



California State University, Long Beach
Curriculum and Educational Policies Council

Minutes

Prepared by Jennifer Asenas

Meeting 9, 2017-18

BH-302

Wednesday, 14 March, 2018, 2-4 PM

Attendance: Jermie Arnold, Jennifer Asenas, Abby Bradecich, Chris Brazier, Jody Cormack, Catherine Cummins, Laura Forrest, Jordan Doering, Terrence Graham, LaRese Hubbard, Neil Hultgren, I-Hung Khoo, Craig Macaulay, Panadda Marayong, Hojin Moon, Henry O'Lawrence, Jessica Pandya, Danny Paskin, Tiffini Travis, Jessica Robinson, Norbert Schürer, Marshall Thomas, Raymond Torres-Santos

1. Approval of the agenda **M/S/A**
2. Approval of the minutes from the February 28 meeting as amended **M/S/A**
3. Announcements
 - a. First GE forum is April 3rd. Our next CEPC meeting is the day after to forum, so we may not be able to begin working on information gathered as a result of the forum. However, there are parts of the new GE proposal that we can begin working on even if we do not have the information from the forums.
4. GE Supplement 82 approved **M/S/A**
 - a. The list is short because they will come out monthly rather than one at the end of the semester so that reclassified classes that address EO 1000 and 1100 can move through the process quickly.
5. Details about two new policy tasks from the Academic Senate Executive Committee
 - A. Revision and revisiting of the current policy on Departmentalization Procedures (AS 95-19)
 - B. Develop a policy on the establishment or dissolution of programs



-
- a. **Overview:** (1) There is a proposal to separate the department of Comparative World Literature and Classics into two programs. Splitting up a department falls under this procedure. The current flow charts for this process are difficult to follow. (2) We need a policy that articulates the conditions under which a department moves to a program or a program is discontinued.
 - b. **Comment:** We may need to move to next year because new GE policy is a more pressing issue.
 6. Continued discussion of and preparations for the creation of a new General Education Policy
 - A. Review of current process and direction
 - a. The goal is to draft a policy by the end of spring for consideration on the Academic Senate floor in the fall.
 - B. Review / overview of current CSULB General Education Policy 12-00
 - a. **CEPC Liaison to GEGC, Danny Paskin, summarized what he understands to be the challenges of the current GE policy:** (1) current policy is broad and not well defined, which means that different committees interpret the policy differently. (2) Some parts of the policy need to be updated. For example, what is considered human diversity is too limiting. (3) Unsure of how to evaluate curriculum proposals that address the new executive order, but do not match the current policy (4) We have never had enough WI or capstone classes. (5) The recertification process needs work. We need a better way to evaluate GE and assess student learning.
 - b. **Comment:** Part of the new EO is that we're required to assess GE.
 - c. **Comment:** Recertification is part of the charge for GEGC, but hasn't been done in years and it fell through the cracks. We should go back to a proper recertification process.
 - d. **CEPC and GEGC member Travis included the following as challenges to the current GE policy:** (1) Human Diversity seems geared toward certain departments. (2) Emphasize the problem with human diversity and WI courses.



-
- e. **Comment:** There is also a concern with courses that, on paper, look like they meet a variety of learning outcomes, but in practice may not. How much coverage is needed to warrant a student learning outcome?
- f. **Comment:** The problem is that there are issues with assigning a percentage (e.g. 40%) or using more flexible standards like "substantially."
- g. **Comment:** Perhaps the committee needs to determine what "substantially" means. **Response:** Does that mean that every year we meet.
- h. **Schürer:** In the past, we have tried to define unassailable GE standards, but I came to the conclusion it is not possible and am ok with that because GEGC member are competent. I also think it's ok if you say no to classes. I don't see how you could have a standard that is objectively divorced from the reality of each SCO that comes forward.
- i. **Question:** Is there a written policy in the departments about this? **Response:** Generally, the moments where courses are checked for these things are at the college level or with GEGC.
- j. **Comment:** The GEGC is just looking at the SCO. You can't tell if something is covered substantially unless you sit in the class. You also can't make it so difficult for committees to assess.
- k. **Comment:** One of the real challenges at all levels is a pragmatic struggle over GE in the sense of who has the disciplinary expertise to teach something and we have to graduate our students in 120 units. One trend for the last few years is that GE classes are in the major and double-counted. Whether that is ok with what we believe the spirit of GE is, is a completely different story. I don't think that we know what people on campus believe—speedy graduation vs. exposure to ideas not in their major. Some years that will be GEGCs that tend in one or the other way. Can't achieve consistence without incredibly restrictive policy.
- C. **Question:** What happens with proposals that are rejected? Are they given feedback and then the proposal is or isn't revised? **Response:** If



the proposal is rejected by the executive committee, they get feedback on how to improve.

- D. **Comment:** Then it seems like you write a policy that is imperfect, but good enough to guide you. And then you trust our colleagues. The elephant in the room is the budget. We are going into another recession. We survived the last one, but some people were just hanging on. Looking forward, how would we be fair minded. What is our intention with this policy?
- E. **Hultgren:** We'll want to think about that in the initial sections.
- F. **Question:** Are we remodeling or rebuilding the GE policy? **Response:** That depends on how people respond to the survey.
- G. **Comment:** We have to coexist on both policies until students who came in under old/new policy.
- H. **Cormack:** Incoming students will take 3 upper-division units in each category: B, C, D. We are keeping all the other requirements that are our campus policy and not in the EO. We are advising freshmen to fit into the EO.
- I. **Question:** What about transfers from community college? **Cormack:** If they have consecutive enrollment, they will stay on the current policy.
- J. **Comment:** The part that we will have to blow up are the terms: foundations, explorations, and capstones. We invented those on our campus. There is potential way to create that and be in compliance, but it would be difficult. The supplementary stuff – HD, Global I, WI – cannot remain as GE requirements. But we can make them campus requirements.
- K. **Comment:** The shifts will be double-counting. There is no limit from the EO. In CLA there is a 13/35 rule. No more than 13 units in your major can count toward GE and 35 units of GE must be taken outside of your major. Under new EO, a student could potentially do everything in the major.
- L. **Comment:** So, students are not going to get a general education?
- M. **Comment:** I think we're making assumptions. A lot of our classes HD, Global Issues, Arts can be taught in the major. For example, there is a music class in the college of engineering.



-
- N. **Comment:** The art component will not be the same outside as within. The mechanics of how music works versus a music class.
- O. **Comment:** Is in the EO a push for interdisciplinary courses? That is something we can think about, too. For example, we could have an acoustic class that is team taught by a physicist and musician.
- P. **Question:** Do we have the resources to do that? **Response:** If we decide to hold interdisciplinary as a value, then you'd have to have interdisciplinary teaching.
- Q. **Comment:** I think the pathways in GE was to encourage interdisciplinarity, but there hasn't been anything on that. **Response:** That was Lynn Mahoney's goal. It matches some of the alternative GE structures on the survey. It is in the current policy, but we don't do it. **Response:** The Pathways component was ballooning the budget for advising. Students were confused. We need to carefully think about this.
- R. **Comment:** The advising issue is the result of having multiple GE models. Trying to do several models at once causes the issue.
- S. **Hultgren:** Are there questions or concerns about integrative learning? Having GE within the major satisfying a capstone requirement as a way to have GE courses that have discipline specific objectives (this used to be category F).
- T. **Cormack:** There are high-unit majors that are having to move their courses in B, C, D. Those classes have discipline specific prerequisites.
- U. **Comment:** But GE is supposed to be for all students and when there are exceptions or take it in their major, that doesn't include all students. **Response:** It's ok as long as there are enough options.
- V. **Comment:** We also should be aware that departments justify GE within the major by arguing that they need the courses for accreditation.
- W. **Question:** Has GEGC had problems with departments appealing its decisions? **Paskin Response:** I have never heard of an appeal. We have always been careful to explain why to reject it.
- X. **Comment:** When a class is rejected for a GE designation, what it really means is that the proposal steps on someone else's territory. That's not how it would be phrased, though.



Y. Comparison of Policy 12-00 with EO 1100 Memorandum from the Chancellor's Office

- a. **Schürer:** GEGC had a meeting on Monday about the definition of terms in the EO. After reviewing the EO 1100 Memorandum, the terms were still vague, so the idea that the EO will clarify is inaccurate. But there will always be vagueness. Committees always have to do interpretive work. We need to let go of the idea that it is possible to create a policy that is watertight. What we need is a system where we have committed faculty members with institutional knowledge who try to be consistent as possible.
- b. **Paskin:** GEGC also addressed the issue that some proposals are requesting B, C, and D designation. We had a long discussion because in the past, they would be granted the designations as long as the proposal explains how a class would meet all the requirements for each designation. But the EO requires substantial coverage. We think that two categories are more than enough. No class can substantially cover all three areas, so we'll only approve two of the three categories.
- c. **Schürer:** One suggestion that the Executive Committee discussed was that four out of ten outcomes would have to be GE, but the EC rejected that suggestion as not practicable. The conclusion was that it would continue to be a judgment call on the part of GEGC – is the SCO seriously addressing the content of the class and the GE categories that it is trying to fulfill.
- d. **Question:** Do we need to formally request the top 10 problems in the policy? It would be great to have those areas identified. Checklist of exactly what the policy says.
- e. **Hultgren** officially requested from GEGC a set of recommendations for changes to the current GE policy and/or ideas for the new GE policy.
- f. **Travis:** The original version had lots of evaluative criteria and questions. Those have been eliminated for uniform evaluation.
- g. **Cormack:** There is a lot on transfer and articulation, which we're already doing.



-
- h. **Question:** On the double-counting issue, is it a misperception that it's going to lead to a more siloed GE?
- i. **Norbert:** This is where GEGC comes in. For example, Engineering is a high-unit major that might create a class that would double-count, but GEGC can say "no, that's not sufficient to meet this GE category," so there would be nothing to double-count.
- j. **Comment:** Section 2.2.3, the upper-division capstone requirement, which is where a lot, but not all GE takes place. That will be replaced by 9 upper-division units distributed among B, C, and D. I don't know if it is obvious, but even if you took a class that had a B, C, D designation, it would not meet all three requirements.
- k. **Comment:** It fits well within capstones.
- i. **Response:** I see this as exploration. What I'm seeing is we have three areas: foundations, explorations, capstones. I'm only seeing two steps.
 - ii. **Response:** It could be a capstone, though.
 - iii. **Response:** Capstones are more than upper-division courses
 - iv. **Response:** It's a signature assignment
 - v. **Response:** There are other kinds of capstones, integrative, advanced, skills, interdisciplinary, service learning. It's unclear where those come into the picture, too.
- l. **Question:** How do we differentiate between lower and upper division courses?
- i. **Hultgren:** Does it say what a lower and upper division class means?
- m. **Question:** How do we fit in writing intensive? **Response:** it wouldn't be a GE. We may have to rename it a campus specific requirement. All of this is a lot work.
- n. **Comment:** GI and HD have both upper and lower division courses. Who is going to make sure that everybody has it? A lot



of departments depend on those classes for funding. Some departments will lose more than ½ of their GE courses. Their courses are disappearing. Which departments will be the worst off and preparing the departments from that?

- o. **Comment:** The Provost has been talking about decoupling GE/FTE.
 - p. **Cormack:** When he explained it to me, he went into math mode. It is something that is beyond the theory stage.
 - q. **Jordan:** On ASI we look for where the money comes from. Maybe a big demand would make it easier.
 - r. **Question:** I'm confused about the wording on page 8 & 9 – C, D exclude and them all skills = move to E. And there will be no upper division E. **Response:** Category E are campus specific graduation requirement. There can be only 48-units of GE toward the 120 units to graduate.
 - s. **Comment:** There is a concern about transferability between CSUs. They're wanting more courses to be transferrable. We're mandating that you're take an A1 class, but we're talking about different standards by campus. **Response:** When they get here, they'd have to take our class.
- Z. Review of recent Academic Senate Executive Memo to GEGC (of March 6, 2018)
- a. **Comment:** If we have any conflicts between our policy and EO, the EO rules. Look at campus policy first, then look at the EO language. **Response:** It is not that EO 1100 overrules, but if GEGC gets stuck because of competing interpretations, then EO language can be used to break that impasse.
 - b. **Question Travis:** Are we supposed to be satisfying the EO? I think there may be an issue with upper-division B. There are some significant differences that we should look at.
 - i. **Response:** Our current policy does not distinguish between lower- and upper-division classes.
 - ii. **Travis Response:** The memo paraphrases the GEAR worksheet and adds a section for upper-division criteria for B, C, D. But the problem is, especially for upper-



division B, that you have to use a lower-division definition for an upper-division course.

- iii. **Schürer Response:** For the next 18 months, this will continue to be a gray area—hence the memorandum to support GEGC.

7. Adjournment @ 3:40