

General Education Committee

WH D-442

Monday, November 14, 2011

10:00am - 12:00pm

Minutes

Present: Lorna Fitzsimmons, Debra Best, Pamela Krochalk, Marek Suchenek, LaTanya Skiffer, Emily Magruder, Ken Ganezer, Ivonne Heinze-Balcazar, Sheela Pawar, E. Carol Dales, Merry Eyman, Cynthia Turner

Absent: Elena Koulikov, Lisa Hutton, Dana Belu, Brandy McLelland

Call to Order: 10:10am

Approval of Agenda:

1. D. Best moved to approve. P. Krochalk seconded. M/S/P
 - i. Agenda Approved

Approval of October 24, 2011 Minutes:

1. #3 Discussion: Item e. ii. Typo. "...the time" double typed.
 - ii. Revise sentence to read: "There seems to be no consideration for the discipline at the time the outcomes were written."
2. Announcements- Typo
 - iii. Revise sentence to read: "M. Suchenek - Academic Senate passed a resolution last Wednesday that would instruct UCC to not approve any waivers for the American Institution requirement."
3. D. Best moved to approve minutes as amended. C. Dales seconded. M/S/P
 - iv. 1 abstention
 - v. Minutes approved with changes.

Old Business- Catalog Description

1. L. Fitzsimmons contacted all departments affected by the changes.
2. L. Fitzsimmons- The Mathematics Department approved the proposed changes to the Area B catalog description.
3. Rudy Vanterpool attended of behalf Ethnic/Gender Studies, not Philosophy, to share a perspective and concern from colleagues that the new language proposed for Area C may be restrictive.

1. Proposed additional text:

The units in Area C are distributed among Humanities, Arts (Art, Cinema, Dance, Music, Theater), Literature, Philosophy, and foreign languages. Ethnic Studies, Gender Studies, or history courses may be categorized in Area C if they emphasize artistic or humanistic perspectives.

 - i. There is concern with the wording of the second sentence and its potential restrictions on new knowledge and new course development. The concern comes from a cultural standpoint.
 - ii. The catalog description accommodates a wide variety of cultures as currently written.
4. D. Best- Understood the language to help distinguish between Areas C and D, not to be restrictive.
5. R. Vanterpool- The original/current language allows greater inclusiveness for a substantial amount of topics and areas as opposed to the proposed revision of additional language.
 1. He expressed worry about the special case for justification and potential for restrictions of how one might get a new course.
6. M. Suchenek- Does not think there are restrictions to what can be offered based on the revision.
 1. There should be freedom to explore, but GE curriculum needs a default structure to identify where different courses fall into each area.
7. R. Vanterpool - Concerned and arguing against the potential for greater restrictions than what already exists in the area. Also sees the potential for a need to justify against the norms.
 1. Clarified that the areas, not the proposed language is what may be limiting. The current language in the catalog description is preferred.
8. S. Pawar- Historically there is a distinction between the arts and the letters in Areas C1 and C2. Ethnic and women's studies are designated to the social sciences according to the EO.
9. M. Eyman- A blurring of social science and humanities cross in Areas C and D. She suggested developing a HUM 200 course with special topic sessions to address the need for ethnic diversity different sections.
10. R. Vanterpool - "May" it's not restrictive language.
11. L. Fitzsimmons - Asked if "Ethnic Studies" was included in first sentence, would that suffice?
 1. R. Vanterpool- Yes; the statement needs to be fully integrative.

12. L. Fitzsimmons – Suggested using “include” rather than “emphasize” as a possible alternative and to make the addition all one sentence.
 1. R. Vanterpool – He favors and does not object the use of “emphasize.” Suggested placing a comma after “foreign languages” and making the statement one sentence. He wants to make the statement more inclusive of the areas.
 - i. Suggested Revision: “The units in Area C are distributed among Humanities, Arts (Art, Cinema, Dance, Music, Theater), Letters (Literature, Philosophy, and foreign languages, Ethnic Studies, Gender Studies), or history courses may be categorized in Area C if they emphasize artistic or humanistic perspectives.”
13. M. Suchenek – Commented that removal of the proposed addition would eliminate “ethnic studies” and would be more restrictive.
14. R. Vanterpool – Supportive of L. Fitzsimmons’ suggested revision. He recommended removal of the period after “foreign languages” which separates the areas. He suggested adding a comma which would make the statement more inclusive.
15. D. Best- The statement does not distinguish between arts and letters.
 1. Suggested including “Letters.”
 2. Suggested revision: “The units in Area C are distributed among Humanities, Arts (Art, Cinema, Dance, Music, Theater), or Letters (Literature, Philosophy, and foreign languages, Ethnic Studies, Gender Studies, history) courses may be categorized in Area C if they emphasize artistic or humanistic perspectives.”
16. I. Heinze-Balcazar- The Department of Modern Languages has not had a chance to meet and discuss the proposed revision.
17. L. Fitzsimmons – The GE Committee is here to be inclusive. She suggested R. Vanterpool come back and discuss different rephrasing that will be more inclusive.
18. E. Magruder- Believes the EO (Executive Order No. 1065- General Education Breadth Requirements) is restrictive; should clarify that we want to get more room among the area and EO.
19. R. Vanterpool –The description remains in the spirit of the law. It should allow for reasonable elbow room but also comply with and stay within the Chancellor’s Office EO.
20. S. Pawar- Does not see anything in the language of EO 1065 that speaks against including the courses in Area C.
21. M. Suchenek – Requested to please bring it to the attention of colleagues that the phrase would be an addition to the current catalog description and will not replace the current language. He will make it a division meeting agenda item.
22. L. Fitzsimmons will email options for a revised area description and share with the committee.

23. L. Fitzsimmons moved to contact each unit and let them know that the discussion item is still on the table and invite them to discuss rephrasing as they see suitable at the next meeting. M. Suchenek seconded. M/S/P
 1. Approved

Old Business- GE Charge Updating

1. P. Krochalk- noted that there are currently 2 faculty representatives for the College of Professional Studies on the committee (School of Education and School of Health and Human Services), not only one as the current charge states.
 1. Panel Membership- Voting Members: The third bullet should be changed to say "1 Faculty member from each college/school." There should be 3 school representatives for the College of Professional Studies. The School of Nursing does not want a representative on GE at this time so the roster can be left as "vacant" for Nursing.
 2. This change mirrors the University Curriculum Committee representation from the College of Professional Studies.
2. S. Pawar- There should be a wide variety of representation on the committee, not just areas that offer GE courses.
3. L. Fitzsimmons moved to change to "five 5 non-voting members" in Overview and change to "1 Faculty member each from the Colleges/Schools. College of Arts and Humanities, Business Administration and Public Policy, Natural and Behavioral Sciences, and Professional Studies" in Panel Membership Voting Members.
4. P. Krochalk questioned if chair should be a voting member except in case of a tie; position should be held as neutral.
5. M. Suchenek suggested the committee chair should be tenured faculty.
 1. Chair should be a voting member. Removing vote from the chair would be removing representation and does not feel it is not appropriate to deny them a vote.
6. P. Krochalk moved that GE committee chair only votes in a tie.
7. L. Fitzsimmons moved to table the topic of discussion until next meeting after distribution of Robert's Rules to the committee.
8. E. Magruder requested other university committees' rule about the issue be shared as well.

New Business- Report from Attendees of the Assessment Conference:

1. Laura Talamante (History), David Sherman (English) attended the WASC assessment and GE symposium and were asked to bring back ideas to GE.

2. L. Talamante- Rather than Area assessment, many are doing GE assessment and program level assessment.
3. "Benchmarking" was a topic of discussion including how it is used with assessment and student learning outcomes. It is used as a tool to make better classes for students.
4. D. Sherman- Benchmarking puts a lot of pressure on WASC; external pressure for accountability. There will be changes about what counts as WASC assessment; syllabi and SLO's will no longer be acceptable. Peer review and student work are examples of what will need to be used for assessment.
5. L. Talamante - There is pressure of program level assessment and how to make it meet the needs of internal review, not only for WASC.
6. J. Bersi- Graduation efficiency is a high focus. There will soon be a new requirement that each institution needs to demonstrate that students are graduating with a certain level of proficiency in their degree.
 1. Core competencies include written, oral, quantitative, critical and analytical thinking, informational technology are core competency skills. These are all area part of our GE curriculum.
 2. At time of graduation, students have retained and can demonstrate these skills.
 3. D. Sherman -There is a focus on acquiring written and oral communication and critical thinking/informational technology competency.
7. J. Bersi- Templates are available for assessment reports on the University Student Learning Outcomes Assessment (USLOA) website. Reports will be done again at the end of spring.
8. S. Pawar- Emphasis on CSU assessing the breadth of GE as a program, not area by area like CSUDH has been doing.
9. L. Talamante - The History Department will go forward with the pilot of assessment. The department is part of GE.
10. D. Sherman- English is developed in assessment because of GEAR requirements. People agree to use GEAR rubric to assess writing in other classes.

Announcements:

1. Maria Corazon- Political Science student and wants to get a degree in Asian Studies, but there is not a degree offered in the area. Attended to question why there are limited courses offered in the area and asked if a degree program can be developed. As a student, she is concerned about the highly competitive job market and wants to get a competitive degree.

1. E. Magruder- The GE Committee does not determine the degrees that are offered at the university.
 2. L. Fitzsimmons - There are modules that include Asian Pacific Studies and suggested the student may want to look into that as an option. She offered to inform M. Corazon.
 3. L. Skiffer- Suggested the student look into internship/volunteer opportunities to prepare while making transfer into the workforce.
 4. L. Fitzsimmons agreed to send M. Corazon information to follow up on possible alternative options.
-
1. L. Fitzsimmons moved to table New Business topic Distance Delivery Proposal until next meeting. D. Best seconded. M/S/P
 1. Approved.

Adjourn: D. Best moved to adjourn. L. Skiffer seconded. M/S/P

Adjournment: 11:52am