in English. M Wu assured that there are “great works” involved.

ix. MLL 251 (M Soules/S Rebessi/P 10-0-1) to approve as C3.

x. MLL 261 (M Liberti/S Nielsen/) to approve as C3. (M Hallab/S Liberti/P) to update LO 3 with Hallab, Inouye, and M Wu consent approve as C3.

xi. MLL 324 (M Liberti/S Liberti/ P 10-0-1) to approve as C4 with the specification that M Wu will update and Glass will verify. Liberti expressed concern about the “oral communication” component for the online/hybrid version of the course. She understood that it could be done, but it was not clear in the application how this would be done. M Wu said that the course is delivered via Voicethread. Watnik suggested that M Wu would specify on the application that technology will be used.

xii. MLL 325 (M Liberti/S Rebessi/P 10-0-1) to approve as C4 with specification as above.

xiii. MLL 333 (M Inouye/S Hallab/P 10-0-1) to approve as C4.
xiv.  MLL 424 (M Soules/S Rebessi/) to approve as C4.  (M Glass/S Inouye/P) to table with Inouye as the consultant.  The concerns were about the third learning outcome.

xv.  MLL 446 (M Liberti/S Rebessi) to approve as C4.  Concerns were expressed about the oral communication.  (M Barrett/S Rebessi/P) to table with Inouye as the consultant.

xvi. PHYS 301 (M Rebessi/S Nielsen/P) to approve as B6.  C Wu pointed out that the course capacity was “C2”.  Watnik said it meant 50.

5.  Adjournment.  (M Liberti/S Nielsen/P) Prior to adjournment, Nielsen asked about GEOG/ENVT courses.  Glass responded that those would be handled once the revision in 4a above progresses sufficiently.