Minutes of the General Education Subcommittee  
May 11, 2015  
LI 2250  
2:00 pm – 4:00 pm

Absent:  Lawrence Bliss, Sally Murphy.  
Guests:  Lindsay McCrea, Luz Calvo, Sarah Nielsen, Jason Singley, Dave Larson, Eileen Barrett, Michael Lee, Nick Baham, Henry Gilbert, Laurie Price, Erik Helgren, Karina Garbesi, Jillian Buchholz, Lonnie Brooks, Mike Hedrick, Gale Young, Chris Moreman, ZaNean McClain, Laurie Price, Henry Gilbert, Cristian Gaedecke.

The Chair (Eagan) called the meeting to order at 2:07.

1. Approval of the agenda. (M Soules/S Glass/P). The Chair noted that Ethics was unable to appear today and would be pushed back.

2. Approval of minutes  
   a. (M Soules/S Ivey/P). April 21. Note that the meeting was convened at 8:41.  

3. Old Business.  
   a. Support of Freshman Year Experience document. Eagan left the electronic document on the home computer. She noted that the document has the current model and the prospective model on it, but the “meat” (with the specifics) to be determined later. The document currently has Area E as one units GS in both first year semesters and one unit information literacy in the second year. She said that there was language noting that the cluster issues might be no longer required if funding were to disappear, reflecting the subcommittee’s feeling expressed previously. Eagan will email the document out to subcommittee members later for approval.

   a. Discussion of overlay of proposed overlay SLOs from Cultural Groups and Women Subcommittee. Barrett presented a Powerpoint presentation. “Placing our Students First” (majority minority campus, wasn’t true 33 years ago when CGW was first created), “proposal strictly about upper division GE”, supportive of continuing areas B, C, D, “central to our SLO Proposal” (intersection and agency), used Pedagogy of the Oppressed, Bloom’s Taxonomy, Fink’s Situational Learning. Barrett argued that engaging students with themes central to their lives and experiences might attract a more diverse faculty. Baham spoke about indigenous sustainability and the importance of it. He read a statement from Enrique Salomon, who wrote about the indigenous experience. Salomon referred to the need to understand
the place of people in the larger ecological context. Young indicated that she represents FDEC, who “fully support” this proposal. Brooks noted how he embeds diversity into every course he teaches. Eagan asked whether the proposal had too many outcomes under each area and would be problematic to assess. Barrett said that two from each of “knowledge”, “skills”, and “action”. Helgren asked about the use of “US” under diversity and multicultural theme, in the context of global in the learning outcomes. Barrett noted that global is in the other two areas. Moreman noted that this proposal has serious implications about GE and have heavy implications on some departments (particularly those dependent upon GE). Baham noted that team teaching between philosophy and ethnic studies might be an option. He offered that zombies (one of Moreman’s areas) might be included under sustainability. Glass argued that the proposal would be overly complex. Price said that, under sustainability, the limitation to underrepresented groups is not inclusive and restrictive. There were responses to the effect that only two of the outcomes (not necessarily the first one that was cited as restrictive). Garbesi pointed out that the sustainability group feels that all the areas, not just two, are important.

b. Discussion of overlay of proposed overlay SLOs from Sustainability Group. Garbesi apologized for not having a handout. She talked about the Faculty Sustainability Group, who is in it and why it exists. She said that there is a mandate to integrate sustainability into the curriculum. According to Garbesi, the sustainability ILO has not been implemented. Garbesi advocated for numerous outcomes under knowledge, skills, and action, and noted that all would be expected to be met (contrasting that to the CGW proposal). She argued that the addition of certain groups in the sustainability outcomes “effectively restrict[s] all university approved sustainability coursework [...] violates international and academic norms on sustainability[...].” The CGW add-on to outcome 2 under knowledge “offer[s] but one lens on this issue.” She said that this approach is too limiting. She argued that the addition of the specific groups under skills and action takes focus away from sustainability knowledge. “Calling out certain populations and ignoring the needs of others contradicts the very principles of sustainable development.” In the sustainability model, the group calls upon the subcommittee to recommend one upper division and one lower division (for “native” students). It could be an overlay or a GE course. The argument to allow use in the major is that it integrates sustainability more deeply into the curriculum and increases depth. Another is to retain the traditional broad diversity of topics in GE. Ivey noted that the last sustainability knowledge theme (prominent existing and emerging strategies...) makes it so that History courses could not meet this outcome. Baham argued that the exclusion by inclusion is a false argument. Soules advocated for a practical solution
to the issue of the differences between CGW and sustainability. Calvo noted again that the two of the five outcomes are required. Calvo said that she feels that the CGW proposal is better aimed at the CSUEB student body. Hallab indicated that he had some agreement with the sustainability group because, in tourism, the limitations placed are problematic and restrictive. Moreman said he liked the “decoupling” from GE. Moreman suggested revisiting the list of cultural group. Baham commented that there were a few comments saying “I value this, but I can’t teach it.” He then pondered “Why aren’t we teaching what we value?” Soules noted that, in the CGW add-ons, avoiding the use of the first two is restrictive. Gilbert noted that there are poor white males living in the river valleys whose pollution goes to the Bay.

c. Ethics ILO. Postponed to a future meeting during the agenda approval.

d. GE meetings. CIC meets on the 18th. The subcommittee meets on the 19th (Eagan will not be able to attend). It will meet on the morning of the 26th (the day after Memorial Day). June 1 is available for an additional meeting after the CIC organizational meeting, in lieu of meeting on the second. Watnik asked whether subcommittee members would be willing to serve next year. All but Ivey and Eagan indicated that they could and would continue if appointed.

5. Adjournment. The chair declared the meeting adjourned at 4:00 PM due to time.

Respectfully submitted,
Mitchell Watnik, subcommittee secretary