



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH

General Education Governing Committee Minutes

February 8, 2021 via Zoom
2:00pm – 4:00pm

Members in Attendance: Colleen Dunagan (Chair), Annel Estrada, Jarrett Boice, Maricela Correa, Greg Gaynor, Rich Haesly, Paul Henderson, Lily House-Peters, Kerry Johnson, Kenji Klein, Yu-Fu Ko, Peter Kreysa (Vice Chair), Oscar Morales Ponce, Florence Newberger, Wendy Nomura, Danny Paskin (GE Coordinator), Ruth Piker (Secretary), Jason Schwans, Michelle Taylor, Kerry Woodward

Excused Absence: Alexis Pavenick, Tiffini Travis,

- I. Call to Order – 2:03 pm
- II. Approval of Agenda – posted in Beachboard – F/S approved
- III. Approval of Minutes – January 25, 2021 - posted in Beachboard – F/S approved; 15 yes, 2 abstentions
- IV. Announcements
 - a. Update on UNIV 310 B/C/D
 - i. Danny and Colleen spoke with Jessica Pandya and Praveen Soni, from Academic Senate.
 - ii. Jessica and Praveen ask that the committee conduct a one-year pilot test for summer 2022.
 - iii. Colleen will speak with Marcus.
 - b. Question from member: what should faculty do if their proposal was approved prior to the policy changes? Should they still offer the class, make changes to the SCO, or resubmit a proposal?
 - i. Response: they should contact Danny Paskin.
 - ii. If the proposal was recently approved, they should move forward with the class.
- V. Review of New Course Proposals (proposals posted in Beachboard in Course Proposals folder/New Courses)
 - a. HM-CAFF 305
 - i. Comment: The proposal has the quantitative literacy elements. However, all the assessments focus on math calculations.
 - ii. Comment: For the GELOs, lower B is selected, but the proposer does not discuss the scientific approach. Several members agree with this statement.
 1. Comment: The scientific method is not visible in the proposal, but they do discuss a scientific approach.
 2. Suggestion: the proposer might consider changing the GELO b to c
 - iii. Comment: For assignments, member is concerned with the focus on calculations, while ignoring other social sciences topics.
 - iv. Comment: For the week by week, the proposal has both area B quantitative literacy and other topics.
 - v. Motion: amendment that asks for revision of assessments to reflect what is clearly course content based on description (i.e. calculations and social impact); suggest shifting GE SLO b to c unless they can revise the assessments to better demonstrate how meeting b, specifically in reference to data. Changes reviewed by executive committee. – F/S approved 17 yes, 1 abstention
 - b. CDFS 310

- i. Email Comment: Doesn't specify which of THEIR GE outcomes are being covered in the weeks outline or assignments. Needs to be revised so that the course GELOs are addressed throughout. I would suggest revising GELO section and just label A,B, C outcomes with which GELO they are fulfilling. Also there are SIXTEEN OUTCOMES. I think significant revision of SCO is needed before I can review- I would like it come back to committee.
 - 1. For example, in week ONE they are supposedly covering 13 learning outcomes. They need to identify which of their learning outcomes they are covering because I doubt in the first week of class they will be covering 13 different learning outcomes... and they would be better served if they limit the outcomes they are teaching to the ones that most directly align w the content for each week. So if they are only covering outcomes A. from the UD GELO 1 then they need to indicate they are teaching that outcome for that week.
 - 2. I suggest they switch how they do their outcomes by making A, B, C and labeling them UD 1 and then in week by week indicating they are teaching A, B, and/or C.
- ii. Comment: A member agrees with the other member's email.
- iii. Comment: For assignments, there is a question whether an assignment could do all the GELOs.
 - 1. Other members think it is possible to cover all the GELOS in one assignment.
- iv. Comment: For GELOs, there are 16 SLOs. It was clarified that there are 9 SLOs and 6 repeated SLOs.
- v. Comment: Member comments that there is the implication of social science theory, but it is not clear that all of the assessments will always lead to addressing all of the GE SLOs.
 - 1. Question: Wouldn't that issue be covered by how the faculty evaluate the assignment?
- vi. Comment: Is it possible to make the alignment of course assessments more specific by focusing on which is most emphasized in each assessment.
 - 1. Suggestion: be more specific – include one or two that is predominant for that assignment or week
- vii. Motion: amendment to revise the SLOs to be better aligned and update the assessment to specify one or two most prominent SLOs. Changes reviewed by executive committee. – F/S approved 16 yes, 1 abstention

VI. Review of Amended Course Proposals (proposals posted in Beachboard in Tabled – Additional Revisions Required)

a. EMER 301

- i. Comment: Member questions whether this class is social sciences.
 - 1. Discussion ensued regarding what disciplines are considered social sciences.
 - 2. Some members believe the SLOs do sound like social science.
- ii. Comment: For GELOs, they are labeling things possibly incorrectly.
- iii. Comment: A member recommended the committee review the GE policy for D3.
 - 1. Discussion ensued regarding whether the proposal meets Area D3.
- iv. Comment: What theories are being used in course is a question asked?
 - 1. A member explains that method and theories of social sciences are not discussed and should be added.
- v. Motion: The proposal meets Area D3 requirement. F/S approved 12 yes, 1 abstention, 4 nays
- vi. Motion: Amendment is to ask for clarification of how social science theories and methodologies are being addressed in SLOs, assessments, and outline, specifically course SLO B needs to be explicit about the methodologies. Changes reviewed by executive committee. F/S approved

VII. Adjournment