California State University, Long Beach

Curriculum and Educational Policies Council

Draft Agenda

Prepared by Neil Hultgren

Meeting 5, 2017-18

BH-302

Wednesday, 8 November, 2017, 2-4 PM

Attendance: Jermie Arnold, Jennifer Asenas, Abby Bradecich, Chris Brazier, Jordan Doering, Malcolm Finney, Terrence Graham, Donna Green, Neil Hultgren, I-Hung Khoo, Christiana Koch, Craig Macaulay, Lilia Meltzer, Henry O’Lawrence, Jessica Pandya, Danny Paskin, Jessica Robinson, Marshall Thomas, Raymond Torres-Santos

1. Approval of the agenda **M/S/A**
2. Approval of the minutes from the October 25 meeting **M/S/A**
3. Announcements
	1. May need to meet on December 13th. Chair Hultgren will look into logistics
4. Proposed Bachelor of Arts degree in Biochemistry from the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry (Professor Chris Brazier, Chair, Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry; Professor Douglas McAbee, Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry)
	1. Overview: There has been a growing need to create a fourth degree for two reasons. The primary motivation is better serve students who are interested in going into law, medicine, or business. A large number of majors are pursuing professional school and would benefit from a BA in Biochemistry to allow them to pursue electives that would benefit them in professional contexts. The secondary reason is that it would alleviate some of the student load demands for laboratory time required of students working toward a BS in Biochemistry and is needed to maintain professional certifications. It would also make it easier to switch majors (e.g. biology) or to double major (e.g. microbiology student could get a minor in chemistry or double major by adding three more classes).
	2. **Question**: Is there a concern that pre-med students, who are trying to impress schools by taking the hardest courses, might perceive earning a BA less attractive than a BS? **Response**: What medical schools are looking for is changing. Regardless of major, they are looking for students to do well on the MCAT and if they need additional biology classes, they can take them.
	3. **Question**: Do you have the requisite support or resources for this major? **Response**: We do not need additional resources, especially since it would reduce the amount of resources needed for lab time. It may be a savings and would compensate for the incoming flow of students.
	4. **Question**: Are 57 units a normal amount? **Response**: It is normal for a BA, which allows students to take electives outside of the degree. We do require CHEM 461 as an upper-division capstone, but it is to be taken in the student’s last semester. Students were attempting to take the class earlier in their coursework and the easiest way to address the issue was to make the course by consent.
	5. **Question**: Will you request new faculty members? **Response**: We do not need new faculty unless the number of students who choose this major is much larger than anticipated.
	6. **Comment**: Cutting back on lab time benefits both professors and students.
	7. Motion to waive the first reading of the proposal: **M/S/A**
	8. Motion to approve the proposal and recommend to AS: **M/S/A**
5. Update regarding Executive Orders and general education, with the Cormack/Pandya memo
	1. **Overview**: We found enough grey area in the educational policy to allow us to move courses between GE categories to meet the EO. This will give the GEGC the specific language they need to move forward. The GE policy will be opened up in the spring. The goal is to have a lot of consultation in the process so that when it goes to the AS floor, the new policy will not be unnecessarily stalled.
	2. **Question**: Do classes have to be re-certified this semester? **Response**: To re-classify a class, faculty can use the GE paperwork currently available. The paperwork will not change much because it is already fairly streamlined. If the paperwork articulates what part of the course meets the new categorization, it’s good. Transitioning something from category F to B, C, or D is not a catalog issue. It is a coding issue. We’re extending the time through February. February 15th for reclassified courses so that they can be coded properly. New courses that help meet the demand of EO 1000 will be considered, but need to be in by February 1 so that they can be included in the catalog. GEGC will need to post dates to clarify when materials need to be submitted to allow time for review. That will need to be done soon.
	3. **Comment**: We are not officially asking for a delay.
	4. **Comment**: Information can now go on to the colleges. Donna can send out a memo. AS senators are also to disseminate information.
	5. **Question**: Long term goals to meet EO 1000 are clear, but what about short-term goals?
		1. **Discussion**: Contributions generally fell into four categories: What will guide our thinking about the new GE policy? What information do we need? How can we organize these discussions? And how should CEPC proceed?
			1. **Question 1**: **Vision**. What values do we want to guide our decisions? What does GE do for our students? We can think topically: (e.g. writing, academic freedom, violence prevention). We can also think more comprehensively to preserve gestalt. GE has and is political. How do we develop a vision that serves student interests? Perhaps we can also think about developing competing plans and debate the merits. We developed some questions to ask at the forums, though each question may not be asked at every forum.
				1. Why do we do general education?
				2. How much do we want to just implement the executive order and how much do we want to revolutionize the policy?
				3. What is and isn’t working with the current policy?
				4. What do we want students to get out of general education?
			2. **Question 2**: **Preparation**. We need two things: (1) We need to know what is the 2012 policy. (2) We need to know what the demands of the EO. Perhaps we can have meetings in January and February to provide this information. There is a worksheet that has a visual of these changes. Perhaps the PowerPoint from the GE “roadshow” would also be helpful.
			3. **Question 3**: **Logistics**. How do we include the most voices in an organized fashion? Two formats were suggestion: Town hall and Thought Exchange.
			4. **Question 4: CEPC Procedure:** It is possible that phase two is under more control from CEPC. That division of labor may make more sense, since GEGC will be busy re/certifying GE. Perhaps the GWAR committee should come to CEPC for consultation.
		2. Motion to approve a meeting between CEPC and GEGC executive committees **M/S/A**.
			1. Goal will be to figure out the GE forums.
			2. May need another CEPC meeting.
6. Adjournment 3:04: **M/S/A**

*Respectfully submitted by: Jennifer Asenas*