Members Present: Carl Bellone, Joy Bhadury, Kyzyl Fenno-Smith, Roberta Millstein, Rosanne Moore, Steve Peng, Xeno Rasmusson, Jeff Seitz (Chair), Jeff Simons, Emily Stoper, Erica Wildy

Guest: Sally Murphy

The meeting was called to order at 2:45 p.m.

1. **M/S/P Stoper/Fenno-Smith to approve the agenda.**

2. **M/S/P Millstein/Fenno-Smith to approve the minutes** of the Oct. 3 meeting, as corrected. The corrections, all of them under the heading Subcommittee Nominations, were offered by Rosanne Moore, as follows: The first sentence of the section on Subcommittee Nominations should read “All subcommittees except Basic Skills Requirements Appeals and the one on Graduate Programs must contain at least one non-administrative CIC member.” Add Lynn Paringer to the list of CBE members on the Basic Skills Requirements Appeals Board. Add Jennifer Eagan as the CLASS representative to the Cultural Groups/Women Committee. Toni Fogarty, not Xeno Rasmusson, was nominated to serve on the Technology and Instruction Committee.

3. **Chair’s Report:** The Executive Committee approved the General Education (G.E.) Subcommittee nominations, with the exception of David Nickles as the CEAS representative, because he has a conflict with his teaching schedule. A replacement for him will be sought.
   Response to an inquiry at the previous meeting: Senate policy is that decisions on application of courses to G.E. requirements made by the Cultural Groups/Women (CG/W) and Critical Thinking Subcommittees are not reviewed through the Senate process, unless there is an appeal. The exception is that CG/W Subcommittee decisions to decertify a course that currently is approved for that requirement do automatically go through the process. <Someone expressed the view that the procedures should be identical for the two subcommittees, either requiring or not requiring routine review for decertification. It may be that the CG/W rule was meant only for the year that a new, more stringent policy was initiated. The Chair will look into this and CIC may recommend a change in decertification policy.>

4. **Report of the Associate Vice President:** No report.
5. **Report of the Chair of the G.E. Subcommittee:** The subcommittee will review 76 proposals for applications of courses to G.E. requirements that are left over from last spring. To expedite the process, two-member subcommittees were created to vet lists of courses; the subcommittee will review the subcommittees’ decisions only in cases of disputes between the two subcommittee members. A call for additional proposals will be sent out soon, with an application form. There will also be a call for new freshman learning communities (clusters), although these will not be reviewed until next fall.

6. **Subcommittee Nominations** (continued from last meeting)
   M/S/P Stoper/Fenno-Smith to nominate Luz Calvo to represent Ethnic Studies on the CG/W Subcommittee.
   M/S/P Fenno-Smith/Simons to nominate Tom Bickley to represent the Library on the Technology and Instruction Subcommittee.
   Patricia Lohman-Hawke’s name will be removed from the Basic Skills Requirements Appeals list because she is no longer available.
   The list of nominations is now complete and will go to the Executive Committee for approval.

7. **Review of Structure of G.E. Breadth Requirements**
The Chancellor’s Office has asked all CSU campuses to offer comments on the effectiveness of the CSU G.E. program as outlined in Executive Order (E.O.) 595, as well as suggestions for changes.
   Fenno-Smith commented that E.O. 595, Section III.A. “will have achieved the ability to think clearly and logically, to find information and examine it critically, to communicate orally and in writing, and to reason quantitatively” works well here at CSU East Bay. Stoper felt that the CG/W requirement is an effective part of our G.E. package here. Bhadury suggested seeking benchmarks by comparing the CSU G.E. package with those of comparable systems such as SUNY or Illinois.

   M/S/P Millstein/Rasmusson, 8-1-1, to recommend elimination of the Lifelong Understanding Requirement and its replacement with a requirement for an interdisciplinary course, in the spirit of E.O. 595, Section II.A.5, which asks campuses to consider “the possibility of incorporating integrative courses, especially at the upper division level, which feature the interrelationships among disciplines within and across traditional G.E. categories.”
   M/S/P Stoper/Rasmusson 8-0-2 to recommend requiring a course on diverse cultural groups and women, in the spirit of E.O. 595, Section V, paragraph 3, which says that “Instruction approved to fulfill <other G.E.> requirements should recognize the contributions to knowledge and civilization that have been made by members of diverse cultural groups and by women.”

   Rasmusson suggested requesting guidelines in E.O. 595 for the use of overlay requirements within G.E., but others thought it was unwise to ask for advice that might reduce campus autonomy.
Seitz suggested that the Quantitative Reasoning requirement (B4) be re-categorized as a skills requirement and placed under A, which could then be renamed “Foundational Skills” (it’s now called “Communication in the English Language”), with Area B, Natural Sciences, then having the same number of units (16) as Areas C and D, Humanities and Social Sciences. An alternative is that Quantitative Reasoning could be separated out of Area B and form its own category. Everyone seemed to agree that removing Quantitative Reasoning from Area B was a good idea.

Seitz suggested that all campuses be encouraged to permit students to double-count courses for G.E. and the State Code requirement in U.S. History and Institutions. (The existing E.O. 595 already permits this, and 13 campuses allow it.) Four members of the committee spoke against this idea and no-one besides Seitz spoke for it. The idea was proposed last year on our campus and failed to be recommended by either CIC or its G.E. Subcommittee.

Seitz also suggested that we recommend that the CSU G.E. package not be increased. There was some disagreement with the recommendation, though it was recognized that it is very unlikely that the package will be increased, in view of the Chancellor’s concern about facilitating graduation.

8. **Adjournment:** The meeting was adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Emily Stoper, Secretary