



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH

General Education Governing Committee

approved Minutes

October 11, 2021 via Zoom

2:00pm – 4:00pm

Zoom Information posted in GEGC Beachboard & in the email

Please notify a member of the GEGC Executive Committee (Florence.Newberger@csulb.edu Chair, Rich Haesly Rich.Haesly@csulb.edu Vice-Chair, Lily House Peters Lily.HousePeters@csulb.edu Secretary, Danny.Paskin@csulb.edu GE Coordinator, Annel Estrada Annel.Estrada@csulb.edu), if you are unable to attend.

Members in Attendance: Florence Newberger (chair), Danny Paskin (GE Coordinator), Rich Haesly (vice chair), Colleen Dunagan, Annel Estrada (UCUA rep), Greg Gaynor, Lily House-Peters (secretary), Kerry Johnson, Nicholas Laskowski, Oscar Morales Ponce, Aparna Nayak, Wendy Nomura, Alexis Pavenick, Jason Schwans, Sarath Cornelio, Shamim Mirza, Yu-Fu Ko

Absent: Daniel Whistler, Angela Locks, Tiffini Travis, Michelle Taylor

- I. Call to Order
 - a. Meeting called to order at 2:06
- II. Approval of Agenda – posted in Beachboard
 - a. Motion (Wendy Nomura)/seconded (Aparna Nayak)
 - b. Passed with 12 “yes” votes, 4 abstentions, 0 “no” votes
- III. Approval of Minutes – September 27, 2021 - posted in Beachboard
 - a. Motion (Wendy Nomura), Seconded (Alexis Pavenick)
 - b. Passed with 11 “yes” votes; 5 abstention, 0 “no” votes
- IV. Review of New Courses (posted in Course Proposals – New Courses)
 - a. New Courses – posted in AY 2021-2022 - Course Proposals - New Courses
 - i. **PHIL 130 Puzzles & Paradoxes** – Requesting A3
 1. Motion (Colleen Dunagan), Seconded (Wendy Nomura)
 2. A3 GELOs are very concrete; Course learning outcomes need to more explicitly reflect all parts of the A3 GELOs (for example, where there is “and” all parts of the GELO need to be reflected in the course SLO). Expand and clarify course SLOs to better demonstrate how the course SLOs meet the A3 GELOs. For example:
 - a. Course SLO 1 needs to reflect the “language” part of GELO 1.
 - b. The inductive/deductive logic component from GELO 2 is currently included as part of GELO 1
 - c. Course SLO 6 should include Copyright language from GELO 6.
 3. Section VIII “Outline of Subject Matter by Week” needs to be expanded beyond a few words to a longer description to tell us more about what is happening each week and how the GELOs are being met.

4. Section VII “Course Assessments” do not add to 100%. Separate out in each assessment what is required and what is extra credit. Or, revise to equal 100% and then state that instructors can weight assessments differently.
 5. Bibliography (Section IX) is very long. Improve headers in the Bibliography to increase clarity about which bibliographic materials specifically cover the GE content.
 6. **Recommendation:** Table course awaiting revisions to return to full committee
 - a. Passed with 9 “yes” votes; 1 abstention, 3 “no” votes
 - b. Summary of the recommendation for revision: Revise the proposal to show more clearly how the course is fulfilling A3, in particular the course SLOs need to more accurately reflect the A3 GELOs. The Outline of Subject Matter should include more description for each week beyond the brief weekly topic areas. Course Assessments should be revised to add up to 100%. Finally, add a header to the Bibliography to more clearly signal GE and non-GE bibliographic materials.
- ii. **TRST 201 Meaning in Transit – Requesting C2**
1. Motion (Aparna Nayak), Seconded (Nick Laskowski)
 2. Course SLO 2 needs to be better aligned to and more clearly demonstrate how it meets GELO 3 language. For example, explicitly tell us what the “theoretical concepts” are that undergird translation.
 3. **Recommendation:** Approve with revisions to clarify the GELOs (GELO 2 in particular), return to Exec Committee
 - a. Passed with 12 “yes” votes; 2 abstention, 0 “no” votes
 - b. Summary of the recommendation for revision: Revise the proposal to better align course SLO 2 to GELO 3, by more clearly reflecting GELO 3 language in SLO 2. Add more detail to the ‘theoretical concepts’ to clearly show these are humanities C2 theories.
- iii. **TRST 301 Translation: Ethics, Theory, Practice – Requesting UD D**
1. SLOs: Make the “D” social science SLOs more clear and explicit. For example, Course SLO 1 could more clearly state which translation theory fits social science and Course SLO 2 could further clarify what is meant by “fundamental theoretical and ethical questions”.
 2. GE Justification: Give us a brief statement that translation studies is interdisciplinary (humanities and social sciences), and explicitly state how this course is social science, rather than humanities. GE Justification could do a better job of interpreting the social science aspects of the course. Tell us explicitly which translation theories are social science.
 3. Bibliography needs header that specifies Social Science UD D, such as “All of the following references cover the UD D category”.
 4. **Recommendation:** Approve with revisions to clarify the UD D Social Science emphasis, return to Exec Committee
 - a. Passed with 15 “yes” votes; 0 abstention, 0 “no” votes
 - b. Summary of the recommendation for revision: Revise the proposal to more clearly reflect UD D social science GELOs by explicitly stating how translation theory fits social science, to better distinguish from humanities. Update GE Justification to more clearly interpret the social science aspects

of the course, such as explicitly stating which translation theories fit under social science. Add header to Bibliography specifying which bibliographic materials cover the UD D category.

- iv. **FREN 240 Paris Past and Present** – Requesting C1
 1. Motion (Alexis Pavenick), Seconded (Oscar Morales)
 2. The SLOs make sense in relation to C1 GELOs, but the GE Justification seems to align more to humanities (C2), rather than artistic approach (C1), focus is on an array of art objects as forms of representation and history of thought, politics, and economics; rather than focusing on the art practice itself.
 3. SLOs don't explicitly mention Paris/France. Add explicit mention of France to ground the class.
 4. The GE Policy (C1) says we are trying to help students develop the integrity of emotional and affective responses through aesthetic creative practices – not seeing the emotional and affective responses clearly reflected in the GE Justification and SLOs. Specifically, revise course SLO 2 to explicitly reflect GELO 1 “Discuss aesthetic experiences subjectively and objectively” which aligns to the policy requirement for “emotional and affective responses” to be addressed.
 5. **Recommendation:** Approve with revisions to SLOs and GE Justification, and return to Exec Committee
 - a. Passed with 15 “yes” votes; 0 abstention, 0 “no” votes
 - b. **Summary of the recommendation for revision:** Revise the proposal to better align the GE Justification and course SLOs with C1. In particular, revise course SLO 2 to explicitly reflect the language in GELO 1 that states “discuss aesthetic experiences subjectively and objectively” which aligns to the GE policy’s C1 requirement to address “emotional and affective responses” to art. Also, explicitly mention Paris or France in the SLOs to ground the class in its geographic location.
- v. **GEOG 325 Geography of Climate Change** – Requesting UD B
 1. Motion (Wendy Nomura), Seconded (Danny Paskin)
 2. Course clearly reflects UD B, clear alignment between UD B GELOs and Course SLOs.
 3. Map is unnecessary for GE proposal.
 4. **Recommendation:** Approve without revisions
 - a. Passed with 16 “yes” votes; 0 abstention, 0 “no” votes
- vi. **PHIL 360 Environmental Ethics** – Requesting UD C
 1. Motion (Alexis Pavenick), Seconded (Aparna Nayak)
 2. Pre-reqs need to be fixed; sophomore standing should be updated to junior standing, completion of 60 units
 3. Expand upon Outline of Subject Matter, from list of topics to actually telling us what students are doing each week. Be more specific about how methodologically they are going to address critical thinking within the Outline of Subject Matter. Add more detail to more clearly show connection between GELOs, such as critical thinking, and Weekly Course Topics
 4. **Recommendation:** Approve with revisions to Outline of Subject Matter and Pre-reqs, and return to Exec Committee

- a. Passed with 13 “yes” votes; 0 abstention, 0 “no” votes
- b. Summary of the recommendation for revision: Revise the proposal to fix the pre-requisites (sophomore standing should be updated to junior standing, completion of 60 units). Expand the Outline of Subject Matter from a list of topics to brief descriptions that more clearly show the connection between the weekly topics and how the GELOs will be met.

vii. **LING 360 Languages of Africa** – Requesting UD D

1. Motion (Wendy Nomura), Seconded (Nick Laskowski)
2. Course proposal is extremely clear; very well developed
3. **Recommendation:** Approve without revisions
 - a. Passed with 16 “yes” votes; 0 abstention, 0 “no” votes

V. Adjournment

- a. Meeting adjourned at 3:33pm