

**Academic Senate
March 27, 2018**

Present: Alvim, Ashmun, Bernard, Bettencourt, Carroll, Chvasta, Crayton, C. Davis, DeCure, Demers, Dorsey, Drake, Edwards, Erickson, Espinoza, Filling, Foreman, Garcia, Gibson, Hight, Hudspeth, Jaycox, Johannsdottir, Nagel, McNally, Mokhtari, Mayer, Morgan, Petrosky, Renning, Rossi, Sarraile, Scales, Strahm, Strangfeld, Thompson, Webster, Weikart, Wellman, Williams, and Zong.

Excused: Daniel Davies, Jason Geer, and Montero-Hernandez.

Proxies: Al Petrosky for Panos Petratos.

Guests: Amanda Theis, Shawna Young, Erin Littlepage, Scott Hennes, Tomas Gomez-Arias, Christopher Claus, Dave Evans, Ron Rodriguez, Nina Palomino, Ellen Junn, Helene Caudill, Jake Myers, Stuart Wooley, Betsy Eudey, Jim Tuedio, Lauren Byerly, Matt Collins, Janette Rodriguez, and Juan Ruiz.

Second Reading Item: 7/AS/18/SEC Stanislaus State Student Success Definition, Passed.

First Reading Items:

10/AS/18/GC Resolution for Graduate Education Assessment Plan

11/AS/18/GC Resolution for Graduate Education Assessment Plan

12/AS/18/SEC Affirmation of Free Speech Rights at CSU – Stanislaus (Sense of the Senate)

Discussion Items:

FAC Range Elevation Policy

XX/AS/18/UEPC/GE General Education (GE) Breadth Requirements

Initial update from ASCSU GE Task Force- March 2018

Next Academic Senate Meeting:

April 17, 2018

2:00-4:00pm, JSRFDC Reference Room 118

Minutes submitted by:

Gerard Wellman, Clerk

1. Call to order

2:03pm

2. Approval of Agenda

Approved

3. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of March 13, 2018 (distributed electronically)

Approved

4. Introductions

Amanda Theis, Shawna Young, Erin Littlepage, Scott Hennes, Tomas Gomez-Arias, Christopher Claus, Dave Evans, Ron Rodriguez, Nina Palomino, Ellen Junn, Helene Caudill, Jake Myers, Stuart Wooley, Betsy Eudey, Jim Tuedio, Lauren Byerly, Matt Collins, Janette Rodriguez, and Juan Ruiz.

5. Announcements

Eudey – You’ve received an announcement, but there is an opening for one faculty fellow, as Gerard Wellman is leaving for other duties. Encourage faculty in your department to consider applying. This position comes with 3 WTUs in Fall and Spring for a 2-year period.

Tuedio – Tonight is the streaming of *Delores*, followed by a screening with Pablo Rodriguez.

Byerly – Tomorrow night at 7:30, in Snider Music Hall, there will be a concert of the chorale and chamber singers.

6. Committee Reports/Questions (FAC, FBAC, GC, SWAS, UEPC, CFA other)

FAC – Met last week. Reporting on range elevation policy which will be a discussion item today. We will be sending a memo shortly answering questions about voting rights in departments. It will say that our CBA defines academic department as all teaching members, so we advise departments to include adjunct faculty in activities. There are two circumstances when all faculty must be consulted: selecting chair and hiring activities.

FBAC – Hasn't met since the last Senate meeting.

GC – Discussed the time module policy and second dual degree policies. Reviewed the Genetic Counseling APR and components of two WASC essays relevant to graduate education.

Statewide – Statewide approved without dissent support for psychological counseling services to be put forward as tenure track.

UEPC – Met on March 22nd. Discussion about EO 1100 and the item that is present for discussion today. Discussed Active Learning classrooms. Committee did not support the idea for direct priority and thought it should be scheduled through normal procedures. Got overview of BA of Health Sciences stateside.

CFA – On April 4th CFA will be taking a bus from campus Reflection Pond at 8 am to go to Sacramento to rally support for financial support from the governor and the legislature. It's a joint effort with faculty and students. We are in need of more faculty to join. This is important to our students in particular because they are facing a tuition increase and they're anxious about that. We need to do everything we can to support ourselves and them. There will be free taco truck. If you want to commit, fill out a commitment card and leave it with Lauren Byerly.

Davis – I created an ad hoc committee for replacing IDEA forms. Nagel – we'll be forwarding our recommendation to the Speaker after Spring Break. We will recommend the development of a campus-based form and system for processing the data. It will be in-house and more inexpensive than IDEA.

7. Information Item

a. WASC Report

Claus – We're still collecting feedback. The online forms allow for comment until the first week of May. The next big event will be the open forums. April 9th 9am – 4pm there will be open forums based on the essays. Essay 9-10 am. 10-11 Essays 3, 4, 6. 2-3pm Essays 2 and 7. 3-4pm Essay 5. The forums will be in MSR 130.

8. Second Reading Items

a. 7/AS/18/SEC Stanislaus State Student Success Definition

Davis – AVP Young took what we discussed in Senate last time and made changes. SEC then did some minor wordsmithing.

Sarraille – Why are we doing this? Davis – our Strategic Plan does not define student success. This will go into the plan as the definition. The Strategic Plan was approved by Senate, so this should be approved too.

Strahm – I like how this is. But I also know that 70+% of our students are first generation. That's transformative for everyone in the family. I like it and I understand that families are part of communities, so it could be subsumed under the term "community." Nevertheless, I liked the original one that mentioned positively transforming their lives and their families. I'd like to see that added back in. It's acknowledging that students don't do this stuff on their own. I'm making a motion to amend to add in "and the lives of their families." Seconded by Foreman.

Foreman – I wholeheartedly support this motion. These types of technical documents can become a muddle. We can demonstrate our uniqueness here in this document. What's unique about us is our population of students we serve. Many higher education institutions are not set up to support our students in our region. Our region is agricultural and rural and a plurality Latino, and family is valued very highly. This phrase is accurate and reflects the unique mission of our institution and our student population.

Strangfeld – I am in favor of this motion. There is research on the experiences of first gen and working class students in terms of their cultural understanding of academia. Middle class values promote individualism but working class individuals – and a high number of first gen students come from working class backgrounds – tend to have a more communal type of value experience. Research shows that when universities present themselves as welcoming of work that is collaborative and communal the students feel more welcomed and belonging than when the university presents an image of individuality. I support this because it's an opportunity for us to break apart the strict individualism that is alienating and off-putting for working class students.

Thompson – I predict this will pass 36:2 but I still will speak against this. I think we're defining success for our overall student body. The comments so far are not really to the point. Some students may not want to transform their families. We shouldn't define for our students that their success is to transform their families.

Carroll – I'm not sure that middle class families are less committed to communalism. I wonder if we add this back in whether the fourth bullet point should have a similar phrase.

DeCure – I speak in favor of this motion. When looking at how we define ourselves we're looking at the lens at which other people see us. To leave a legacy in writing about how we define ourselves, a family can be any group of people. It's important to put it in writing that our students define themselves in terms of their families. Our students stay here. To put this as part of the legacy and how we're defining the structure of this institution is important.

Garcia – I speak in favor of the resolution how it is. This conversation sounds almost paternalistic. Student success is about transforming students and ourselves. If everything is about them/they, it becomes problematic. The way it's currently written doesn't do that.

Strahm – Families aren't just those of the past, but also the ones we create on our own. This is future-looking too. Families are the things we create as we go forward. It's not our current families, but what we're doing as human beings to improve the lives of those that come after us.

Foreman – if Mark's point is correct, we'd need to look at all the other considerations and say that students must exercise civic rights to be successful. I don't think putting in families excludes anyone. Also, most students will never see this.

Thompson – I'm in agreement that we shouldn't be directing to the degree that we already have dictating what is student success. We shouldn't be giving those kinds of directives to students. A better change would be to take the word "their" out of the third line and simply say "transform lives."

Junn – in our Strategic Plan there is language that we seek to be a student-ready university. We strive to create an atmosphere for our students that we're ready for them. That's already in our strategic plan. I'm glad to see this discussion. WASC asks what does student success look like on your campus, and what is unique about your campus's definition? I'd love to be able to say, as president, "this is how my campus defines student success."

Alvim – The end of the paragraph speaks to communities, and I think that includes families.

Vote on Amendment: 16:23:2. Amendment does not pass.

Jaycox – I make a motion to amend the paragraph to remove "their". Carroll second.

Jaycox – Thank you Mark for that suggestion. With our discussion of families, removing "their" encompasses what everyone wants. I want to change my life, my community, and the world with my education. Carroll – what she said.

Morgan – Grammatically, the verb is separate for each part of the list. I'm not as supportive of this primarily because it falls in the same trap in that it's becoming a directive of what we're

supposed to do with our education. It's not focusing on the student. I think saying they have to actively, positively change the lives of others puts us in an odd position.

Chvasta – It smacks of evangelism to talk about transforming others' lives rather than a more fruitful individual focus.

Byerly – If you say transform lives, that includes just your own. It doesn't have to be everybody.

Vote on Amendment: 19:21:1. Amendment does not pass.

Petrosky – It will be impossible to measure, but I support it.

Vote on Resolution: 36:1:3. Resolution passes.

9. First Reading Items

- a. 10/AS/18/GC Resolution for Graduate Education Assessment Plan

Dorsey moved; seconded by Thompson.

Dorsey – This is an update of the previous assessment plan for graduate education. We spent a lot of time amending the text with respect to the institutional level assessment, numbers 6-8.

Morgan – How does this assessment plan affect courses that are cross listed, like 4000-level courses that graduate students can take for credit?

Dorsey – I can't speak to the policy across all programs, but in our program when we're assessing our curriculum, they're assessed in the same way as graduate courses. I would like to recommend a revision of item 7 under institutional-level graduate assessment. The current language suggests that the Faculty Fellow for Assessment and Grad Council coauthor that document. I would like to recommend the following change: "In early Fall, the Faculty Fellow for Assessment reviews the College FLC reports from the previous year and writes an Annual Institutional Graduate Education Report, in consultation with Graduate Council, summarizing observations about graduate education across colleges and makes recommendations regarding graduate education at the institutional level. The observations from the Annual Institutional Graduate Education Assessment Reports are integrated into a 7-year Graduate Education Academic Program Review, developed by the Faculty Fellow for Assessment in collaboration with, and approved by, Graduate Council." The purpose is to clarify that GC is a consultative role in that process.

Young – I support that this more accurately reflects what was discussed in GC.

b. 11/AS/18/GC Resolution for Graduate Education Action Plan

Dorsey moved; Thompson seconded

Dorsey – Some of the changes from its predecessors include the role of institutional-level assessment in #6.

Young – In light of the changes in the assessment plan, I was wondering if GC would consider adding in 6b: “observations about” after “report and discuss.” And those same words in 6c before “program-level data.”

Dorsey – Those changes are consistent with our understanding of the important distinction between observations at the institutional level and the findings at the programmatic level.

Morgan – What is meant by “observations about”? What does that look like methodologically?

Dorsey – This was a suggestion originally made to distinguish that observations connote a dialogue. Findings suggests finality of results. Observations are open-ended and dialogical.

Wooley – Programs will do the findings. Each program analyzes their program and figuring out what they’re doing well and where needs improvement. The institutional level looks at those and looks for patterns across campus, collecting observations about what programs are saying.

Weikart – What’s the rationale for doing this annually under 2A?

Dorsey – To be able to be responsive from one year to the next with respect to the effectiveness of the process. The comments in previous Senate meetings about assessment generally is that it seems like the institutional level assessment adds more work for programs and departments. The outcome and the improvement that is offered with respect to student success have not been forthcoming. The idea is to be nimble and if something isn’t working to change it so that the work of assessment is less burdensome or can be improved.

Carroll – In 1a, is that intended as a step back from hiring a graduate dean?

Dorsey – Depending on perspective, this could be viewed as a placeholder. We need to define leadership whether or not we have a graduate dean. At present the institutional roles are spread out across different departments with different responsibilities. Some of that won’t change with a graduate dean. The idea is that even if we don’t have someone unifying and centralizing those roles and tasks, our bases are still covered.

Weikart – Annual updating could become unproductive busywork.

Young – I think in our conversations around the action plan, we talked in GC about the multiple previous action plans which have never gone to Academic Senate. They've only existed within GC. It was revisited from time to time, but not in a systematic or regular way to check our progress on our priorities. Having a built-in regular time annually that we go back to that plan and do a bit of introspection to see where we've made progress and not accomplished things we'd like to, it gives us an opportunity to look at where we're going and revisit whether we need to adapt or go in a different direction.

Weikart – 2b would cover those concerns about monitoring. You could simply update it if there were problems.

- c. 12/AS/18/SEC Affirmation of Free Speech Rights at CSU – Stanislaus (Sense of the Senate Resolution)

Nagel moved; seconded by Carroll.

Nagel – This arises from the History Department so I'll let Brett speak to this.

Davis – we made changes based on feedback, and you have the track changes in front of you. In the rationale, the added piece was previously taken out but has been added back in.

Carroll – I support the resolution. For the most part I like the changes. In the third resolved clause, the reference to the CSU Code of Conduct was removed. If that remains out of the resolution, the second paragraph could be removed. The Code of Conduct provides some policy basis for the resolution.

Petrosky – The resolution is agnostic with respect to who's making the final decision about whether there's been a transgression. It should be determined by a community committee representing university stakeholders.

Foreman – This is a Sense of the Senate. It doesn't create anything, it's just a statement about our sentiment. There's not action involved.

Chvasta- Is there a procedure in place when violations of the code of conduct occur?

Davis – There is.

Petrosky – In lieu of recommendation of process, it'll be determined by whomever wants to make it.

Carroll – The intent was never to create policy.

Thompson – The code of conduct was removed mainly on my argument that the language in separating the two resolved clauses, was to take out the “While”. While seemed to deemphasize or subordinate free speech. That resolved clause talks about what’s foundational to civil discourse, democracy, and the educational process. The student code of conduct doesn’t cover our other priorities to promote free speech.

Carroll – In that case, you might want to take out the second paragraph of the rationale.

Davis – We left it in there to provide more context to the rationale.

Thompson – The History Department bravely put this in the form of resolved clauses. That may come to your aid in the second reading.

Espinoza – I’m interested in the interplay between the Time, Place, and Manner Policy. That policy is centered on free speech. We need to evaluate this language in view of this policy.

Davis – Senate passed a version of TMP, then it went through some changes, and it has not returned to Senate. SEC could not agree on those changes.

Sarraille – Does it matter what the current policy is if this is a Sense of the Senate? It’s more of an expression of what we desire. I question whether it needs to agree with policy.

10. Discussion Items

a. FAC Range Elevation Policy

Foreman – We need to pass a permanent policy. The temporary policy sunsets on May 31st. Eligibility is determined by the contract. Faculty Affairs has to let lecturers know they’re eligible for a range elevation. The lecturer notifies the chair and the department creates an evaluation committee. There are specific steps to this process detailed in the policy. The policy allows for extra-curricular activity to be discussed, but someone can’t be penalized for not engaging in them.

Nagel – It’s the almost-final decision of the provost. Should a lecturer feel they reached an incorrect decision, they can appeal to a faculty committee. For range elevations, the committee’s decision is final and binding on the university.

Foreman – I thank AVP Myers and Chris Nagel for their work on this at our last meeting.

Carroll – First, the evaluation criteria and procedure. It sounds like an inconsistency between the first half and the second. Second, while this allows for the candidate to respond to a dean-level evaluation, I don’t see anything that allows for a response to a department –level decision.

Foreman – That was not intentional, and we’ll consider this at our next meeting. Our intent was to allow responses at each level of review.

Greer – Under application #1, can you elaborate on student surveys of opinion?

Foreman – We’re referring to student evaluations with “student surveys of opinion”

Morgan – The part under evaluation criteria, it suggests that lecturers can be rewarded for going beyond minimum standards, but can’t be penalized for not going beyond minimum standards.

Carroll – That makes more sense than what’s written here.

Morgan – How will one measure development? There is wiggle-room that could be used positively or negatively

Foreman – The previous policy was even less-specific.

Nagel – We don’t know what this policy really means until someone is denied and grieves. That’s true of any contract language. The intention of changes to CBA language regarding range elevation is to make sure it’s based on the job of being a lecturer and minimize imposition of extra work requirements since we are told repeatedly that we’re paid for nothing but teaching.

Foreman – The discussion in committee was between simply saying “you need to talk about your teaching exclusively” or come up with compromise language that would allow them to brag about pother accomplishments, but not be penalized for not engaging in them.

Thompson – To Nagel’s point, are there occasions where lecturers have other duties than teaching?

Nagel – Yes.

Davis – In my department at one time, a lecturer was in charge of advising. Their letters of appointment included assigned time for advising.

b. CSU General Education Breadth Requirements

Thompson – The UEPC and the GE subcommittee have done a lot of work on this and we appreciate the support from Stuart Wooley and the Provost's Office. The mandate for change did not generate on our campus. There was not a move to restructure GE on this campus. We are discussing this item due to mandates in an EO. Through the Senate and SEC, this campus decided to work on implementing the mandates of the EO at the appropriate pace. The UEPC

believes that we have given due information, consultation, and consideration, and that it is now time to send a draft forward for discussion. I provided an outline to reflect what's in the draft resolution. The first thing is upper-division GE. Any course that satisfies an area of upper-division GE will satisfy that area regardless of whether the course is in a student's major or a concentration. Second, we had too many units in Area D. The proposal is to remove PSCI 1201 from that area but retain it as the graduation requirement it already is. For Area E, one path was a university requirement for the physical activity courses; the other was to collapse area E and keep the activity courses in the area. The UEPC's consensus was to recommend the latter. Doing that would also remove the exemption for people 25 and older that was attached to Area E.2. Areas F1, F2, and F3 would be renamed UD-B, UD-C, and UD-D. Area G will be removed but the multicultural requirement remains. We sent language forward that reflects limiting the requirement to be satisfied within GE or allowing the requirement to be satisfied both in and outside of GE. There are about 17 "G-only" courses, so there's a question about what will happen to those. The UEPC is not trying to promote or demote anyone's program. Our approach has been to meet the mandates in the EO with minimum disruption or damage to the campus.

Davis – I've given you a list of G courses. There are 19 multicultural courses in a major, and 2 that are floating on their own.

Strahm – A clarification: is it D1B that is being retained as a university requirement? Thompson – Yes. Strahm – On #5 Area G, I would like to get clarification and/or make a statement. What are you doing with G? I would like to see this as a university requirement. That way we don't have to concern ourselves with the whims of the CO because the legislature has a mandate. We retain control over that. Thompson – That's the next resolved.

Foreman – In Area E, my understanding is that we're retaining the physical activity courses but not requiring them. Thompson – You're not prohibited. Yes, is the short answer. Foreman – on #4 upper-division courses, is there a requirement that students take upper-division within the GE? Davis – there is still an upper-division requirement, we just cannot call it F. Thompson – it's purely renaming. The courses will remain. Foreman – I want to make sure that we name an upper-division requirement. Wooley – the EO specifies 9 upper-division units.

Carroll – Question: once we move Area G, with that removed, I can think of many courses in my department that deserve designation as multicultural. Can we expand that list? Yes. Given the fact that EO is still controversial, I think it would be a good idea to build in a contingency clause that's contingent on actual implementation of EO 1100.

Weikart – I'd like to recommend that part of the rationale in paragraph 2. I'd like to see that in the Resolved clause rather than just in the Rationale.

Thompson – It's not that that *will* happen, it's going to *continue* to happen. There will not be a change for students.

Eudey – I'm interested in the recommendations regarding the multicultural requirement. There is absolute agreement that we want to retain the multicultural graduation requirement. The question UEPC has is whether students must satisfy that graduation requirement only by courses in GE or with courses outside GE. My personal preference is to keep it in GE. My argument is that we approved goals and outcomes for the GE including Outcome 3.4. It's only anchored to Area G. We have made a commitment to diversity and inclusion. If we take that out of GE, we're devaluing the intent of it. I like that it's in GE and could be reinforced through the major or electives. But when it's in GE, it shows that we value it. I also like that it will be reviewed through GE Sub. Our GE program must include an anchor related to diversity and inclusion. This is the question UEPC is very much grappling with.

Wooley – Functionally for students, the GE programs will still have 48 units. 39 lower-division and 9 upper-division units. Right now we have 51 because of PSCI 1201, but that's coming out. To complete the university requirements plus the GE it will still be 51 units. Area E changes quite a bit without the activity courses. Functionally, there won't be a lot of change that this EO is proposing, we're just restructuring what we call things. Students will still complete 51 units. The issue of where to put Area G is a real issue. It's a good idea to have that commitment to diversity. Making sure we put it in the right place is important.

Xamuel Banales – I like that we're committed to multiculturalism. It's outdated rhetoric and we should consider in the future revamping that rhetoric. I teach Ethnic Studies and have asked students about their multicultural requirement. They report that it's ineffective and they don't like it. I worry that keeping it in GE will replicate what we currently have which isn't working. I think it also occludes that we're committed to diversity. I recommend, based on Northridge which has already dealt with this issue, they created a taskforce to evaluate this. The people on the committee did research and went in-depth and made recommendations. Because there's confusion, we should put experts in the field on this issue to create recommendations. I recommend we create a taskforce to make a recommendation about how we move forward.

Ariana Cruz – I'm an Ethnic Studies major, and think there should be a requirement that gives it meaning. In my multicultural class, I don't remember anything. I want other students to take it more seriously. It's important for students to see themselves in the curriculum. In our careers we're going to have to deal with diverse members of the public. Writing Proficiency has a committee for that. I would push for a multicultural committee made up of faculty, staff, and students. Ethnic and gender studies needs to have a set seat on that committee.

Bao Lo – The fact that the Executive Order mandated the G requirement to be taken away from the GE program is already a statement that is not valued in the same way as physical education, math, english, etc. in the mission and values of the GE program, so hiding it under a different designation of the GE program does not do any justice or emphasize the G requirement in the same way. If we truly value issues of diversity, equity, inclusion, and social justice, we need to make a stronger statement on our campus within our curriculum.

The option to have the University wide requirement for graduation similar to a WP requirement that is reviewed by a committee will give more focus and visibility for issues of diversity, equity, inclusion, and social justice that is at the core of our mission and values statement and reflective of the programming, curriculum, and many things we and our students care about. I believe the second option for the university graduation requirement could give us more flexibility and opportunity to make the wider campus impact we hope to do with issues of diversity, equity, inclusion, and social justice within our curriculum and for our diverse campus.

Given that if GE is 51 (now 48) units of a student's 120-unit undergrad education, students should really be aware that this is happening and not when they are receiving advising after changes have been made. Students are central and should be at the forefront of this discussion and they are not. The process has moved very fast and needs greater input and understanding from the larger campus and students.

Thompson – As a senator from English, the idea of Writing Proficiency is a good example. If you look at WP, one of the main tenants is that it spreads writing discussions across the campus so it's a campus responsibility. If you want to use that model, going back to what Senator Carroll raised, there should be openness about who should teach a multicultural requirement. Spreading it across campus is the better path. If we're talking about diversity and inclusion, we should invite people in rather than trying to cordon off who should provide this to students.

Strahm – I thank Ariana for pointing out what we call cultural competency and the need for students to come out of their educational experience being able to understand difference and empathize. I like the idea of having a multicultural committee take on this task. I note that what we call cultural taxation is that faculty of color are culturally taxed more than white faculty. We saw that today; they end up doing a lot more work because there are fewer of them. They do more work, and are not recognized as faculty members. To Betsy, keeping it GE, I hear what you're saying, but I would like to raise CS 4000 at one point was listed in GE as a multicultural requirement for one semester. When we have GE classes that have certain requirements, we're trying to make sure that people who come out of these classes have a level of competence in that subject matter. Having this in GE also presents a whole host of problems which is why I advocated for making it a university-wide requirement.

Student – As a student who is a minority, it goes back to institutional racism because you're burying us. If we're a diverse school, how will you not emphasize multiculturalism?

Morgan – With the EO stating that we cannot add more graduate requirements that are like GE, we can't add a standalone 3-unit multicultural requirement? According to the EO, does it have to be double-dippable?

Thompson – About the computer science course, that's a perfect example. Is the Internet a culture, do we need to look at social media? If CS wanted a class on internet media, should that be denied a multicultural label because experts don't agree with that?

c. Initial update from ASCSU General Education Task Force – March 2018

Nagel – The next to last page is the page that includes the issues that the statewide group wants feedback on. For instance, models of GE, American Institutions, etc. The feedback on these issues is what we're asked for.

Davis – The statewide GE taskforce asked for our feedback. I'd like to gather feedback from the Senate today or through other means so SEC can create a general statement to provide to them in response to these four things. If we want to add something about our multicultural requirement, we could add that.

Jaycox – On the models of GE, I had both in my undergrad. I had the cafeteria style as well as the pathway. I liked the pathway more because I was able to pick courses that I cared about. Students don't understand GE. In pathways, I was able to learn the purpose and I became a better student because of it. I like what we're doing with the SEEs and the pathways idea.

Hudspeth – As the representative from Political Science and Public Administration we're concerned with Item 2. This item sounds a bit like it's lumping American History with American Government. My colleagues and I would like to emphasize it's a policy course, not a history course. It deals with the institutions of government, what it does and how it does it. It encourages civic engagement. It is not a history course.

Nagel – Partly responding to Jaxcox's point, years ago, the impetus for the upper-division GE Summit program, surveys of faculty and students were done and the students indicated they didn't understand the purpose. That was the faculty's attitude too. One response on this campus was the Summit program to link courses and make them meaningful. There were difficulties with funding and scheduling. What killed it was that it wasn't supported with funds.

Strahm – I'd like to say that part of the problem is that we don't do a good job of nurturing our GE and explaining it to our colleagues and our students. I had a thing I wanted to raise. I don't

know how many departments there are where faculty serve as student advisors. If you do, I'd like you to think about how you advise your majors as they're going through their GE. I think in a strange way we might be guiding our majors and students on a pathway that she mentioned. For example, in sociology, I have students who want to go on to MSW. They want to work with children. As part of their GE, I suggest they take classes related to child and adolescent development, where they will encounter ways that children develop. That is sort of a pathway. I was hoping when folks talk to colleagues, find out if we already do that. If we do, then maybe this is something to consider trying to find a path to create and could recreate how we understand the purpose of GE and its value to them.

Sarraille – I want to concur with a couple of things. Professors in courses can discuss the purpose of GE as part of the course. They probably should. Another observation I concur with is that we've been under a speed-up for so long, we don't remember what it's like to have time to pull back and consider what we're doing and reformulate things. Our students are living like that and so are we. We have to do some background thinking.

Wooley – I have a lot of thoughts. It's great to hear the careful, thoughtful commitment to GE. The program is diffused and divided among many departments. They need support to help address issues that can't be addressed at the department level. No one really owns GE and from a university-wide perspective, it's important that there's a way to spearhead and coordinate things. When this GE assessment plan comes back, that's the goal of the plan. It's meant to help us see the issues like with the Pathways program. There are other areas in GE that fizzled out as the leading faculty move on to something else. Having a university-wide, faculty-driven role will help create a framework to help folks identify patterns so we can support and strengthen GE. Based on your feedback today, it's really important we look at GE from an institutional level because there's no way a single department or faculty member will effectively manage the entire GE program.

11. Open Forum

12. Adjournment - 4:04 pm