1. The chair thanked S. Wilson for presenting the committee’s response to the Faculty Senate in March and the committee members, E. Meehan, C. Anderson, L Manne, and R. de la Dehesa, who had drafted the response. The Faculty Senate has now asked the General Education Committee to address whatever issues need to be resolved in order to reconfirm the Framework the committee recommended to the Faculty Senate in October 2012.

2. A motion was made to approve the agenda for the April 4th General Education Committee Meeting. With the addition of the Writing Intensive Proposal as item # 2, the agenda was unanimously approved.

3. A motion was made to approve the minutes from the March 7th General Education Committee Meeting. The meetings were approved with one abstention (J. Como)

4. Writing Intensive: D. Allen reported on the presentation of the Writing Intensive Proposal to the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, noting that overall it was well received. A. Levine stated that he hoped Departments would now move to infuse Writing Intensive courses into their major requirements and identify, work with, and train faculty who are interested in teaching these courses. C. Lavender asked that the Writing Intensive Proposal be sent to the Faculty Senate as an informational item for the April meeting, with the objective of presenting a final version of the proposal for approval in Fall 2016. The chair noted that a subcommittee was now needed to work on the details of the proposal, including the process for approving courses as Writing Intensive. R. Powers asked that the assessment office be involve in the make-up of the Writing Intensive committee that would oversee such a process. (Subsequent to the meeting, D. Allen took the lead in developing a proposed process and committee structure, for consideration at the May meeting.)

5. Issues from Faculty Senate Resolution: The chair presented the October 2012 Framework to the committee. The Faculty Senate has asked the committee to identify the issues that must be corrected before reconfirming the framework. The issues discussed were:
   a. Correction of course list for College Option: The chair reminded the committee that the subcommittee on the clarification of the catalog language had already addressed this issue, having recommended that the committee reaffirm the language in the
October 2012 Framework: that all College Option courses be at the 200-level or higher with the exception of language and laboratory courses. E. Meehan moved that:

The General Education Committee reaffirm its vote of May 4, 2015 that: *Current General Education policy reads: ‘Except for laboratory and language courses as outlined below, all courses taken in the College Option will be at the 200-level or higher.’ This Committee supports this policy.*

S. Wilson seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a vote of 19 yes, 2 no, and 2 abstentions (G. Reichard an A. Bongiorno).

V. DiMeglio indicated that for every 200-level course listed in the College Option a sentence will be included in the course description indicating such. The chair also asked that 100-level courses be removed from the College Option lists on the website.

b. Call for courses that should be designated for General Education: The chair indicated that he would send a call out to the Departments for courses to be included as part of General Education. V. DiMeglio will provide a list of courses and changes in degrees that were sent forward to the Chancellor’s report without Faculty governance approval.

c. Possibility of STEM departments proposing substitution of appropriate STEM courses for Social Science or TALA requirement: After brief discussion, it was agreed that it would require further discussion.

d. Re-evaluation of “overlay” requirements: The Committee discussed the positives and negatives of the overlays required for all baccalaureate students. V. DiMeglio mentioned that a major problem related to overlays is that students who are working toward an AA or AS are not required, but only encouraged, to complete courses that satisfy the overlays. M. D’Alessandro indicated that proposals to change the AA an AS degrees to include courses that would satisfy the overlays would solve this problem. He indicated that he would forward such proposals to the chair for possible discussion at the May meeting.

e. Discussion of 3-credit/4-credit issue: The chair reminded the committee that this is both a pedagogical and an economic issue for the college. F. Soto, A. Levine, and C. Anderson will meet to discuss the historical patterns of the credit/hour issue, discuss national trends and report back at the next meeting.

f. Creation of a faculty-based appeals process: The issue is the current lack of faculty involvement in the handling of General Education appeals. C. Lavender suggested that the Pathways appeals process should be formally handled by the Course and Standing Committee. In response to discussion, the chair read the charge of that committee, giving it responsibility for reviewing student appeals related to readmission and graduation. It was also suggested that the General Education Committee, or a subcommittee of it, could handle appeals. The discussion of this issue will continue at the next meeting.

6. A proposal from the Department of Philosophy for a new course, PHL 225 Political Philosophy (UG) (GE), was tabled due to time.
7. Report from the GECAS Committee was tabled due to time.

A. Levine made a motion to adjourn the meeting. R. Hendrickson seconded the motion. The motion was approved and the meeting adjourned at 11:29am.