

ACADEMIC SENATE – GENERAL EDUCATION GOVERNANCE BOARD

Spring 2016

Due: Wednesday, June 8, 2016

MEMBERS	
Name	College/Unit
Bailey, Helen	Admin
Battista, Clare	OCOB
Fernflores, Rachel (LV W&S 2016)	CLA
Fogle, Emily (LV W&S 2016)	CSM
Giberti, Bruno	CAED
Helmbrecht, Brenda (CH)	CLA
Jasbinsek, John (LV W&S 2016)	CSM
Keeling, Elena	CSM
MacDougall, Neal	CAFES
Machamer, Josh	CLA
O'Clair, Katherine	PCS
Pedersen, Mary	Admin
Sawyer, Thomas	ASI
Scriven, Tal	CLA
Turner, Clark	CENG
VACANT (Fogle)	CSM

CHARGES	
Charge	Status/Notes
Ongoing review of curriculum proposals: catalog cycle proposals and continuous course review proposal. August 2016.	During the Spring Quarter 2016, we looked at BMED213 which was approved, and CRP325 which was sent back for further revisions. The course was evidently approved.
GE program review. Report due in August 2016.	The GEGB factual review was completed and finalized to Academic Programs. The final GE review report was submitted. In moving forward, a list of priorities for the future of GE was generated by the committee and sent to the Provost and Chair of the Academic Senate. The goal was to provide key issues involving GE that need to be addressed by a University Task Force
Explore “course renewal” cycle (in tandem with ASCC). Spring 2016	This was put forward as as part of the GE priorities given to the Provost and Academic Senate Chair.
Examine impact of Quarter Plus courses (in tandem with ASCC). Spring 2016	A joint meeting with ASCC was had with Brian Tietje. The following concerns with Q+ were asked by the Interim Chair of GEGB 1. instead of giving the GPA for the Q+ cohort compared against the FTF cohort, what are the specific course comparison GPAs (e.g. COMS via Q+

	<p>vs. COMS in a regular quarter session)? Are the outcomes being met. What is the GPA comparison? What is the success rate in follow-up courses. No specific answer was given.</p> <p>2. Is there an intentionality of GE offerings? Might there be a better way to design the experience for students coming into CP with particular GE courses and their outcomes related to enhancing a first year experience (e.g. bottleneck courses or critical thinking or writing). No particular answer. To be fair, the Interim Chair did not follow-up as there was a “want” to allow others in the room to talk.</p> <p>3. What is the availability of this experience for non-residential FTF (locals). The whole package of Q+ for students is roughly \$4000 (including meals, housing). BUT, there is no “a la carte” as Brian says... It is an all or nothing experience. Students have to live on campus for his experience (or at least live on campus for the 3 weeks). So like UNIV100, we seem to be marginalizing those students who could and should really benefit from the experience; tailoring to those of “privilege” who can afford the opportunity...</p> <p>The take away from the Interim Chair’s POV is that ASCC and GEGB should be able to set some of the terms of concerns via questions that need to help lead any larger investigation of the Q+ Program. Like a charge via the Senate, along with others, the pedagogical questions/concerns raised by GEGB would need to be addressed specifically. The Senate has oversight on programs that Departments put forward, but there doesn’t seem to be the same type of scrutiny in regards to this Q+ Program.</p>
<p>“Pathways” discussion.</p>	<p>Recommended as part of the Priorities generated by GEGB for a GE Task Force</p>

NOTES: