1) Minutes for Nov (one revision) and Dec 2015
   a) Motion to approve Nov. 2015 minutes with one edit, made by S. Christofferson, 2nd by A. Wise, motion approved, 8 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain.
   b) Motion to approve Dec. 2015 minutes made by A. Redman, 2nd by J. Jackson
      i) Discussion: comments were made that the Dec 2015 minutes didn’t seem to fully reflect all the complex conversation that took place regarding the mathematics courses.
   c) Vote: 7 yes, 1 abstain, 0 no

2) University-wide Curriculum Committees Master Calendar
   a) A document created by a Curriculum Conference ad-hoc committee was circulated regarding a proposed campus-wide meeting schedule to streamline scheduling.
   b) The GenEd committee would need to change our by-laws to accommodate the proposed format
   c) Discussion: we can’t necessarily command any given department when to schedule meetings, but by agreeing to this schedule, or giving our support to this idea, it could help expedite curriculum approval processes on campus. The idea is to gain support from various committees like this one to present to the Provost’s office for their support/agreement. Another comment was that the bolded language regarding departmental meetings seemed to be overstepping – a suggestion to change the language for the 2nd week dates to be “open” dates instead and the decision can be made on a departmental level when to hold meetings. R. Attele voiced support for 2nd Tuesday being a departmental meeting.
   d) If all the curriculum-related committees agree on this schedule, it would take effect in the fall of 2016.
   e) A motion was made to support moving our meetings from 1st Thursday to the 4th Tuesday of the month as suggested by the proposed calendar. We will plan to have a by-laws
meeting this semester to consider amending the bylaws to reflect that change, assuming other curriculum committees agree to the schedule. 2nd by L. Osika.

f) Vote: 8 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain.

3) Math course applications presented by R. Attele

a) If students take higher level courses that require lower classes as prerequisites, they will also receive credit for the lower classes.


c) Math 1250 and 1210: pre-calculus is not listed in any comparable institutions and does not have an IAI articulation number. R. Attele and the proposal document argues Math 1250 does fulfill the #3 critical thinking component on the list of 6 Gen Ed requirements.

i) The proposal does not have an assessment instrument attached, it was said there’s a multiple-choice online test given, but there is a desire within the Math department to update it.

ii) Discussion: it was suggested that #4 was also fulfilled on the 6 of Gen Ed requirements and that it should be added to the course proposal document. 1250 is essentially 1200 and 1210 material put together. Therefore, only credit is given for EITHER 1210 OR 1250.

iii) The 1210 application has OLD Gen Ed requirements listed. And the 1250 application the 1st three bullet points also. Request that the proposal be updated to reflect current Gen Ed requirements.

d) Motion to accept MATH 1210 and 1250 as Gen Ed for the professional schools that requested them as a waiver pending the submission of GEAC outcomes and objectives and providing the assessment instruments made by P. Cronce. 2nd by E. Delgado-Norris.

e) Vote: 7 yes, 0 no, 1 abstain.

4) ICCB revised A.S. document, and what this means

a) Document proposing changes to the AS program

b) The humanities & fine arts requirements changed somewhat for the ICCB AS program. It would fall short of our foreign language requirements, and our College of A&S has an additional social science requirement.

c) This has already been approved by the ICCB. We don’t have to accept this as meeting our GenEd requirements if we don’t want to. Some other universities are requiring students to make up the missing Gen Eds that aren’t fulfilled from the IAI core requirements.

d) Previously, anyone coming in with an AA or AS is considered as completed their GenEd requirements. This “new” version doesn’t fully comply with CSU’s requirements.

e) Comments were made that registration/advising/scheduling has been loose to some degree with GenEd requirements in the past few years (many changes, confusion, etc.) and it’s important to have clear guidelines for incoming students and documentation.
f) A suggestion was made to not accept/reject this document specifically but continue discussions. Some more information regarding how other schools are responding to this update will be distributed and we will discuss at next meeting.

5) Nominations and elections – several seats need to be filled on this committee.
   
a) They are: S. Christofferson’s CAS-Humanities position, L. Osika COE, T. Davis CAS-Social Science, and currently vacant positions are: CAS-Math, CHSc, COB, and Library.
   
b) The Vice-chair will be responsible for collecting nominations and conducting elections.
   
c) The nomination form currently has 10 Unit A signatures required – this was created somewhat arbitrarily when some departments were much larger. The form needs to be updated/changed to reflect lower Unit A numbers. S. Christofferson will send the document and we will discuss further at next meeting.

6) Meeting adjourned at 1:57, Next meeting is March 3rd.