CIC Subcommittee Meeting on Cultural Groups and Women - Minutes

Wed. March 11th, 2015 2:00 pm – 4 pm, SA 2200A

Starting time: 2:05pm

Attendance:
Sara Smith
Eileen Barrett
Nicholas Bahan
Cristian Gaedicke
Michele Korb
Ying Guo
Sally Murphy (absent)

Guest: Karina Garbesi

NOTES OVERALL:
1. Eileen reviews the goals of the committee based on GE forum meetings and proposals for our guest. Reviews power point presentation presented by Eileen and Nicholas on March 9th, 2015 to the CIC GE subcommittee. (See Attached Power point).
2. Karina reviews her role: this is the time to examine the move from Q2S and the ILO’s. This is time to integrate ILOs more systematically into the GE requirements – esp. the sustainability requirements. There was a lot of interest in the CGW proposal presented on 3-9-15. Karina is formally appointed as a representative for the faculty sustainability group. This CGW proposal is this group’s priority.
3. Eileen summarizes: the CGW requirement has been around for 33 years – started when the campus was not very diverse, but there was a need to discuss race, social justice, cultural ideas (U.S. society). This CGW committee has a new call since CSUEB is one of the most diverse campuses in the U.S. The vision of general education – an excellent way for our student population to be exposed these ideas.
4. Discussion of emails circulated between the sustainability group and CGW (see attached)(March 11, 2015).
5. Karina reviews the model for courses coming from the sustainability group. She comments that we need to put more “hits” for courses to meet sustainability in the lower level GE requirements. Diversity within the majors and then “grand diversity” courses outside of the major.
6. Eileen points out that departments can require students to take courses outside of the department. Karina adds that there may be ways for students to achieve their CGW requirement within our “grid” OR within the GE requirements OR within their major OR through electives. The CGW CIC Subcommittee would have to approve any course (taught in a major) that proposes to cover any CGW requirement (social justice, sustainability and diversity).
7. These models of integrated and overlaid courses may attract more diverse faculty to CSUEB.
8. The issue of advising is an important one to consider. What do requirements look like? How easy will it be to advise students? How do we make advising clear for new students? The advising process and the visuals, grids, etc. NEED TO BE CLEAR and SIMPLE ☺
9. We are charged now with writing SLOs for the three areas (Social justice, Diversity and Multiculturalism and Sustainability).

10. We addressed some of the emails: the issue of double counting – do we allow “double counting”? We have for years – will this continue?

11. Do we need to have a more clear design of the term, “sustainability”? There may be a certain lens on what sustainability means from the perspectives of science, humanities, and social sciences. Do we leave this open for interpretations? Is this clear in the ILOs? How do these ideas overlap ideas of CGW? How do we propose and ensure intersectionality?

** Sara suggests that we create a student contest for designing logos for the three areas for CGW.

Informational: Emails from March 11, 2015 (between CGW and Sustainability subgroup)

HI All,

Thanks Karina for setting up this opportunity to meet with CGW, and for your energy and leadership. I appreciate your framing of our wish to share ideas. I would like to add two things to the model 3 based on my understanding of our discussion yesterday: 1. It would entail 3 CGW like committees, each evaluating one of the 3 themes (Social Justice and Equity, Diversity and Multiultraculturalism, Sustainability); 2. There would be no double counting - students would not be able to get credit for 2 of the 3 themes in one course).

Carl Stempel

First, these meetings need to be scheduled for a different time. Not all of us can attend a 4-5 PM meeting. Next, this is an opportunity to recalibrate, reformulate, reorganize, learn from past shortcomings, and to release those shortcomings toward embracing a new pedagogical paradigm. Unfortunately, we are resorting to standards that we know do not and have not worked with students such as those who attend CSUEB. Sustainability in the sense that I am currently reading might as well be called stagnate-ability. We will simply be maintaining the status-quo. I propose we look at a model that begins with the student at an ecological and intersectional center surrounded by several elements including community, local ecosystem, vision, empowerment, respect, relativity, and integration with ones roots. It would mean that students would have to take more than a single class, but that's what cutting edge means.

Respectfully,

Enrique

I think in principle all of us who were at the meetings agree with Enrique, and indeed have said as much (“...One class? Really? That's it?”), but the point was raised that we are severely constrained by system-wide (and statewide) requirements, as well as by the diversity of students, academic programs, and disciplines (students in high-unit majors are constrained in what they can take outside of their major). So the consensus seems to be, "One is better than zero."
Is "something is better than nothing" transformative? No. I find it hard to disagree on this point.

I hope that we can gain some traction for sustainability issues by building in enough flexibility for students to pursue sustainability-focused learning on their own, in a variety of ways (e.g., through a minor in sustainability, student groups, community engagement, etc.) Personally, I view the GE discussion as only part of the larger picture.

Mike Massey

NEXT STEPS:
1. Writing SLOs for the three areas of CGW. Each committee member should look at SLOs for Chico State, San Jose State, CSU-LA and SF State. Then at our next meeting, we will compare SLOs. Propose SLOs in each category of SJ, DM and Sus.
2. Eileen is attending Faculty Diversity Committee, Thursday March 12th, 2015
3. Nicholas will speak to Carl Stempel in sociology to follow up on ideas and clarify any misunderstandings and the idea that a “wild card” option reverses forward motion of our proposals as a CGW committee.
4. Ponder what percentage of a course must infuse CGW requirements – what are these requirements? What does this look like?

Meeting adjourned (move to adjourn Michele/ Eileen): 4:05 pm

NEXT MEETING: Wednesday April 1st, 2015, 2-4 pm (SA 2200A)