Preparatory: the meeting was opened at 3:10pm.

I. Minutes: none.

II. Communications and Announcements:

III. Reports:
   A. Academic Senate Chair:
   B. President’s Office:
   C. Provost’s Office:
   D. Statewide Senators:
   E. CFA Campus President:
   F. Staff Council Representative:
   G. ASI Representative:
   H. IACC Representative:
   I. Athletics Governing Board Representative:
   J. Other:

IV. Consent Agenda:

V. Business Items:
   A. Resolution on Proposed Model of Unit Distribution for General Education and Breadth: first reading.

   (Gooden) What’s driving the reduction to 72 units? Any reduction in GEB should not be used to load up on major/support courses. This should be put on the template. (Harris) It doesn’t seem to allow any double-counting. (Irvin) Title 5 gives flexibility to meet this requirement.

   (Amspacher) If we get to change the rules about how to deliberate this resolution, I believe we need to discuss these rules early in the first reading. (Greenwald) the Executive Committee makes decisions on procedural issues. The next Executive Committee meeting would be the time to change any rules from those of the last resolution.

   (Coleman) This is a major change from the last template. It appears the majority of departments will not have any students to take their courses
and there are no international courses. This is contrary to the guiding documents of this campus. (Botwin) There is no rationale for any of the numbers. Where did information come from that made up this template? (Hampsey) responded with a history of the committee and its communications. (Irvin) the needs and variations of programs across campus have different requirements. It’s hard to create one template that meets every department’s needs.

(Warfield) I would prefer taking more time to build a core curriculum where all students are taking the same courses. If we take enough time to develop true interdisciplinary courses, then we’re giving students something mutual to talk and think about.

(Vanasupa) I believe this template is a good-faith effort but the needs of colleges are very different. CENG is under great pressure to accommodate numerous units. The constraints placed on its students by this template is overly burdensome. Maybe the colleges need to design their own programs. (Hampsey) This model cuts units from the present requirements for GEB. (Vanasupa) But it’s still far more than other Engineering programs. (Hampsey) The committee may find ways to do this.

(Morrobel-Sosa) What passes the Senate provides a baseline, but since we haven’t seen flexibility in the past, we don’t anticipate change in the future. The number of units and topics required by CENG accreditation is maximized already. We need to consider the needs of each college and allow for these individual needs. (Hampsey) I would like to see a flexible template so these needs can be accommodated.

(Miller) I’m troubled that Cultural Pluralism is not included. Some of the most meaningful courses for business majors have been eliminated. (Hampsey) Cultural Pluralism is not part of the GEB program. (Gish) Many authorities have said the best way to incorporate Cultural Pluralism is through GEB. If this template is deconstructed, we’ll see this model is very anti-Cultural Pluralism.

(Hood) Is more refinement to come in each of these categories? Will it be specific that, for example, in V, 20 units = 1 math course, 1 statistics course, 1 technical course, etc. (Irvin) Yes. (Hood) Will there be discrete courses and interdisciplinary courses? Will there be tracks of courses that are offered serially? If so, we should add language that expresses this.

(Martinez) CENG’s submitted model proposes ratios that are different that the present accreditation requirements. Why? (Vanasupa) Because of expectations for the future structure of the program. What are the pedagogical reasons for having a core of courses? (Irvin) To have something our students do together, common things they can talk about. It
affords them an opportunity to integrate courses across the campus. Courses would be put together that would have common experiences to them. (Lewis) My experience is that ABET accreditation is more flexible that the college has indicated here.

(Valencia-Laver) For students to be prepared to take common core courses, they need some other courses that are not here. Could CENG’s petition for more units be made of free electives instead of GEB? (Vanasupa) We would like input into the number of units and topics proposed for CENG students. We are already juggling a nightmare. If this passes it will become a night terror.

(Amspacher) What is it, mechanically, that would be so bad to have each college determine its own GEB needs? (Irvin) There is good rationale to having the needs of individual programs addressed. It was the feeling of the committee that this is possible and desirable. However, since 90 percent of courses required for GEB are in two colleges, there’s some sense that the faculty in these disciplines should determine the content of it.

(Ryujin) It doesn’t seem like a “common philosophy” regarding core courses is guiding this area. I would feel more comfortable if there were guidelines defining this area. In Area IV, students will only be taking mandated courses. This is too limited. (Morrobel-Sosa) I would like to see a definition of GEB. It seems “Polytechnic” is lacking in the proposed experience of “common, shared experience.”

B. Resolution on Department Name change for the Agricultural Education Department: first reading.

C. Resolution on Change of Grades: first reading.

VI. Discussion Item(s):

VII. Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 5:00pm.

Submitted by:

[Signature]
Margaret Camuso
Academic Senate