



---

California State University, Long Beach  
Curriculum and Educational Policies Council  
Agenda – 2018-19 Meeting 9  
Wednesday, February 27, 2018, 2-4 PM  
AS-119 (Anatol Center)

*Members in attendance:* Mehrdad Aliasgari, Jennifer Asenas, Babette Benkin, Jeffery Bentley, Chris Brazier, Jody Cormack, Laura Forrest, Neil Hultgren, Xuhui Li, Emely Lopez, Craig Macaulay (Vice Chair), Panadda Marayong, Jung Mee Mun, Henry O'Lawrence, Jessica Pandya, Chloe Pascual (Secretary), Danny Paskin (Chair) Nancy Quam-Wickham, Raymond Torres-Santos.

*Guests:* Norbert Schurer, Jennifer Ostergren, Teri Yamada, Tiffini Travis

1. Start time: 2:04pm
2. Approval of the agenda M/S/P
3. Minutes of February 13, 2019 Approved as amended: M/S/P
  - a. (Removed "Art" from Jim Scott.)
4. Announcements
  - a. Norbert Schurer: GE Debate in Senate: moving forward collegially and productively. Biggest discussion in AS is regarding the fractions that foundation or exploration courses need to have in the GE area in terms of SLOs, evals and assessments. Consensus is 2/3 of SLOs, which will be voted on Thurs (Feb 28).
5. Approval of GE Supplement #85
  - a. Approval of the next GE supplement from GEGC, the list of classes that GEGC has approved since we last approved the supplement.
  - b. GEGC has a moratorium on new classes with the exception of those that need to be changed because of EO 1100 or 1110, or capstone classes that are moving over to a new category. Danny received an email this morning from CWL that approves the list minus CWL line 17.
  - c. Discussion:
    - i. Neil Hultgren: ENGL 380 is not listed as WI.
    - ii. Jody Cormack: Can exploration courses be upper div? 300/400 level? Usually lower div 100/200.
      1. Neil: EO 1100 is very specific about 39 lower, 9 upper div in EO1100. Exploration is LB's term.
      2. Danny Paskin: Is this a question that we need to answer right now?



- 
3. Jessica Pandya: Policy seems to say it must be lower division.
  4. Question: What's being approved for 2012, and what for 2019?
  5. Laura Forrest: motion to asterisk that the exploration column is for 2012 approval, not 2019 approval.
    - a. Friendly amendment to vote on the supplement minus the exploration column. M/S/P unanimous.
  - d. M/S/P Approval of supplement minus exploration column.
  6. (Campus-specific) Graduation Requirements Policy (cont'd)
    - a. Timed discussion, with Laura Forrest keeping time. Chair asks that we keep comments as brief as possible and only add new info.
    - b. To start, we're looking at the course-based GR policy clean document, not tracked version.
    - c. CHLS was asked for comment, and they prefer Chicax/Latinx as gender neutral term.
    - d. Line 211, WGSS chair was asked for comment, and suggests gender is broad enough and encompassing enough to cover issues CEPC discussed.
    - e. Line 208, Tiffini Travis was asked for comment on the proper place in the document of the term "structural disadvantage." Tiffini Travis: Replace "influence of race and ethnicity" for "impact of structural disadvantage on these racial and ethnic groups."
      - i. Panadda Marayong, Xuhui Li, Craig Macaulay, Henry speak against motion.
      - ii. Norbert Schurer speaks in favor of the motion: these are minimum standards, so the point is to be specific. You can add other things if you feel they are as important.
      - iii. Babette speaks against: The language is limiting and narrow.
      - iv. Mehrdad : Why is this a bullet point when it is referring to the previous bullet point? It should be put in bullet 1 if we do it.
      - v. Jeff Bentley: why are the other parts of the preamble not requirements in the bullets?
      - vi. Danny calls a vote on the motion: Do we need to add Tiffini's language re: impact of structural disadvantage on these racial and ethnic groups? M/S/P: vote: 12 y, 4 n, 3 abstain.
    - f. Comment ##01: Jody's proposal from last week, Section 2.0 line 77: SLO-based, rather than course-based requirements.
      - i. Discussion:
        1. Panadda: does this mean it wouldn't be a graduation requirement, since our grad requirements are course-based? Jody: No, it would still be grad reqs, just judged by SLO through curriculum.



- 
2. Nancy Quam-Wickham: Would these be approved at degree-level or institution-level? Jody: Both. Two levels.
  3. Jennifer Asenas: Are their people with more experience of this type of thing? What are we getting ourselves into? Babette: There are examples across campus. I.e. BS in math.
  4. Jennifer Asenas: What if a student fails a course with a CSGR SLO? Babette: We don't fine-grain it, if you fail a course with SLOs, you have to find a class with those SLOs to pass. If you pass a class with SLOs, you pass the req whether you did well on the SLOs or not.
  5. Craig: Gen in favor for flexibility, but fear guiding students through it when there are so many complexities in advising, it could harm timely graduation.
  6. Norbert: Interested in the concept, but speaks strongly against for now, because it will require curricular redesign immediately. Prefer to think about it for the future.
  7. Nancy: What about assessment? Danny: GRGC would be doing the standards.
  8. Chris Brazier: How would this would work in practice?
  9. Nancy Q-W: This is doable, as all courses have SLOs. In favor of proposal, but has concerns re: assessment. Less concerned about faculty ability to develop learning outcomes, and more concerned about assessment, done by GRGC. Doesn't have confidence that assessment can be done well.
  10. Babette: Thinks many departments students will still be told to take a course. Other places they will, at program level, decide to do SLOs. We would have to come with a new rubric like GEGC uses. Probably not many would come forward.
  11. Mehrdad: I think this plan is better for learning, instead of one-shot course. I don't see why it would be a gigantic quantum leap in terms of implementation.
  12. Jody: The only way we avoid curricular redesign work is with no GRs. Jody supports GRs, and if we do have GRs, there will still be some programs that will have to do curriculum revision either way. Proposal is a culture change. We have a conference on GE assessment to send a team to. Worried that if we don't provide flexibility of this plan, the Senate vote will be no.
  13. Originally we planned to decide on CSGRs by end of meeting, but AS does not have GE reqs on next meetings agenda, so we may have more time.



- 
14. Jessica: I would rather say “let’s not bother” than water down the reqs. The SLO-version says that we don’t believe in disciplinary expertise for diversity and global knowledge. That “anybody” can teach them.
  15. Neil: Yes to Jessica, and I struggle to see exactly which programs will be impacted by the course-based model. The impact has not been proven to us, so why are we coming up with a solution to it?
  16. Norbert: I echo Jessica and Neil: A lot of you are underestimating the work that would need to go into this. I am not catastrophizing, I am basing this on my experience of the past 3 years. Mehrdad presented it as though the course-based model is not interested in learning, which is not true. HD and global can be at the upper or lower level. My concern is that the model being proposed will not teach these things.
  17. Panadda: In favor of proposal: Req’s won’t be watered down, but will have more flexibility to be added into the curriculum. We do assessment for things like writing. We all think these are important issues, and this model will allow programs to fulfill the model within their own curriculum. There will still be GE courses outside of this req, so students will be exposed to GE. Students learn more when it is relevant. For ex: Writing, engineering faculty should have the right skills to teaching writing technical writing and reports.
  18. Craig: It won’t water them down, even if it is different. These things are already taught well on these issues by people in a variety of disciplines. Our students are probably better than students at most universities on these issues. The question “are our students deficient” in these areas hasn’t been asked.
  19. Jody: Scaffolded model is not “watered-down”, it is good pedagogy. I hope disciplinary experts would be pulled in to teach.
  20. Babette: It can be watered-down in the course-based model. The program has to verify that the people teaching it are qualified. Trust your colleagues.
  21. Mehrdad: Why would it matter which way we teach it?
  22. Chris: There are no additional units from GR. It does have impacts on some individual students, especially transfers. Supports a program-approach, as it allows some flexibility. And we should all be able to teach writing in our disciplines.
  23. Laura: We don’t as a faculty know how to teach writing, even if we write well.
  24. Teri Yamada: We are trying to be more pro-active about training.



- 
25. Jennifer: Do we trust faculty, or do we need to certify them with training?
  26. Xuhui: If the college doesn't believe there are qualified faculty to teach, they can pull in two or three specialists.
  27. Babette: There are a ton of gen ed courses that are being taught by people without certification or training in that discipline. Or perhaps we should go to an even more strict model, where writing course is in a specific department, and diversity course in a specific department.
  28. Danny calls a vote on course-based or SLO-based approach (we may decide on a different name for the latter): Should we continue with an SLO-Based approach? M/S/P 14 y, 3 n, 1 abstain.
    - g. Danny: In the next two weeks, go carefully through the document and let Danny know if any of the amendments don't make sense anymore. Send amendments to Danny by the Monday before the next meeting.
    - h. Craig: Can we vote now on whether want to have GR reqs? This is hanging over our heads.
    - i. Straw poll: Should we recommend a flexible approach GR policy?
      - i. Results: 9 y, 8n, 1 abstain
7. Adjournment at 4pm

*These minutes have not been approved.*

*Respectfully submitted, Chloé Pascual, Secretary*