Members Present: Carl Bellone, Peter Claus, Fung-Shine Pan, Kris Ramsdell, Jeff Seitz, Emily Stoper David Stronck, Alison Warriner (Chair)

Members Absent: Joy Andrews, Hadi Behzad, Solomon Cason, Toni Merendino, Karen Wong

Guests: Linda Kinrade, Rosanne Moore, Sue Opp, Don Sawyer

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

1. Approval of the Agenda – M/S/P 6-0-0 Stoper/Claus to approve.

2. Approval of the Minutes of the Meeting of Nov. 18 – M/S/P 6-0-0 Claus/Stronck to approve as corrected.


4. Report of the Associate Vice President, Academic Programs and Graduate Studies - Carl Bellone reported that 02-03 CIC 1, Proposed Alternative Methods for Students to Satisfy the University Writing Skills Requirement was approved by the Senate at its meeting of November 19, 2002. The Executive Committee voted 9-0-0 at its meeting of November 26, 2002 to place 02-03 CIC 3, New Course and Course Modification Request Forms on the Senate Agenda.

5. Subcommittee Reports –
   b. Writing Skills – Alison Warriner reported that the subcommittee had met that morning and decided to re-word for clarification the criteria for the second-tier writing skills courses. It also approved two sections of ENG 3000 as second-tier courses that fulfill the writing skills requirement.

   The subcommittee was quite concerned because only 41% of those students who took the Writing Skills Test this quarter achieved a passing grade. Transfer students did far worse than our native freshmen, of whom 54% passed. The subcommittee discussed at length the causes and cures of this woefully low pass rate. After speculating that perhaps students are so accustomed to writing on a computer that they have difficult writing effectively in longhand, the Subcommittee decided to ask Emily Nye (Director of the Student Center for Academic Achievement) to select a small random sample of students to take the test on a computer, to see if they do better. Warriner urged CIC’s members, who are also very concerned, to attend the next Writing Skills Forum – an opportunity for faculty to discuss means to improve student writing.
6. New Business –
   a. Approved the G.E. application of KPE 3200, Sports in Film, as a 4-unit course. (This application was approved earlier as a 3-unit course.) M/S/P 6-0-0 Stronck/Ramsdell.
   b. Apply HIST 4032, Introduction to Public History, to G.E. Area C4 upper division Humanities 88-96, 96-98. The course seemed to some members to be an orientation to careers and therefore not appropriate for use as a G.E. course. Therefore, consideration was postponed until a member of the History Department can be present.

7. Old Business –
   General Education Review – Interview with G.E. Subcommittee members Linda Kinrade, Sue Opp, Kris Ramsdell, Don Sawyer and Jeff Seitz (4 others could not be present). The G.E. Subcommittee will make recommendations to CIC with respect to the G.E. program, which is undergoing review and modification this year.
   Following are highlights of a discussion that lasted over an hour. The Subcommittee members agreed with the Outside Reviewer that the current G.E. programs lacks a clear mission or coherent goals. The founders of the cluster program had broad goals, such as the creation of learning communities and of interdisciplinary dialog, but these have not been adequately communicated to the rest of the faculty. Perhaps there should be a campus-wide discussion leading to the creation of a mission statement for the G.E. program.
   With respect to the Subcommittee’s work, a major perceived problem is that, in the absence of learning outcomes for science, social science and humanities, there are no criteria for approving or turning down proposals for G.E. courses or clusters on subject-matter grounds. There are skills-based criteria but it is often difficult to determine if a course meets these criteria, since the forms use the Catalog language as boiler-plate. The requirement to attach a syllabus has improved matters. Still, the G.E. Subcommittee often feels that it has little choice but to rubber-stamp the approval of the Science and ALSS curriculum committees, and that its decisions are then rubber-stamped by CIC and the Senate. Linda Kinrade argued that if there were subject-matter learning goals, there could be a cyclical review process for G.E. courses and clusters, and that G.E. application could be revoked, as Critical Thinking courses sometimes are today. To win faculty support for this, there would have to be agreed-upon assessment tools and an appeals process.

The meeting adjourned at 4:42 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Emily Stoper, Secretary