**Campus: \_\_Long Beach\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Please check as applicable for your campus. This response is inclusive of:**

X (1) Ethnic Studies Council

\_\_\_\_\_ Campus Senate

\_\_\_\_\_ Campus Associated Students

\_\_\_\_\_ Campus Administration

\_\_\_\_\_ Academic Senate, CSU

X (2) General Education Advisory Committee (GEAC)

\_\_\_\_\_ California State Student Association

X (3-5) Other (Please specify. If an individual, please specify your role on the campus. If a combined response, please specify the groups included.)

(3) College of Business Faculty Council; (4) College of Health & Human Services Faculty Council (5) Curriculum & Educational Policies Council (2 individual member responses from College of Business faculty)

|  |
| --- |
| **Please Type Comments Below** |
| **(1) CSULB Ethnic Studies Council (Africana Studies, American Indian Studies, Asian and Asian American Studies, and Chicano and Latino Studies)**  The CSULB Ethnic Studies Council (Africana Studies, American Indian Studies, Asian and Asian American Studies, and Chicano and Latino Studies) stand with the California State University Council on Ethnic Studies (CSUCES)’s statement on the Chancellor’s Office’s proposed changes to GE Title V, particularly regarding its impact on Ethnic Studies and associated requirements regarding the implementation of Weber Bill AB1460.  Additionally, we acknowledge and affirm the efforts of Ethnic Studies colleagues on at least eleven (11) campuses to date, whose Academic Senates have passed resolutions to oppose the proposed implementation plan from the Office of the Chancellor.  The Chancellor’s Office’s (CO) proposed changes regarding Ethnic Studies requirement pit it against other programs, departments, and diversity requirements, falsely implying that GE Area D must be diluted in order to implement the Ethnic Studies requirement. It also imposes a lower division requirement when most campuses and students would benefit pedagogically and administratively from the flexibility of an upper or lower division option.  The CSULB Ethnic Studies Council unequivocally supports the following points from the CSUCES statement and various CSU Campus Resolutions:   1. Rescind Title V July 2020 changes as stipulated in the draft EO. 2. Implement the Ethnic Studies requirement as a freestanding graduation requirement. This is the most effective, efficient, and cost (funding and faculty labor)-effective way to implement AB1460 and consider the diversity and limitations of course offerings across the CSU. It reduces the impact of GE restructuring on all faculty and departments, but especially the Humanities and Social Sciences. It enables the Ethnic Studies faculty on each campus to collaborate with other academic units to develop campus-specific mechanisms for students in high-unit major degree programs. 3. Provide enrollment flexibility for students to meet the Ethnic Studies requirement with either lower division or upper division courses. 4. Reduce the impact on the California Community Colleges (CCC) and the CSU Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT) programs. First, AB1460 is a requirement that is primarily about the students in the CSU and it should not be deferred to the community colleges to implement. Second, forcibly implementing the Ethnic Studies requirement would disadvantage students who attend CCCs with no or few Ethnic Studies course offerings. The proposed GE changes would also create unnecessary additional processes of course articulations between the CCC and the CSU, particularly around ADT programs. 5. Retain 9 units in the GE Area D Social Sciences, specifically D1, D2, and D3, in order to guarantee that students fulfill Title V mandate (American Institutions). 6. Allocate funding provided by the state to build capacity in Ethnic Studies (AAAS, AFRS, AIS, and CHLS).   **(2) GE Governing Committee (includes responses gathered by members of the committee from their respective departments)**  **Pg. 9-10 Area F (Feedback on Impact to majors’ curricula and GE):**   1. Still some questions about limiting the courses to the Ethnic Studies Departments rather than to the Ethnic Studies discipline(s), content, and methodologies that arising from departments want to be able to offer ES courses. 2. The largest concerns raised by GE Committee members revolve around the impact the creation of Area F has on Area D in the current policy draft: **A)** A few departments whose disciplines are categorized as Area D Social Sciences at CSULB are concerned about their ability to recruit majors, because the majority of their majors come from students exposure to the discipline in LD GE courses and/or students who take the LD courses at community colleges as part of meeting GE transfer requirements. **B)** Since our campus allocates 6 units of LD D3 to American History and the U.S. Constitution and American Ideals, removing LD D3 to make room for Area F means that students will not receive exposure to other social science disciplines as part of LD GE. 3. Some committee members suggested moving the Area D American History course to Area C, since history can be designated a humanities discipline, thus allowing Area D to lose 3 units but still have room for one LD social science course. Or adding Ethnic Studies to Area C and leaving American History in D, since one might view aspects of the methodology as aligning with humanities methodologies. 4. Some committee members suggested eliminating Area E and replacing it with the Ethnic Studies courses, because there are less courses in Area E and the category is less defined than those based on essential skills (Area A) or disciplines/methodologies (Areas B, C, D). However, Engineering said that losing the ability to double count major’s courses and Area E would put their majors over in units. 5. Committee members were in favor of allowing the requirement to be met by both UD and LD courses, though the impact of this on units within majors was not discussed in depth. It seems that moving it to the UD would still impact unit loads within several degrees. 6. There was some support for asking if the ES requirement could be a graduation requirement rather than as part of GE; however, the committee also recognized and supported the need to validate the importance of Ethnic Studies to the general education of students and saw including it in GE as way of demonstrating that importance. Having it as a GE requirement will allow us to graduate students who possess a greater understanding of race and ethnicity, and it will contribute to opening minds and perspectives. The experience of cognitive dissonance disrupts world views in positive ways. In addition, making ES a GE requirement may also bolster development of faculty in ES, which may contribute to campus efforts toward diversity and inclusivity. 7. Some members advocated for non-ES faculty being allowed to apply to the ES Departments for approval to teach courses approved to meet the Ethnic Studies requirement, which seems to be allowed for within the draft. 8. Several members voiced concerns about the impact of losing D3 on the ability to double count major requirements and GE. They indicated that losing that ability to double count courses will result in certain majors being over in units – at least some of these majors are in accredited programs where curricula have restrictions based on requirements put forward by the accrediting institutions. 9. The committee felt that the core competencies were comprehensive enough to not warrant devising additional SLOs.   **Comments about Clarity and Corrections**  **Pg. 9-10 Area F and Core Competencies**  **Suggested revision of Competency #2:**  Apply theory to describe critical events in the histories, cultures and intellectual traditions, with special focus on the lived-experiences, social struggles, agency, and group-affirmation of one or more of the following four historically defined racialized core groups: Native Americans, African Americans, Latina/o Americans and/or Asian Americans.  **Comment about Competency #5:**  “Demonstrate active engagement with anti-racist issues, practices and movements to build a diverse, just and equitable society beyond the classroom.” Concerns were expressed that arise from reading this as an SLO and interpreting “active engagement” to mean forcing students to adopt specific practices and perspectives and thus it having the potential to silence free speech/thought.  [This was not discussed in depth at the meeting but was submitted by a member via email. However, I think the concern arises in relation to assessment: how is active engagement assessed? Does the phrasing imply that students are required to adopt a particular set of beliefs and behaviors outside the classroom?]  **(3) College of Business Faculty Council**  The Faculty Council of the College of Business broadly supports the idea of a required ethnic studies course, per the executive order on CSU General Education Breadth (formerly EO 1100-revised). However, we support the requirement of this course at only the lower division. Such an approach would allow us to fulfill several important goals for the benefit of our students:   1. It would enable this important course to help shape the trajectory of our students’ learning throughout their college experience, if taken earlier. 2. From a practical standpoint, it avoids adding additional pressure on our upper division curriculums for high-unit majors (like Accounting and International Business), and our upper division core course requirements. 3. It helps ensure our continued commitment to AACSB accreditation in our College, which is a vitally important differentiating factor for our program vs. other institutions.   In summary, we support the idea broadly, but strongly encourage the Academic Senate to make this a lower division course.  **(4) College of Health & Human Services Faculty Council; the feedback is also comprised of consultation and input from CHHS’ Dean, Chairs/Directors, Educational Policies Committee, and Advising Center**  October 28, 2020  **SUBJECT:**  To: Brian Jersky Provost and Senior Vice President  Jessica Pandya Academic Senate Chair  From: College of Health and Human Services (CHHS) Faculty Council  **College of Health and Human Services: Ethnic Studies Course Implementation**  This memo summarizes the recommended implementation of an ethnic studies course requirement (AB 1460) from the perspective of the College of Health and Human Services (CHHS) at California State University, Long Beach (CSULB).  ***CHHS strongly supports the study of racial inequity and racial justice as an important and foundational topic for CHHS students***  As a college that values social justice and one whose programs prepare students in service of a diverse population, CHHS believes that the study of racial inequities and racial justice in the United States are important and foundational topics for all CHHS students. Many of the undergraduate degrees within CHHS are accredited. Most accrediting bodies require specific learning outcomes in the area of human diversity to ensure professional competency of CHHS students as they enter the health and human services workforce. As such, a disciplinary lens on human diversity is applied across major coursework for CHHS students. We are supportive of expanding the scope of CHHS student learning to include an ethnic studies disciplinary perspective. CHHS programs and faculty look forward to collaborating with experts across campus in amplifying, extending, and applying this important content throughout our students’ educational experiences.  CHHS is comprised of:   * Approximately 7,000 undergraduate students * 11 Departments/Schools * 10 undergraduate majors, with 24 distinct sub-options and degree paths * High-unit accredited programs   o Average required major units of 66 units, ranging from 36-84 units o 21 disciplinary accreditations from 17 distinct accrediting bodies  Because of our accreditations, high-unit majors, and diversity of programs, there are limitations for how a new ethnic studies requirement can be accommodated within CHHS degrees. What follows are the parameters that CHHS requires to effectively do so.  ***Ethnic studies must be a lower-division GE requirement***  CHHS is in support of a lower-division GE course requirement for an ethnic studies course. We see the learning outcomes in an ethnic studies course as foundational for all students and especially CHHS students who have accreditation requirements in the area of human diversity throughout their degree programs. Introduction to this content should occur early and at the lower division so that it can be expanded upon throughout a student’s educational journey.  ***Ethnic studies must be embedded within the 48 units of total GE unit requirements.***  CHHS degrees are high-unit majors, with an average of 66 units required (ranging of 36-84 units required in the major). Eleven (11) of our majors require 70 units or more for the major. As a result, CHHS students have few elective units they can devote to a new ethnic studies course requirement. CHHS programs have also limited flexibility in removing required major units and remaining within accreditation standards. Further, in order to maintain 120-unit degree limits, some CHHS majors currently double count GE courses needed for accreditation within major requirements. The specifics of an ethnic studies requirement prevents CHHS majors from doing so. This effectively adds units to CHHS degree plans, even if the total number of GEs has not changed. As such, within the current 120-unit degree limit and given the limits on double counting specific to an additional ethnic studies course option, CHHS majors require that the ethnic studies course be counted within the 48-unit totals of GE and not be added as an additional graduation requirement.  ***Ethnic studies should replace the current D3 GE requirement.***  CHHS supports a similar GE unit total and similar breadth and intellectual integrity of the current GE patterns. We believe the nature, scope, and student learning outcomes proposed for an ethnic studies course most closely aligns with Area D requirements (as noted below). As such, CHHS supports removing a 3-unit D category (D3) requirement and replacing it with an ethnic studies 3-unit requirement. We understand that removal of 3-units of GE in other categories has also been suggested to maintain GE totals, such as removal of 3-units of area C or E. We are not in support of doing so as neither C nor E areas of GE closely align with core competencies proposed with the addition of an ethnic studies 3-unit requirement.   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Ethnic Studies Core Competency** | **Area D** | **Area E** | **Area C** | | *1. Analyze and articulate concepts of ethnic studies, including but not limited to race and ethnicity, racialization, equity, ethno-centrism, eurocentrism, white supremacy, self- determination, liberation, decolonization and anti-racism.*  *2. Apply theory to describe critical events in the histories, cultures and intellectual traditions, with special focus on the lived- experiences and social* | *Students learn from courses in multiple Area D disciplines that human social, political and economic institutions and behavior are inextricably interwoven.*  *Through fulfillment of the Area D requirement, students will develop an understanding of problems and issues from the respective disciplinary perspectives and will examine issues in their contemporary as well* | *This requirement is designed to equip learners for lifelong understanding and development of themselves as integrated physiological, social, and psychological beings.*  *Physical activity may be included, if it is an integral part of the study elements described herein.*  *Content may include topics such as student success strategies, human behavior,* | *Across the disciplines in Area C coursework, students will cultivate intellect, imagination, sensibility and sensitivity. Students will respond subjectively as well as objectively to aesthetic experiences and will develop an understanding of the integrity of both emotional and intellectual responses.*  *Students will cultivate and refine their affective, cognitive, and physical faculties through studying works* | | *struggles of one or more of the following four historically defined racialized core groups: Native Americans, African Americans, Latina/o Americans and/or Asian Americans, and emphasizing agency and group-affirmation.*  *3. Critically discuss the intersection of race and ethnicity with other forms of difference affected by hierarchy and oppression, such as class, gender, sexuality, religion, spirituality, national origin, immigration status, ability and/or age.*  *4. Describe how struggle, resistance, social justice, solidarity and liberation as experienced by communities of color are relevant to current issues.*  *5. Demonstrate active engagement with anti- racist issues, practices and movements to build a diverse, just and equitable society beyond the classroom* | *as historical settings and in a variety of cultural contexts.*  *Students will explore the principles, methodologies, value systems and ethics employed in social scientific inquiry.*  *Courses that emphasize skills development and professional preparation are excluded from Area D.* | *sexuality, nutrition, physical and mental health, stress management, information literacy, social relationships and relationships with the environment, as well as implications of death and dying or avenues for lifelong learning. Courses in this area shall focus on the development of skills, abilities and dispositions.* | *of the human imagination. Activities may include participation in individual aesthetic, creative experiences; however, Area C excludes courses that exclusively emphasize skills development.*  *In their intellectual and subjective considerations, students will develop a better understanding of the interrelationship between the self and the creative arts and of the humanities in a variety of cultures.*  *Students may take courses in languages other than English in partial fulfillment of this requirement if the courses do not focus solely on skills acquisition but also contain a substantial cultural component. This may include literature, among other content.* |   **(5) Curriculum & Educational Policies Council (CEPC)—2 individual responses from council members (both from the College of Business)**  October 30th, 2020 To Whom It May Concern,  As the Vice Chair of CEPC, I broadly support the idea of a required ethnic studies course, per the executive order on CSU General Education Breadth (formerly EO 1100-revised). I believe it should be required in the lower division, as this would accomplish several important goals for the university, my college, and its students:   1. It would enable this important course to help shape the trajectory of our students’ learning throughout their college experience, if taken earlier. 2. From a practical standpoint, it reduces pressure on our upper division curriculum issues with specific majors (like Accounting and International Business). 3. It helps ensure our continued commitment to AACSB accreditation in our College, which is a vitally important differentiating factor for our program vs. others.   In summary, I support the idea broadly, but strongly encourage the Academic Senate to make this a lower division course.  Sincerely,  Craig D. Macaulay Associate Professor of Management Vice Chair of CEPC California State University – Long Beach  **COB member:**  With regards to the addition of Area F, I strongly advocate enforcing completion of the Ethnic Studies requirement through only a lower division course. I represent the College of Business on our University-wide curriculum council. Two of our majors, Accounting (our largest major in terms of student enrollment) and International Business, are already considered “high-unit” majors. We are able to comply with the Area B, C, and D upper-division without sacrificing any of our core courses. However, we cannot maintain this balance if Area F is to be fulfilled at the upper-level. Removing a course (to allow for upper-division Area F) from our Accounting major in particular would jeopardize important accreditation requirements, as well as our students’ ability to sit for a crucial credentialing exam after completing our program. It would also place in jeopardy the comprehensiveness of our curricula for our other majors, who would likely be forced to drop an upper-level elective, and prevent students from obtaining specialized knowledge in their major. |