

## Minutes: May IMPAC Statewide meeting (LAX)

### **Attendees (expected)**

Edman, Jeanne	Faculty	Cosumnes River College	<a href="mailto:edmanj@crc.losrios.edu">edmanj@crc.losrios.edu</a>
Haddad, Lubna	Faculty	Allan Hancock College	<a href="mailto:lhaddad@hancockcollege.edu">lhaddad@hancockcollege.edu</a>
Kelley, Robert	Faculty	MiraCosta College	<a href="mailto:rkelley@miracosta.edu">rkelley@miracosta.edu</a>
Mazeika, Edward	Faculty	Los Angeles Pierce College	<a href="mailto:mazeiker@piercecollege.edu">mazeiker@piercecollege.edu</a>
McCabe, Laurel	Chair	Sonoma State (CSU)	<a href="mailto:laurel.mccabe@sonoma.edu">laurel.mccabe@sonoma.edu</a>
McCormick, Marcia	Faculty	American River College	<a href="mailto:mccorm@arc.losrios.edu">mccorm@arc.losrios.edu</a>
McPatchell, David	Professor	Compton College	<a href="mailto:mcpatchell@compton.edu">mcpatchell@compton.edu</a>
Narrie, Estela	Articulation	Santa Monica College	<a href="mailto:narrie_estela@smc.edu">narrie_estela@smc.edu</a>
Price, Paul	Assoc.Prof.	Fresno State (CSU)	<a href="mailto:paulpri@csufresno.edu">paulpri@csufresno.edu</a>
Rezec, Amira	Chair	Saddleback College	<a href="mailto:arezec@saddleback.edu">arezec@saddleback.edu</a>
Ulloa, Emilio	Faculty	San Diego State (CSU)	<a href="mailto:eulloa@sciences.sdsu.edu">eulloa@sciences.sdsu.edu</a>
Van Selst, Mark	Lead Faculty	San Jose State University	<a href="mailto:mvselst@sjsu.edu">mvselst@sjsu.edu</a>
Williams, Herkie Lee	Faculty	Compton College	<a href="mailto:williams_h@compton.edu">williams_h@compton.edu</a>

### **Overview**

- 1) Review of prior minutes from 2005/06 (as posted on the IMPAC website)
- 2) Overview and update of PSYCHOLOGY LDTP process
- 3) Given the status of LDTP (course descriptor approval phase), it was elected not to specifically examine any particular descriptors although the descriptors were discussed in general terms.

There are a large number of curricular initiatives that were “in play” during the 2005/2006 academic year. The statewide [IMPAC](#) meeting provides a mechanism through which faculty can achieve a bigger picture understanding of the curricular processes underway and the ways in which they can contribute to them.

At this point, the work of IMPAC can be seen as being “largely complete” vis-à-vis Psychology course descriptors. We have a set of descriptors (Introductory Psychology, Introductory Statistics for Psychology, Research Methods for Psychology, and Biological Psychology) that have been widely vetted and which have received broad support. The only one of the descriptors to be (thus far) used as the basis for an LDTP course was the Introductory Psychology descriptor. This descriptor was forwarded to the Descriptor Writing Group to the CSU Department Chairs list for comment. The ensuing discussion led to a dramatic reduction in the number of objectives and a slight reduction in the specificity of the content. It was decided that the objectives would have to all be present, but in some cases the wording of the objective allows some flexibility. The descriptor currently being voted on by the CSU Psychology departments is appended. The second descriptor currently being voted on by the CSU Psychology departments is for Introductory Statistics for Psychology. For a variety of procedural reasons, that descriptor did not follow the version vetted previously through the IMPAC process. At a discussion amongst the chairs and their representatives at the April meeting of the Western Psychological Association (and on the email list), it seems that the common response to the proposed descriptor is to either approve or disapprove of the descriptor but to invariably indicate that the most recent CAN descriptor is superior.

We also discussed the current status of the CCC numbering system (somewhat analogous to the old CAN system, but CCC controlled and with the details still being worked out – awaiting any movement on development until funding is secured), the Transfer CSU (TCSU) numbering system used for the LDTP process (again, somewhat analogous to the old CAN system, but CSU controlled with the descriptors more fleshed out -- learning objectives, outcomes and required activities could all be included within a descriptor), and the UC major preparation initiative (too early for any level of discussion).

We had an excellent discussion on the fact that existing articulation agreements would remain in effect on the campuses and that a likely future use of TCSU numbers would be to guide articulation agreements.

The renewed push to develop assessment metrics, the CSU LDTP process, and the UC major preparation initiative have converged to produce a demand on the faculty to take a system-wide view of curricular objectives and, in some cases, to explicitly develop course and major-specific objectives. We had an extensive discussion on the virtues, costs, and constraints of such curricular alignment both within and across institutions. The general feeling was that there needed to be explicit room for individual variation. Some attendees were shocked to discover mandated text use (or mandated selection from a sub-set) at some campuses for some courses.

A discussion on AB 2168 (Liu) mandating a common core GE curriculum to replace IGETC and CSU Breadth revealed a number of major concerns with the bill beyond simply the issue of UC non-compliance. Restricting access to transfer seems contrary to the stated intent of the bill. Elimination of IMPAC funding and then requesting that the UC, CSU, and CCC work together to resolve what sacrifices could be made in serving the needs of their students in order to accommodate AB 2168 also seems counter-productive. The discussion of lowest-common denominator versus best preparation was revisited. Our experience with the LDTP process would seem to suggest a trend toward the lowest-common denominator. Our experience with IGETC (not accepted at two of the UC campuses) suggests that UC will “hold the line” for their statewide package rather than endorsing elements of CSU breadth. This is not seen as an effective route to meet the needs of the students in the CSU, especially those more likely to have communication difficulties and/or be generally less well prepared for college-level study.

This discussion was followed by a substantial discussion on workload requirements that will unfold from recently enforced requirements for accommodation/access to materials in alternate formats (e.g., as produced by the CSU center for alternative media). Disability accommodation, among other things, means timely access to alternate forms and to ensure that the material provided is in a format appropriate for use (e.g., web-pages need picture descriptions rather than just the pictures themselves). It is unclear where the additional resources required by staff or faculty for training and execution are expected to come from. Given the higher proportion of accommodation-requiring students in the social sciences, this is a particular worry for our discipline.

A discussion of concerns over online and technology-mediated learning revealed continued deep concerns over both ownership and quality. The ownership issue covered both intellectual property and concerns over the system by which one segment could require a flag (e.g., indicating whether the content might be offered online) prior to considering further articulations. The quality issue touches on the perceived and often-realized lower quality of education delivered via the technology mediated format. Hybrid courses were discussed as a promising mechanism of ensuring both quality and honesty in exam taking. Research supervision (ethics) and going through the research development process (being allowed to make mistakes) were both cited as reasons that, unless strongly contra-indicated by identifiable interventions, we should be very cautious about offering or accepting online methods courses for university level credit.

A discussion of the use of undergraduate teaching assistantships, while excellent, left unresolved the issue of whether or not one undergraduate could grade another undergraduate's coursework. It was generally seen as undesirable and also as potentially illegal. Use of undergraduates as discussion leads, etc. was considered appropriate and desirable.

---

Statewide LDTP agreement: <http://www.calstate.edu/AcadAff/docs/Psychology-FIN.pdf>

**Psychology**  
**LOWER DIVISION TRANSFER PATTERN**  
**California State University (CSU) Statewide Pattern**

The Lower Division Transfer Pattern (LDTP) consists of the CSU statewide pattern of coursework outlined below, plus campus-specific coursework, bringing the total pattern to at least 60 but no more than 70 transferable semester units for students to complete at a California Community College (CCC).

The CSU statewide pattern of coursework for CCC students who plan to major in Psychology at any CSU campus offering the major includes:

Completion of lower division general education requirements, following either the CSU General Education Breadth (GE-Breadth) or the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) pattern except GE-Breadth Area E;

- Completion of the CSU graduation requirements in United States History, Constitution and American Ideals; and
- Completion of additional semester units as specified in (4) below. Campus-specific coursework for this LDTP including requirements to meet GE-Breadth Area E will be provided by fall 2005.

**(1) Complete lower division general education requirements.**

Obtain a certification of completion of GE-Breadth or IGETC by the California Community College before transferring to a CSU campus.

While completing general education, follow the course pattern stated below.

**39 units for  
GE-Breadth**

Minimum grades of C are required in courses used to meet GE-Breadth Areas A and B4.

**or**

**37 units for IGETC**

Minimum grade of C is required in each course used for IGETC.

**(2) Complete the graduation requirements in United States History, Constitution and American Ideals.**

These are typically completed with one course each in American government and American history, or a sequence of courses that integrate the history and government topics.

Students completing GE-Breadth should ordinarily use these courses to satisfy 6 units of Area D.

**0 units required for  
GE-Breadth**

**6 units for IGETC**

IGETC does not permit double counting of courses to meet IGETC and U.S. History, Constitution and American Ideals requirements.

(3) Complete **Introduction to Psychology** [CAN PSY 2\*].

This course should be used to meet GE-Breadth Area D9 or IGETC Area 4I.

**0 units**

**(4) Complete one or more courses from the list below to bring total to 45 transferable semester units:**

- • • **A second transferable course in English composition**

**Psychological Statistics** [CAN PSY 6\*]

**Any other transferable course(s)**

**2-6 units**

**Total Semester Units Required for Statewide  
LDTP Pattern**

**45 Units**

\* Course descriptor to be expanded.

CCC courses that fulfill general education and graduation requirements in United States History, Constitution and American Ideals are listed at [www.assist.org](http://www.assist.org).

## **Current Introductory Psychology Descriptor being voted on by CSU Psychology Departments for approval**

### INTRODUCTORY PSYCHOLOGY

Replaces: CAN PSY 2

Recommended Preparation: NONE

Required Prerequisites: NONE

Minimum Unit Requirement: 3 Semester Units (4 quarter units acceptable)

#### Description:

Psychology is the scientific study of behavior and mental processes. The content of the course focuses on the exploration of major theories and concepts, methods, and research findings in Psychology. Topics covered in the course include the biological bases of behavior; ethics; perception; cognition; learning; memory; emotion and motivation; development; personality and social psychology; psychological disorders and therapies; and applied psychology.

#### Required Topical Coverage

1. Exploration of major theories and concepts, methods, and research findings in Psychology.
2. Research Methods, including the scientific approach, data collection procedures, the use of descriptive and inferential statistics, and qualitative approaches.
3. Major fields in Psychology including but not limited to: the biological bases of behavior; ethics; perception; cognition; learning; memory; emotion and motivation; development; personality and social psychology; psychological disorders; therapeutic approaches; and applied psychology.

#### Measurable Learning Outcomes

- 1) Demonstrate familiarity with the major concepts, theoretical perspectives, research methods, core empirical findings, and historic trends in psychology (e.g., the history of intelligence testing).
  - a) Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the major theoretical perspectives of psychology (e.g., behavioral, biological, cognitive, evolutionary, humanistic, psychodynamic and socio-cultural) and demonstrate basic understanding of their relative strengths and weaknesses;
  - b) Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the following nine general domains of Psychology (1) biological bases of behavior and mental processes, (2) sensation and perception, (3) learning and memory (4) cognition, consciousness, (5) individual differences, psychometrics, personality, (6) social processes (including those related to socio-cultural and international dimensions), (7) developmental changes in behavior and mental processes that occur across the lifespan, (8) psychological disorders, and (9) emotion, motivation
  - c) Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the ways in which psychology differs from other disciplines.
  - d) Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of some of the areas in which psychology is applied in diverse personal, social, and organizational arenas and, and some of the ways psychology can inform efforts toward self-management and self-improvement. (e.g., clinical, counseling, forensic, community, organizational, school, health);
  - e) Recognize connections between empirical research findings and theory in psychology;
  - f) Demonstrate basic understanding of the scientific method and of how critical thinking skills in psychology can be used to evaluate public discourse.
- 2) Recognize reasons why it is important to understand the impact of race, ethnicity, culture, gender, socioeconomic status, disability, sexual orientation and other diverse factors on psychological theory and research.
- 3) Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the ways in which ethical principles are embodied in psychological research and practice.