California State University, Long Beach

Curriculum and Educational Policies Council

Minutes for:

Meeting 3, 2017-18

BH-302

Wednesday, 11 October, 2017, 2-4 PM

Attendance: Jermie Arnold, Jennifer Asenas, Chris Brazier, Jody Cormack, Catherine Cummins, Jordan Doering, Malcolm Finney, Donna Green (alt for Susan Leigh), Neil Hultgren, I-Hung Khoo, Christiana Koch, Craig Macaulay, Panadda Marayong, Henry O’Lawrence, Danny Paskin, Chloe Pasqual, Jessica Robsinson, Marshall Thomas.

1. Approval of the agenda approved as amended. **M/S/A**
2. Approval of the minutes from the September 27 meeting approved with amendment **M/S/A**.
3. Announcements
   1. GE changes are influx and we will do our best to keep moving forward.
   2. New member: Christiana Koch is a new ASI representative to CEPC.
   3. Although meetings have primarily addressed the GE executive orders, we do have program proposals to consider in future meetings.
4. Election of liaisons to standing committees reporting to CEPC
   1. University Grade Appeals Committee liaison. Catherine Cummins and Lilia Meltzer will be co-liaisons. **M/S/A**
5. Second reading of the proposed Business Analytics Certificate from the College of Business Administration (Dean Michael Solt, College of Business Administration; Professor H. Michael Chung, Chair, Department of Information Systems; Professor Sam Min, Chair, Department of Marketing)
   1. Major difference is that the document now reflects the overall units for the certificate, including all prerequisite units.
   2. GPA requirement should be overall GPA. Should add “overall” to clarify.
   3. To be a CBA minor, you need a 3.0, but the university standard is 2.5 so the certificate has a 2.5 minimum GPA to make it general to all students.
   4. There is an overlap with Information Systems classes, but IS students can still get the certificate.
   5. Move to approve with addition of “overall” to GPA. **M/S/A**
6. Revision to AS Policy Statement 05-08 on Graduate Studies 700
   1. Discussion primarily concerned how many semesters of GS 700 a student could take without having a hold put on registration that would be lifted after consultation with the Associate Dean of her/his respective college.
   2. The following changes were suggested to the 3rd draft of the GS 700 policy
      1. Line 21-23: change from “If a graduate student taking GS 700 reaches the sixth year of a graduate program, the department graduate advisor must confer with the student and with the associate dean of the college about an appropriate course of action for the graduate student” to read “After registering for four semesters of GS 700, students will be subject to a registration hold prior to registering for any subsequent semester of GS 700.”
      2. Line 26-27: change from “Colleges may vary from this procedure at their own discretion, though procedure should be consistent within the college” to read “Colleges/departments may hold students to a stricter timeline than outlined here.”
      3. Line 20: Add: “chair” to the list of possible signees for GS 700.
      4. Line 18: Add: “including for scholarship eligibility purposes.”
      5. Line 23-24: Delete: “Students may no longer register for GS 700 once courses taken for the graduate degree expire after 7 years.”
      6. Line 13 remove second “must”
   3. Second reading: Motion to approve revisions and send to the Academic Senate. **M/S/A**.
7. Discussion and revision of GEGC Chair Ruth Piker memo dated September 26, 2017 and discussion of Hultgren memo.
   1. Piker Memo:
      1. Purpose of the memo is to clarify how GEGC can certify courses to meet the demands of the executive order without opening up the entire GE policy.
      2. There are two motions GEGC would like CEPC to approve and move on to the Academic Senate
         1. Motion 1: Request a moratorium on GE proposals except those that would help meet the Fall 2018 EO 1100 demands.
            1. *CEPC approves of the moratorium for two reasons*

Unwise to approve courses that may not fit in with future GE policies.

Workload.

* + - 1. Motion 2: Going forward, GEGC will interpret CSULB GE 7.6 in a way that aligns with the EO 1100 language.
         1. Suggestion: Remove highlighted addition
         2. Suggestion: Remove reference to EO. The goal is to expand not reinterpret or change current policy.
         3. Suggestion: Use examples of student learning outcomes to demonstrate to faculty how GEGC will expand that which is considered in course proposals.
         4. Chair Hultgren will revise before sending our version back to GEGC.
  1. Hultgren Memo: Purpose of the memo is to provide the Academic Senate how CEPC and GEGC plan to proceed in light of EO 1100. The two councils wish to express that the GE policy not be opened at this time, instead looking for ways to both meet the demands of EO1100 and remain consistent with our current GE policies. This draft of the memo makes four recommendations.
     1. Recommendation 1: We are not changing CSULB’s GE or GWAR policies. Any policy change should follow the correct channels and cannot be done piecemeal since any change requires opening up the full policy to potential amendments.
        1. Suggestion: delete last line of bullet point 1 “but must revise it in full, line by line” and replace it with “without opening the full policy to potential amendment.”
     2. Recommendation 2: In making GE- and GWAR-related decisions, we should be mindful of the curricular and education consequences to all those who would be impacted by those changes.
        1. Inclusion of GWAR may initially seem out of place, but if the writing intensive classes change, it will impact GWAR.
        2. Some writing intensive classes are already creating bottleneck and this would make it worse.
        3. Redistributing Category F GE to B, C, or D, may have implications for high-unit majors that benefit from double-counting classes. May need to create integrative capstones to address this issue.
     3. Recommendations 3: We should maintain a distinction between the Chancellor’s guidance and CSULB’s policies
     4. Recommendation 4: Revising GE will require a tremendous amount of work and we should be conscious of how it will impact people’s workloads.
     5. Based on our discussion, Chair Hultgren will revise the first two recommendations and remove the last two (perhaps for a future memo). Chair Hultgren will take the revisions to CEPC for their input. The goal is to have approved versions to the Academic Senate by their November meeting.

1. Review of the 80th GE Supplement: **M/S/A**
   1. Consists of a list of courses GEGC has approved. We approve the list and then it goes on to be coded, then into CMS system, and then into catalog.
2. Review of the draft of the General Education Governing Committee Annual Report for 2016-2017 **M/S/A**
3. Adjournment: **M/S/A** 3:54 pm.

Next meeting: 25 October 2017

*Respectfully submitted by Jennifer Asenas*