



Office of Academic Programs • 1000 East Victoria St. • Carson, CA 90747

## General Education Committee

Monday, February 25, 2013  
10:00-12:00 – Provost's Conference Room

### Minutes

Present: J. Badrtalei, D. Best, L. Fitzsimmons, K. Ganezer, P. Kalayjian, P. Krochalk, E. Magruder, A. Pu, L. Skiffer, M. Suchenek, K. Bragg, P. Kim, M. Maki, T. Philo

Absent: L. Goldman (P. Krochalk- proxy), I. Heinze-Balcazar (E. Magruder- Proxy), J. Bersi, B. McLelland, C. Turner

1. **Call to Order:** 10:04 a.m.

2. **Approval of Agenda**

a. P. Krochalk moved to approve.

i. M. Maki- requested to move his discussion topic, Item 4f Upper division GE Transfer up to before or right after Item 4a- Cathy Jacob's time certain.

ii. L. Fitzsimmons commented that the agenda was altered without her knowledge.

iii. L. Fitzsimmons- Believes the insertion without her consultation is irregular and should not be encouraged.

b. P. Kalayjian seconded motion to approve amended agenda. M/S/P

i. Agenda approved as amended

3. **Approval of February 11, 2013 Minutes**

a. Minutes were not available. Will be reviewed at next GE meeting.

**Old Business**

Upper Division GE Transfer- M. Maki

1. Thanked L. Fitzsimmons and will consult with her in the future.
2. Continued topic of discussion regarding 5 digit course prefix to help satisfy so departments will get proper FTES.
  - a. Proposal for the distribution of Upper Division FTES for HUM, SBS and SMT was distributed to the GEC. Suggestion to tag on department abbreviation to HUM, SMT, SBS.
3. M. Maki- A priority would be to make the department prefix invisible. This would be done through the IT process. Asked if GEC would feel comfortable with this.
4. P. Krochalk- Without the last 3 letters of the department prefix, a student's perspective of the course may be distorted.
  - a. The course itself does not change.
5. P. Kalayjian- It's about the faculty teaching HUM, SBS, and SMT. Wants to see proposal section revised. The language in the proposal needs to reflect that the FTES goes to the department of the faculty that are teaching the courses.
6. M. Maki- In the College of Arts and Humanities, fiscally it's handled in the dean's office.
  - a. Example: IDS faculty teaching HUM courses; IDS should get reimbursed for the faculty, but not credit.
7. M. Suchenek- An example from his College of Natural and Behavioral Sciences- faculty teach cross departments- Computer Science faculty teach Math courses; Math got the workload for the course.
  - a. Math got the workload for the course. The first 3 letters always got the credit.
8. L. Fitzsimmons- Reluctant to go forward since the GEC's SBS representative was not in attendance.
9. D. Best and P. Kalayjian have made revisions to the proposal and will send to M. Maki.

#### **AFS 205 Proposal (2<sup>nd</sup> reading)**

1. M. Suchenek- strongly suggests the courses should be broad- cross-cultural. Correct him if he's wrong. Does not see this course meeting the GE requirements.
2. L. Fitzsimmons- States cross-cultural in course description. Recommended maybe address this in the articles.
3. M. Suchenek- Questioned how much this course would help students get a good paying job after they graduate.

4. L. Skiffer- Hip Hop is the significant movement that meets the global Area C Outcomes. There are opportunities for oral and written creativity.
  - a. There can be some additions made to the syllabus, but it meets the objectives.
5. P. Krochalk- Has no problems with the content of the course. It's rich. Thinks students can get very involved and more open-minded about Hip Hop. Students can learn to analyze, how to appreciate and apply the knowledge to other areas of their life.
6. M. Suchenek- His problem is that he does not see a range of cultures, not that Hip Hop isn't an important culture.
7. A. Pu- The world of "culture" is a huge topic. How to interpret a "range" or "culture". The topic crosses suburban to urban; cross gender. She does not see the issue there.
8. E. Magruder- Opportunity for metacognitive development for students. Use of E-portfolios.
9. A. Pu moved to approve. P. Krochalk seconded. M/S/P
  - a. L. Skiffer recommended adding another reading for Latin, Caribbean to the daily reading schedule.
10. Approved. 1 opposed.

**Assessment: Cathy Jacobs**

1. As chair of USLOAC and dealing with Student Learning Outcomes Assessment (SLOAs), GE's assessment is central to university's mission/assessment.
2. C. Jacobs proposed some changes that would make things easier. 2 prongs:
  - a. 1- If want to do SLO assessment in realist way in GE, we need to have fewer outcomes for each Area. Each Areas- 5, 6, 7 outcomes.
    - i. Consider rewriting the SLO's for the GE Areas. Recommended 1-2 Outcomes per Area.
  - b. 2- Align the new Area Outcomes with the 5 WASC Core Competencies; particularly Upper Division GE courses can gather information for WASC.
    - i. 5 WASC Core Competencies: 1) Information Literacy 2) Critical Thinking #) Written Communication Skills 4) Oral Communication Skills 5) Quantitative Skills
    - ii. Also propose to departments that teach GE courses to add a section to the annual assessments that they can pull that out for GE assessment; yield data that will be useful in the long-term.

3. C. Jacobs- Reduce and focus Area Outcomes so it will be easier to gather data. Do not have to state these Outcomes in the syllabus; they're to be implicit in the Outcomes. Make a statement that all students will accomplish/achieve these Core Competencies to make record in the prologue.
  - a. Not each GE Area needs to meet/address each of the 5 Core Competencies.
4. E. Magruder- Just returned from a faculty development conference. Humboldt is going through something similar. Critical reasoning cannot be developed in a single course.
  - a. Using metacognition ... 'ways of thinking' in each discipline. They have an instrument to assess early and when students they complete their GE to provide evidence that these 5 Core Competencies have been achieved when they're done.
  - b. She is in favor and also wants to see how to see how the GE works as a whole.
5. C. Jacobs- WASC doesn't define what the Core Competencies mean. They are stated in general terms. WASC was deliberately vague, leaving that to the institutions; we set the criteria.
6. L. Fitzsimmons- Faculty concerned about timelines.
7. C. Jacobs - It is essential to streamline and have an ongoing gathering of GE assessment.

#### FIN 200 Proposal (2<sup>nd</sup> reading)

1. Changed to "course description" not 'catalog.'
2. J. Badrtalei- Worked with them proposal originator. Proposed some minor modifications. Does not know if they've all been addressed. Concern about the book for extra credit not being used in any assignments.
3. E. Magruder- Commented that Week #1 and Week #16 of the Class Schedule have been modified since 1<sup>st</sup> Reading.
4. L. Fitzsimmons- Course is not in a condition the GEC would usually pass. Would encourage them to continue to work on it more. Asked J. Badrtalei to work with them. He agreed.
5. P. Kalayjian- For Readings suggested using "summarize and analyze."
6. D. Best- Does not see the connections of the assignments and outcomes. This course doesn't meet SLO #1.
  - a. L. Fitzsimmons- The link can be made more explicit.

Comment [U1]: The

7. K. Bragg- The syllabus is not written and does not read like a GE course reads. The course could be based on the discussion. Issues related to the GE topics need to be worked into the syllabus; need to put the cues into the syllabus.
8. J. Badrtalei- Department has an upper division personal finance course; they are trying to reduce this for GE.
9. L. Skiffer- Suggested putting a discussion question under each topic to relate to GE.
10. L. Fitzsimmons- Will ask department to resubmit.

### **New Business**

#### **Proposals ECO 210 and 211 (1<sup>st</sup> reading)- Burhan Yavas**

1. The original course FIN 200 did microeconomics and macroeconomics together. These proposed courses are separate topics and want to bring these in to GE as separate courses.
2. P. Krochalk- Recommend to the Computer Information Literacy Statement under Student Expectations- re: Blackboard.
3. L. Fitzsimmons- (*Referring to FIN 200 course proposal*) Course tends to expect a lot of extra credit to be offered.
4. L. Fitzsimmons- Much of the text in the syllabus under Optional Book for Extra Credit is plagiarized; copy and pasted from the book's website.
  - a. B. Yavas will take the course syllabus back to proposal originator for revision.
5. D. Best- Speaking in support of ECO 210 and ECO 211; this is what the community colleges are looking for. These are 2 different topics and she is glad to see them separate. The idea behind them is quite solid.
6. L. Fitzsimmons- Commented that all proposals need to be more closely linked to GE objectives.
  - a. There are grammatical errors. Grading scales are off normal GE standards. She encouraged them that the grading may be consistent with others in Area D.
7. B. Yavas- Asked for an example; his department has used this scale for years.

**Comment [U2]:** Not much. An advertisement for the book is plagiarized on the syllabus

8. L. Fitzsimmons- There is inconsistency with the GE norm. Think carefully about grading procedures; reconsider attitude toward use of extra credit.
9. M. Maki- Commented that 3 different proposals were being addressed at the same time: FIN 200, ECO 210 and ECO 211.
10. E. Magruder- Referred to the university catalog; the university grading policy references letter grades and grade point average.
  - a. There is not a policy on grading points scale.
11. A. Pu- Grading points should be left up to the instructor to decide; then the department should hopefully have quality control. The GE committee should not have a say in it.
12. M. Suchenek- Agrees grade scale should be left to discretion of instructor. L. Fitzsimmons remarks are appropriate; should be sensitive to the change of grade inflation.
13. B. Yavas- Stated if there is an example of a normal grading scale the committee could provide him with, then he would be happy to follow.
  - a. There is none.
14. K. Bragg- This discussion of grading tags back into what C. Jacobs was talking about; setting standards with the objectives/outcomes. At this point we don't have that. This is part of an ongoing conversation; these courses are willing to be a part. We do not have a standard for Area D.
15. B. Yavas- Where's FIN 200 in the review process?
  - a. L. Fitzsimmons- Going under 2<sup>nd</sup> reading today.

**Proposal CIS 275 (1<sup>st</sup> reading)**

1. M. Sheu- Department is changing course title to reflect the content. Wants to double count course for Area E.
  - a. M. Sheu – The points it will cover are physical health, social and psychological impact all in a larger level of technology. Internet related-ethics; internet and health issues and needs. Course teaches how to

determine accuracy and confidence in Internet searches. Think how to use the Internet to benefit physical health and improve their life.

2. L. Fitzsimmons- Can they articulate those GE links and the course SLO's?
3. M. Suchenek- It is unfortunate that computer literacy fell through GE cracks. His impression is that this course is not enough to link to Area E. Wants to see in Area E values and skills that are related to what the course offers but as Area E stands, there are no direct links.
4. M. Maki- Perhaps this is the time to readdress the way the GE Areas and Objectives are written. The Internet was not included when they were written 20 years ago.

**Announcements- Area Assessment Updates:**

**1. HUM 200**

- a. D. Best- They are happy with everything in the packet. SLO's are measurable. Suggest they include a rubric.

**2. HEA 100**

- a. Some recommendations: 1) Typos on syllabi need to be corrected. 2) All syllabi for each section need to be submitted.
  - i. P. Krochalk noted that each course section is taught by the same instructor.
  - ii. Recant second recommendation.

**Comment [U3]:** This doesn't reflect the main points of the review I have emailed these to you. Pls. integrate them here .

**Adjourn: 12:00 pm**