I. Call to Order

II. Roll Call

III. Approval of the Agenda

IV. Public/Faculty Comments (must pertain to item[s] on the agenda)

V. Reports (information only)

VI. Unfinished Business

The first order of business was what to do in response to the curriculum committee’s voting down the proposed second ISLO. P. Bucho didn’t think it seemed right to have just one ISLO. W. Shaw said that “engage in respectful, cooperative interaction” just doesn’t reflect what is going on around campus, although others thought that it did reflect what goes on in the classroom. T. Alexander asked, “Do we keep working on it?” It was decided that while the creation of a second ISLO was a nice idea, it doesn’t seem necessary at this time. The ALSO committee had proposed the wording, and the curriculum committee didn’t like it, but didn’t come up with anything better, so maybe we should just let the matter drop for the time being.

P. Creason also wanted to be finished with the debate about removing listening from the list of communication skills. T. Alexander said she could go either way. P. Bucho voted to drop it. P. Knapp wanted to know if we have any course in listening. There is one, but it’s not in the GE course plans. A way to give evidence to the curriculum committee regarding the possible deletion of “listening” from the communication outcome would be to send out a second grid with GE Plans A, B, and C course offerings mapped onto the four skills currently listed in the GE communication outcome. Otherwise, if we drop the matter now, we’ll have to bring it up again later, when it is no longer fresh in people’s minds.

The committee decided to send out both grids on Flex Day: The one for mapping courses onto the GE outcomes and another one for mapping GE courses onto the communication outcome. P. Creason recommended supplying the Core Competencies Appendix along with the grids to provide definitions of the outcomes.

Do we want to put Info Tech & Computer Lit under the Communication/Teamwork outcome? T. Alexander asked for a review of the committee members’ rationale for this proposal. K. Tsuji thought it fit well. It is a medium for communication.

The next item of business was deciding what to do about the Creative Thinking outcome. There was discussion at the previous meeting, but no conclusion. P. Creason said that if simplifying the list of outcomes is our goal, then putting it under Critical Thinking would work fine. Should we have an overall category covering “Thinking” and put Critical Thinking and Creative Thinking under it? T. Alexander pointed out that there would then be three tiers of information, because Critical Thinking already has two subdivisions. S. Chang thought this would be too many tiers under each heading. B. Harrell said we could have “Critical Thinking” as an overall category, with “Creative Thinking” under it. P. Creason liked P. Knapp’s idea of a combined category: “Aesthetics and Creativity” as an overall heading, placing all relevant bullet points underneath. Would it work to put “Creative Thinking” as a bullet under this heading, as well? The idea of combining Aesthetics and Creativity was decided upon as a solution, and the details were worked out. T. Alexander will present a motion to this effect at the next curriculum committee meeting.