



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH

General Education Governing Committee

Approved Minutes

April 27, 2020

NO PHYSICAL OR SYNCHRONOUS MEETING

Please notify Tiffini.Travis@csulb.edu, AND Colleen.Dunagan@csulb.edu if you cannot connect to Beachboard.

- I. Approval of Minutes: GEGC Minutes from 3-23-2020 posted on BeachBoard (Discussion Board)
 - A. MSP
- II. Announcements/Discussions
 - A. Following courses were approved in virtual GE Exec: CE 406/406H and NRSNG 402
- III. Current Business:
 - A. Executive Committee Election Results: Chair, Vice Chair and Secretary for F20-SP21:
 - i. Total of 14 ballots cast with one ballot being blank and one submitted via email.
 - ii. Chair nomination Nancy Quam-Wickham – 13 votes
 - iii. Vice-Chair nomination Colleen Dunagan – 13 votes
 - iv. Secretary – One write-in nomination for Alexis Pavenick (plus 1 additional vote) and one write-in nomination for Josh Palkki, and one write-in nomination for Kenji Klein.
 - B. GEOG 304: California
 - i. Course GE Form
 - ii. Continuing GE (Category F, Interdisciplinary, Human Diversity)
 - iii. Request for UD D (Social and Behavioral Sciences and History)
 - iv. Comments via Discussion Board:
 1. SLO 4: suggestion-- replace "understand" with "describe" SLO 5: suggestion-- "interpret and explain" is a more logical word order. Otherwise, it looks good!
 2. I agree about word choice on SLO 4 & 5; "interpret and explain follows the upward flow of hierarchy of Bloom as well. On SLO 4, I'm a little stuck on the phrase "critically **evaluate** the general social practices..." and how it relates to the **research paper**: "This exercise assesses the student's ability to identify, describe and **evaluate** the spatial migration and settlement of social groups in California." Just want to confirm that this is typical phrasing - it seems like it's asking students to critique the manner and method of migration, rather than what I feel may be implied - to examine its many facets. But maybe it IS a request for critique and that's OK? If no one else has a concern, I'm fine with it.
 3. With the first important suggested revision, I'm good with this course. Alignment of SLOs with assessments is appropriate for an upper-division D category course. Evaluating migration patterns is appropriate language. (Truth in advertising: California history is one of my graduate areas. I teach the history equivalent -- HIST 473: California -- and this is a good course.)
 4. I agree with the first comments as well, and overall, I think the course form does a good job of demonstrating how it fulfills the GE requirements. I do have a quick question, though. I note that the course is requesting approval as a Human Diversity course. Am I right that GEGC does not weigh in on that issue since it is GR and not GE? I assume we don't, but if we are supposed to weigh in on that issue, I'm comfortable with approving the course for that based on the

description, but I do note that the SLOs deal exclusively with Category D, not Human Diversity, which I'm assuming is because there are no approved GR learning outcomes to use for evaluating courses for Human Diversity approval. Just curious about this. Recommendation: Ask for those minor SLO language revisions and approve.

5. I concur with Josh's suggestions. Maybe the Exec Comm can finalize the approval with those changes.
6. **SUMMARY of requested amendments:**
 - a. SLO 4: suggestion-- replace "understand" with "describe" SLO 5: suggestion-- "interpret and explain" is a more logical word order.
 - b. Executive Committee can finalize the approval with those changes.

C. GEOG 318: Russia and Its Neighbors

- i. Course GE Form
- ii. Continuing GE (Category F, Interdisciplinary, Global Issues)
- iii. Request for UD D (Social and Behavioral Sciences and History)
- iv. Comments via Discussion Board:

1. The catalog description is not a complete sentence. p. 2 middle "Along the way students will develop critical writing skills." How? Is this sentence necessary? It's not a WI course, correct (it's not checked on the GE form)? SLO's should not include the word "understand" ("describe" is a better word). SLO 5 should "realm" be "region"? Outline of subject matter by week: It doesn't seem that all of the SLOs are covered...
2. First, while I agree that Understand is a top level term in Bloom's, I think we have all been leaning toward more actionable words like "identify" and "explain." And I think these should be suggested to the faculty as preferable. This form is already a dense read, so any clarity is welcome, to my mind. With regard to these comments: "Missing SLOs are a more serious concern, though all the SLOs seem to be listed next to the assignments (if I understood their interesting numbering choices). Does the subject matter outlined miss a topic necessary to address a particular SLO?" It looks like they have numbered the SLOs in terms of the area D divisions, as they see them. I feel this should be corrected to match the actual numbering of 1 - 5, which they use to identify their content. But I defer to anyone who feels the 1 - 3b is OK. Finally, my understanding of "realm" is that it fundamentally refers to kingdom, however, in geography there are biogeographic realms, and it is likely these are what is meant, so I vote to keep the term.
3. I agree with others here about the unnecessarily complex course and SLO descriptions; some sentences are incomplete. And while I believe the subject matter is appropriate for D3, here's my concern: The assessments do not align well with the new UD-D3 SLOs. 80% of the course grade is determined by "short quizzes, true-false quizzes, short answer and essay exams," including 40% from brief quizzes (maps, films, texts, etc.). I would like the instructor to explain to me how a short quiz on a film or a true-false quiz allows students to demonstrate "analysis" of material," and "utilize tools [of the social science disciplines] to examine" proposed content. That's why I think the important issue of use of "Understand" in first two SLOs are telling -- this feels more to me like a course unsuited to upper-division GE but more suited to lower-division GE where the emphasis is on content mastery. And yes, I know that we are not really supposed to evaluate assessments. But if there is no alignment

between SLOs and assessments, then this is a serious structural issue with the course as proposed. I propose we send back to the department. Areas to fix? All that's noted by others (basic written descriptions - emphasize brevity!, clearer discussions of "critical thinking" skills development which is alleged, revise SLOs), but also include discussion of how these assessments align with SLOs at the UD level.

4. I agree with the feedback about the mis-alignment between the SLOs and the modes of assessment. In Geography, realm (although awkward) can also be used to mean "a field or domain". One administrative note as faculty in Geography, GEOG 318 was previously D3, but when the global and capstone categories were added the D was inadvertently dropped, thus necessitating the re-review, while other classes that were D3 were automatically granted UD D without another review.
5. The D designation must have been dropped by the Geography dept. since the form they submitted for capstone certification in 2014 did not indicate it was continuing D nor is it addressed at all in the SCO.
6. **SUMMARY of requested amendments:**
 - a. The catalog description is not a complete sentence.
 - b. On page 2 in the middle: "Along the way students will develop critical writing skills." How? Is this sentence necessary? It's not a WI course?
 - c. SLO's should not include the word "understand" ("describe" is a better word). I agree with others here about the unnecessarily complex course and SLO descriptions; some sentences are incomplete. And while I believe the subject matter is appropriate for D3, here's my concern: The assessments do not align well with the new UD-D3 SLOs.
 - d. Outline of subject matter by week: It doesn't seem that all of the SLOs are covered. It looks like they have numbered the SLOs in terms of the area D divisions, as they see them. I feel this should be corrected to match the actual numbering of 1-5, which they use to identify their content. But I defer to anyone who feels the 1-3b is OK.
 - e. 80% of the course grade is determined by "short quizzes, true-false quizzes, short answer and essay exams," including 40% from brief quizzes (maps, films, texts, etc.). Can the instructor explain how a short quiz on a film or a true-false quiz allows students to demonstrate "analysis" of material," and "utilize tools [of the social science disciplines] to examine" proposed content. this feels more to me like a course unsuited to upper-division GE but more suited to lower-division GE where the emphasis is on content mastery. If there is no alignment between SLOs and assessments, then this is a serious structural issue with the course as proposed.

IV. Future Business

V. Adjournment

GEGC Meeting Dates
AS-119 (Anatol Center)

Spring 2019

