Present: Evelyn Greene, Fumiko Takasugi, Paul Sherard, Frank Fenlon, Karadeen Kam, Sandra Sanpei, Absent: Diane Caulfield

Chair Sandy Sanpei called the meeting to order at 11:00 a.m.

BUSINESS

I. CTE Gen Ed Charter proposal was opened for discussion.
All members of the committee received the proposal prior to the meeting date in anticipation of discussion at this meeting. All typographical errors pointed out by Doug Madden’s Feb 5 emailed response to the charter was acknowledged and will be implemented in the final edit of the document.

Committee discussion centered on the section: Committee Composition and Governance
1. Membership
   a. The board will be composed of:
      2 Tech I, 2 Tech II, and 2 UC and 1 Academic Counselor
   Sandy: The presented proposal divides Tech I, Tech II and UC as 3 distinct groups thereby giving equality to the three groups, in keeping with the rest of the memberships of the other sub boards.
   Kara: Did not agree it is equal. The interpretation of the accepted proposal number 2 that went before CPC and FSEC was meant for equal amount of members between CTE and UC.
   Sandy: Disagreed with Kara regarding structure and membership.
   Frank: Made a point about the importance of having a counselor present at the meetings during discussion on voting members. It should be noted that he was impartial as to whether the counselor should be a voting member or not. He stated that it did not matter whether he was a voting or non-voting member; but that it was important for a counselor to be present, and the committee agreed.

As a result of discussion, the following formulas for membership was brought forward:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Member</th>
<th>Tech I:</th>
<th>Tech II:</th>
<th>UC:</th>
<th>Student Services: Committee agrees non-voting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sandy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kara &amp; Fumi (or)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn &amp; Paul</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a result, the committee wishes to postpone discussion pending clarification from Sally Dunan and Jennifer Higa-King regarding membership understanding and definition of “equal”. The committee chair will poll constituencies by sending out an email to all faculty regarding membership numbers.
2. Old Business

Subject of: Clean up catalog: deletions, corrections, certified (add) and not certified (delete)
The committee feels all we can do is forward the information to VCAA.

- put back: CE 211 into Natural Science
  CE 211 appears in the 2011 catalog under (a) Understanding the Natural Environment. This category converted into the Natural Science category for the 2012 catalog. The course, CE 211, was not picked up again under the Natural Science category in the 2012 catalog. Again, this was an attempt to correct what was assumed to be an error.

- Hum/Phil 50
  Please note that HUM 50 was originally a (b) Functioning Effectively in Society category and the application was requesting a Humanities and Fine Arts category. It was approved as such. In the 2012 catalog, it was erroneously (?) listed in Quantitative or Logical Reasoning. PHIL 50 is a crosslisted course with HUM 50. PHIL 50 appears under Quantitative or Logical Reasoning in both catalogs. The question then is - Can crosslisted courses be under two different categories? If it can, then HUM 50 only should be corrected by removing it from Quantitative or Logical Reasoning, and establishing it under Humanities and Fine Arts as the application is requesting an approval for.

It was agreed this is a problem.

- SP 151, 251 appears in both Communications and under Humanities/Fine Arts. The 2011 catalog reflects SP 151 under Communications and SP 251 in (b) Functioning Effectively in Society. However, the 2012 catalog has both courses under Communications and Humanities and Fine Arts. How did this double listing come about?

  Sandy: It has been my understanding that a course can satisfy a single category only. In fact, the General Education for Career and Technical Program Minutes October 14, 2011 confirms this bit of information. Frank Fenlon had asked the question and “the response was that a course can satisfy a single category only”. It was approved as such.

  Kara clarified that having speech listed under two categories (i.e., Communications and Humanities and Fine Arts) is not inconsistent with the policy agreed upon by the CTE Gen Ed Committee on October 14, 2011. Listing speech under both categories simply gives students more options in terms of courses that they can choose from to satisfy a Gen Ed category. It does not nullify the stipulation that a course can satisfy a single category only. Kara agreed that a course can satisfy a single category only.

  Frank Fenlon affirmed that the Speech courses being listed in two categories were not a problem, however, counselors do have to be careful in checking individual students. He also pointed out that the PHIL/HUM 50 course was problematic due to the cross-listing of these two courses.

The situation continues to remain unresolved.
3. New Business:

As a reminder to the committee, once the charter gets final approval, the hallmarks and the application forms will need to be addressed.

Next Meeting:
Feb 22, 2013 11:30 a.m. 2/303

Meeting adjourned