

Minutes

December 13, 2018

11:04am-12:56pm

Academic Affairs Conference Room (Steve 1040)

Attendees: Jenn Lillig, Kaitlin Springmier, Chiara Bacigalupa, Luisa Grossi, Katie Musick, Karen Moranski, Melinda Milligan, Christina Baker-Foley, Emily Asencio, Michael Visser (proxy for Kathryn Chang), Breana Archie

11:04am Call the order

Agenda approved

Minutes approved

Old Business Items

EDUC Tesol Discontinuance

Jenn Lillig (JL) received email for SRJC and graduate studies committee.

Motion (MM) Approve item to get it on the Senate agenda. Michael Visser (MV) added that this be accompanied by a second request for feedback from grad studies.

Second (MM)

No discussion.

JL will send email directly to grad studies.

Motion Passed TESOL discontinuance recommended with additional words from grad studies.

GE Curriculum

JL clarified procedural details.

Committee can vote with assumption that if we want to revisit earlier curriculum, we can. There would be a meta vote on curriculum after 2nd reading. Committee agreed to voting terms.

Committee agreed to mini votes.

Anyone can ask for a secret vote during the process.

Be concise; not repetitive

Speaker's list will be prioritized

Motions shall be made by voting committee members, require a second, and discussion.

Vote will take place at the end of motion.

GERS DEF Docs for epc v3 2nd reading

General comments/items addressed:

Prop. state of purpose of goals:

Inconsistencies existed as to whether overlays included within this document as a whole are part of GE or not. Now, the whole document refers to overlays as GE requirements and is, therefore, consistent. If committee is unsure, overlays will be dealt with separately later.

Questions/comments:

- From Sustainability, Modern languages, and A&H
- The role of community engagement is in question
- Perhaps too many and complex learning outcomes

Specific Motions/Items Addressed

Motion (JL): In the LO's, change Natural and Physical Sciences to Life and Physical Sciences

Second Chiara Bacigalupa (CB)

Discussion:

MV: Clarified that this is Industry standard language

Motion passed

(JL: Reminded us that this language only appears once in document)

Motion (CB): In GELO for diverse cultural competencies, change the wording "different identities" to "diverse identities"

Second Kaitlin Springmier (KS)

Discussion: None

Motion Passed

Feedback from groups folder:

SEC request for language modifications, for example the LO's on pg 21

Motion (MM): Take the SEC definition of sustainability learning outcomes, but include past and present.

Second CB

Discussion:

- LO's did not account for history enough. To call out the past to make this more obvious.
- Why not future in there? Can't explore future. Future is implied in the latter part of outcome.
- Should "create and find" be added to language? Is there a difference between the two?

Motion Passed

Recommendation for change:

Motion (TW): Replace diverse cultural competencies and add “Locally, nationally, and globally” (also fixing the grammar)

Second MV

Discussion:

- GERS feels there is national need for diversity
- Does addressing each of these require too much for a 3 unit course? If including globally, can we this include the language “recommend” or “instead of”?
- Language seems repetitive. Should the language include aspects of our US cultures some competencies specific to the US?
- MM supports last two comments
- Concern expressed that there is a sense that our nation is separate from the global and that international awareness and competence are not the same
- Comment was also made that global awareness acknowledges culture; to add global to this unnecessary.

Motion Not passed.

JL: With motions that have passed with slight variations; all in favor of supporting mission statement and purpose and general learning outcomes now:

Yes.

Some of the sustainability issues/suggestions still in play.

Definition of a GE Course

Will there be a general impact on Hutchins?

Concrete definitions of unit requirements for 1C (no feedback)

Different language for professional development workshop (recommended or required?)

- CB: GERS clear that they wanted professional development to be required.

Motion (JL): Professional development be required, rather than recommended

Second KS

Discussion:

- GE is becoming a campus-wide investment that will be assessed and modified. Asking people to take 1 hour workshop so they know how they will contribute is important and helps in their overall preparation and building of community
- Lecturers will be paid to attend.

- Discussed the upfront workload vs continuing workload. Upfront: One hour lecture, changes to a syllabus to make sure courses meet requirem LO's, and possible changes to assignments, especially the one that we are offering that can turn into the signature assignment. The workshop can help faculty make those changes; they can bring their syllabus. Ongoing will be the assessment and turning in your student work products. Some faculty will be on a faculty learning community to do that assessment and analyze results.
- Goal of the assessment plan will be to assess aggregated student learning. Help us understand what students know. General outcomes
- Consider that junior and mid-year faculty feel there are too many meetings. Should we add one hour to the language?
- Can we video or audio record the workshop?

Motion Passed

Off the list:

Motion (KS): Remove references to GE Assessment committee from E and A of #2

Second (JL)

Vote Passed:

Motion (MM): In 1C reverse by putting the standards first and then availability of seats (flip the two issues). (In the language about exceptions to 3 unit courses)

Second (KS)

Discussion:

- Is there an implication? Will we be more strict on one versus the other?
- This would emphasize the process.
- Measurement of standards of the CSU and nationwide practices

Motion Passed (with and)

Follow-Up Questions:

- What defines the exceptions? Will come back to this later. Do we want to make those exceptions to the 3 unit requirement of 1C. In policy or process document?
- Implementation is part of what EPC needs to pass. Process has to be approved as part of the EPC approval process.
- We will revisit.

CB-F: 1A sentence 2: come back to that later. Wordsmith 1A

KS: in a lot of bulleted policies “All GE courses must meet” repeated. Wordsmith

--

CB-F: 1A Overlays must meet as least one GELO (come back)

--

Upper Division GE Courses

What defines upper division course?

Prerequisites discussed.

Pre-reqs: Golden 4, completion of lower division in that area, and 45 units. Definition of prerequisite:

- Only Golden 4
- People can have whatever prereqs they want
- Upper division have the golden 4 and 1 prereq in that area (instead of all)

Issues raised:

- If there are no prereqs, how do we know the difference between upper and lower
- GERS felt that GE courses should not have prereq because they then are less of a GE in that courses are not open to everyone and they lose exploratory flavor to them
- Will requiring a lower in the same area this create bottlenecks for students?

Motion (KS): UD GE prereqs “may” include LD prereqs instead of “must include” in that area.

Second (JL)

Discussion:

- Upper division is about depth, rather than survey. Supports this motion and want to give clarity.
- What about requiring a series of prereqs? 1 prereq vs. many? Does the series need to be clarified?
- Clarification about overlay. III. should add “upper division” before overlay courses.
- Do overlay courses belong here? Should they be 300 level courses? Does this apply to overlays? (Come back to that.
- This motion only for B,C, D, UD
- EO specifies that LD be specific to discipline; UD is integrative. One needs to finish basics before try to put things together
- Katie Musick (KM): Bottleneck implications for transfer because they may have completed LD but not in subareas that are coming over. Either one we pass will have implications for transfers, potentially delaying graduations because they may have to take another LD sub areas
- Upper division require higher level thinking, not that have to do with prereqs.
- Katie Musick (KM): Important that we remember that EO 1100 is talking about 60 plus model. Intent is that students should have completed 60 units and golden 4 before taking UD GE. Also, campuses may develop policies less than 60. GERS wants to add

flexibility for students. Freshmen who can't get into a major may have completed GE but may not be able to take much yet because they are not yet majors. Some students get stuck. That's the 45 units and the golden 4. Prescription on prereq in the area is about preparation for UD. KM and Luisa Grossi (LG): impact in requiring all courses in BCD LD may not allow transfers to take UD. Is there a happy medium where second semester sophomores can take some upper division courses? Multiple populations of students need to be served.

- JL: Hard to be integrative when have not completed LD, but she would like to air on side of inclusivity and progress; when we assess learning outcomes, if we are not doing well this could mean that they are not doing well in integrating enough. Perhaps we have to put in LD prereqs. Not know how to fix part about Gen Chem I then Gen Chem II, etc.
- Is this a giant problem? Or small?
- Should be looked at from a discipline-specific view.
- If a person came in and took something other than astronomy, then they need to take another LD if want to change. Also, what do you do with student who has taken 45 units? There are other GE options.
- PhD lecturers appreciate being able to teach upper division GE. The ability to go into depth is special and not always feasible at the JC.

Motion Amendment (JL): Amend motion to say UD prerequisites should include prerequisites in that area, however, they may not result in lower division pre reqs that are taken in series.

Second Breana Archie (BA)

Discussion

- WIC course in area D: Concern that this will impinge on ability to offer this depth and meaning of course. Is this a real problem?
- Area B is a new area. Would like a lot of options in B so students are excited and want to take courses. How do we get to that place? Nervous about prereqs in area B.
- KM: One problem with current program is UD courses are major courses. Multiple prereqs attached to them. No distinction between major and upper division GE. GERS trying to solve this with definition of LD and UD GE. Hundreds of courses that are major courses that are inviting people with multiple backgrounds to explore in more depth. Contradiction is that it needs to have more depth but must be open so people are excited to take. Doesn't mean can't have any prereqs, but if 3-4, this is a major course, not a GE.
- Allow flexibility is spirit of the original motion. Everyone is on the same page in that we are just not allowing prereqs to get out of control.

JL: Summary: Difference to amendments specifies not in series and language can get tightened up at later date. Does anyone have anything new to offer?

Vote on amendments: No (3-7)

Vote on original motion:

- If all LD not required before ud, how will there be an integrative element to class?
- Add in needing a reason to have more than 1 or 2 prereqs in implementation documents rather than policy to avoid inflexibility.

- Integrative: what does it mean? Can be in sense that WIC course integrate writing skills. Tie to C4 descriptive lower division, numerical reasoning integrating
- How does wording change?
- To do upper div D must take all lower division D. Change to: in order to take UD D, not required to have LD, but rather with discretion of instructor. Moves prereqs into the hands of the instructor.
- Some felt language sounds more restrictive with the amendment. Given that info, this may be more limiting or more freeing. Not worded as best it could.
- When we move to implementation should we require faculty to provide more explanation when requiring additional prereqs.
- Will the language of the implementation be clear for the students?
- Just changes "requiring" to "may" in 3C.

Motion (MV): Table discussion.

Second (JL)

Motion to table discussion Passed

JL: did not hear committee fully supporting inclusion of all LD prereqs for upper.

MM: Undecided

TW: For requiring.

JL: Trying to get to spirit of loosening up prereqs to help enrollment, but didn't quite get there.

How would we motion that next time?

JL will clean up the motions.

Adjourned: 12:56pm

Respectfully submitted by Jenny Bent