1. Update on AB 2168
   a. The legislation has moved out of the Assembly.
   b. The CSU, ASCSU will likely testify in opposition at the Senate in June.
   c. Mary Gill has been addressing groups around the state to marshal support.
   d. The bill may be in response to the differences across UC campuses. (IGETC is not accepted by all majors at all campuses.)

2. Preliminary discussion of a response to AB 2168 if signed into law.
   a. GE-Breadth has more course offerings than IGETC
      i. Our students have an advantage in this regard.
      ii. Reducing the number of choices would have negative ramifications for the CCC.
   b. Foreign Language
      i. The IGETC foreign language requirement seems reasonable given that it mirrors the a-g HS requirements.
      ii. The number of students who would be affected by this new requirement is unclear.
      iii. The extensive foreign language requirements at Monterey Bay have resulted in lower business major and other enrollments.
      iv. The IGETC foreign language can be met at UC by one 5-unit semester course.
      v. We could discuss the cost of allowing providing examinations to students in many different languages when discussing the bill.
   c. A second course in composition (and critical thinking)
      i. 80% of the responding campuses in our survey indicated that they agreed in this proposed change.
      ii. The committee consensus was that this is a good idea.
   d. Oral communication
      i. There was strong consensus in the committee to maintain this requirement.
      ii. Both CSU and UC transfer students would be served by retaining this requirement.
   e. American Institutions
      i. We should fight for double-counting (not allowed in IGETC)
      ii. A state-wide challenge exam would be desirable to avoid the dislocations in Area D.
      iii. Reducing the requirements in this area would likely result in bad press.
iv. Double-counting will be an issue of contention with the UC.
v. Political science could double-count in Area D.
vi. U.S. history could double-count in Area C.
f. Area E
   i. We gave in during the IGETC negotiations in this area. It would be difficult to argue for inclusion in that light.
   ii. It could be moved to upper-division.
   iii. It could be incorporated into lower-division requirements but not be a specific GE requirement.
   iv. While this area has a lot of diverse courses, many students end up in courses dealing with sex, etc.
   v. We could allow it to be upper or lower-division.
   vi. We need to see where the CCC is on the issue.
   vii. It could be treated as a graduation requirement (ala diversity).
g. Certification
   i. The committee is in favor of both Area-by-Area and course-by-course certification.
h. Unit requirements
   i. All IGETC courses must be 3 semester units (or 4 quarter units) (plus 1 for a lab course). There is advantage for students on quarter campuses.
   ii. Area-Breadth has no course unit requirements, only Area requirements.
   i. If we reach impasse in ICAS, we should jointly declare impasse—not report separately.
3. SciGETC Update
   a. A task force composed of John Tarjan (CSU), Jane Patton (CCC) and Bob Reilly (UC) has been appointed to come up with recommendations for ICAS. John Tarjan has prepared a position paper. The task force will meet via conference call next Monday.
   b. The engineering faculty opposed the concept of SciGETC. They want to maintain flexibility across majors.
   c. The ASCSU approach to SciGETC (AS-2678) is a more broad approach, supporting the concept of deferral of some l.d. GE requirements until after transfer.
   d. The committee is in favor of the concept proposed.
4. Discussion of the campus survey results—was embedded in the discussion of AB 2168.
5. Items to be carried over until next academic year.
a. AB 2168
b. Campus survey results and potential recommendations for change.
c. SciGETC