



VENTURA COLLEGE
PHILOSOPHY AND GENERAL EDUCATION
(Workgroup of Curriculum Committee)
Campus Center Conference Room (CCCR)
Tuesday, November 27, 2018
3:00–4:30 PM
Minutes—Draft

M. Bowen welcomed everyone to the meeting at 3:10pm

	Member Name		Recorder/Guests
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> P	Michael Bowen	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> P	Arlene Reed (Registrar)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> P	Thao Brabander		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> P	Chloe Branciforte		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> P	Michael Callahan		
<input type="checkbox"/> P	Dan Clark		
<input type="checkbox"/> P	Nancy Fredrickson		
<input type="checkbox"/> P	Lydia Morales		
<input type="checkbox"/> P	Maline Werness-Rude		
<input type="checkbox"/> P	Lauren Wintermeyer		

I. Procedures

A. GE determination cycle

T. Brabander distributed a bound pamphlet that included paper copies of this item and several other items discussed below. It showed deadline dates for submission of various articulation items, including CSU GE-Breadth and IGETC, as well as the dates by which we would usually expect to receive approval notifications for the 2019–2020 and 2020–2021 cycles (additional copies available through T. Brabander; also see page 3 of agenda). The P&GE workgroup only approves local (AA/AS GE), not CSU GE-Breadth or IGETC.

B. Title 5 definitions of GE areas

T. Brabander explained the Title 5 regulation explicating AA/AS GE areas A through D, which are prescribed at the state level. Areas E and F are locally defined for VCCCD via the BoT. She explained how both the state and VCCCD requirements are reflected in our rubric document.

C. CSU GE reviewer guidelines

T. Brabander indicated the section of the pamphlet containing the reviewer guidelines that are used to determine whether a course is CSU GE Breadth applicable. A discussion followed in which it was clarified that courses receiving CSU GE or IGETC approval would be added to the local GE list, provided that a corresponding area existed.

D. IGETC 1.9

T. Brabander indicated the section of the pamphlet containing the guidelines that are used to determine whether a course is IGETC applicable. In recent years, the document has been updated annually; the current version is 1.9. C. Branciforte suggested posting the materials in Thao's pamphlet to the Curriculum Committee web page. M. Bowen will discuss with S. Ayala, who maintains this page on behalf of the committee.

E. VC GE rubrics

T. Brabander presented a list of courses (see page 2 of agenda) that she had suggested might be suitable for GE. She verbally added a few more courses to the list that she had identified after compiling the printed list; however, these did not have completed GE rubrics, so they were not considered. She has discussed with applicable faculty the courses she is recommending for GE, and she will be submitting courses on the list for possible CSU GE Breadth and/or IGETC approval as appropriate (these are submitted at her professional discretion, with the advice and consent of faculty). However, only a few faculty completed rubrics requesting the addition of courses to the local GE list. A discussion followed in which the workgroup membership agreed by consensus that it would only recommend courses for the local GE list at this meeting if the rubrics had been completed and submitted to T. Brabander or S. Ayala. It was also agreed that courses approved for CSU GE-Breadth and/or IGETC could be added to the local GE list later if there were a suitable area for them, and if they were approved by Curriculum Committee.

Of the courses on the list, only four had completed rubrics submitted. A fifth course, HED V04, was very similar to existing HED courses (HED V01 and V02) that had previously been approved for area E1; the group decided to consider recommending this course as well, provided that a rubric form could be completed by the time the Curriculum Committee agenda was posted. [Note: in the days immediately following the meeting, a rubric was submitted, the membership reviewed it electronically, and agreed by email to recommend it.]

II. Course Approval Recommendations

A. HIST V04A

This course had a completed rubric, and the workgroup recommended it for addition to local GE area F by consensus.

B. PHIL V12

This course had a completed rubric, and the workgroup recommended it for addition to local GE area C2 by consensus.

C. PHIL V14

This course had a completed rubric, and the workgroup recommended it for addition to local GE area C2 by consensus.

D. PHIL V15

This course had a completed rubric, and the workgroup recommended it for addition to local GE area C2 by consensus.

E. HED V04

This course did not have a completed rubric at the time of the meeting. Because this course was very similar to other HED V01 and HED V02, which were already approved for local GE area E1, the workgroup agreed to review the rubric outside the meeting and make a recommendation, if the host department were able to provide one before the Curriculum Committee agenda was prepared.

III. Adjournment

- A. The meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.