C C C
, A 17, 2012
2:07 . . 3:28 . .

<u>D</u>

- h. Division Reports
- i. Other

Weds. April 18th, 12:00 in Appreciation Hall. h. A few faculty are working to build a sustainability certificate of achievement. English has developed a Vampire Literature course. Multidisciplinary course is being discussed in biophysics. An American Cultures program is being developed by Ziegenhorn. He plans to bring it to CCC for discussion.

i. Other:

- Questions regarding the process for a new course that's been presented at CCC: since new course proposals are being presented in CCC, what is the procedure from there? There seems to be some confusion about the next step(s). The example used was the recent Humanities courses discussed on 3/20/12. After Cammin shared proposals, BSS rep noted there might be some overlap with some BSS courses. Cammin contacted BSS faculty to discuss the outlines and in one case did not have any response. What is the appropriate length of time that she should wait before moving forward? It was suggested that when you contact a faculty member from another division, you might want to also notify the CCC Rep for that area so that they might express the importance of responding to the request. The committee felt that a week was an appropriate opportunity for response from others. After that, the faculty should move forward with development of the course. Clarified that once proposal presented in CCC, faculty would be given C3MS shell.
- Lankfor 1 (-1 (e) -2Tm (bTm (bT (Lan) -1Tm / F2.0 1 Tf

	meeting.
5. Area V "Across Disciplines"	: C During previous conversations regarding the Communication & Analytical Thinking GE pattern, there was a question regarding the words "other disciplines" in C1 of the guidelines. What is the intent of this wording? The sub-committee thought on first read, that the intent of the GE pattern authors was different than the discipline faculty course author interpretation expressed in a recent GE application. As they could see the faculty applicant's position with regard to the course and the guidelines, they approved the course but would like clarification going forward. Perhaps a resolution to modify the wording of this sentence would clarify the intent of this directive for future application evaluation. Ziegenhorn will have conversation with the editors of the particular course that brought forward this question. His understanding of the creation of the course was for a very narrow focus, and not for GE.
6. GELO feedback	D 5/1/12 .

A: K. Armstrong, J. Baker, F. Cammin, R. Campbell, B. Cashmore, B. Day, I. Escoto, M. Francisco, P. Gibbs, B. Hanning, R. Hartwell, C. Holcroft, K. Jones, K. Jordahl, M. Knobel, D. MacNeil, P. Murray, P. Starer, K. Svetich, V. Villanueva, B. Ziegenhorn: C. Nuñez