



**Chancellor’s General Education
Advisory Committee**

**Tuesday, October 31, 2017
Anacapa Room, CSU Chancellor’s Office
11:00-3:00**

Minutes

Present: Jodie Ullman, Jackie Escajeda, Virginia May, Laura Hope, Mark Van Selst, Susan Gubernat, Mary Ann Creadon, Paula Selvester, Catherine Nelson, Steve Filling, Tiffany Tran, Maggie McGlothlin, Chris Mallon, Alison Wrynn, Patrick O’Rourke, Barry Pasternack, Kris Roney, Denise Fleming (remote), Bill Eadie (remote).

1. Announcements

Kevin Baaske is sick. Mary Ann Creadon is acting Chair.

2. Approval of Minutes from September 12, 2017

Minutes Approved

3. Approval of Agenda

Agenda Approved

4. Chair’s Report

No Chair report

5. Business

- A. Chancellor’s Office Update (Alison Wrynn, State University Associate Dean, Academic Programs)

CO update (Wrynn):

Oct. 12, 2017—EVC LJB sent note to presidents re: EO 1100 and EO 1110 indicating the process for requesting exceptions by Nov. 15.

GEAC Membership

GEAC Membership Chair

ASCSU Senator, Los Angeles

Kevin Baaske, Chair

ASCSU Senator, Los Angeles

ASCSU Senator, Humboldt

Mary Ann Creadon, Secretary

ASCSU Senator, Humboldt

ASCSU Senator, San Diego

Bill Eadie

ASCSU Senator, San Diego

ASCSU Senator, East Bay

Susan Gubernat

ASCSU Senator, East Bay

ASCSU Senator, Fullerton

Barry Pasternack

ASCSU Senator, Fullerton

ASCSU Senator, Chico

Paula Selvester

ASCSU Senator, Chico

ASCSU Senator, San Jose

Mark Van Selst

ASCSU Senator, San Jose (Ex Officio)

ASCSU Senator, Chair Academic Affairs

Jodie Ullman (Ex Officio)

ASCSU Senator, Chair Academic Affairs

Committee, San Bernardino

California Community College Academic

Virginia May, Representative, Sacramento City

California Community College Academic

Senate Representative, Sacramento City

CSU Campus Academic Affairs

Kris Roney, Administrator, Monterey Bay

CSU Campus Academic Affairs

Administrator, Monterey Bay

CSU Articulation Officer, Long Beach

Maggie McGlothlin

CSU Articulation Officer, Long Beach

CCC Articulation Officer, Irvine Valley

Tiffany Tran

CCC Articulation Officer, Irvine Valley

Executive Vice Chancellor, CCC Chancellor's

Laura Hope

Executive Vice Chancellor, CCC Chancellor's

Office

Dean, Intersegmental Programs and Credit

Jackie Escajeda, CCC Chancellor's Office

Dean, Intersegmental Programs and Credit

Curriculum, CCC Chancellor's Office

Dean, Education Services, CCC Chancellor's

Sally Montemayor Lenz

Dean, Education Services, CCC Chancellor's

Office

Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic

Christine Mallon, Faculty Development

Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic

Programs and Faculty Development

State University Associate Dean

Alison Wrynn

State University Associate Dean

Requests must come from the campus Provost. Sonoma has been approved. Monterey Bay approved, San Bernadino has submitted.

Discussion:

The QR courses that CO approves may not be in line with the UC requirements. As the course submissions and reviews take place, it will be determined to what extent there are differences and exceptions. The UC doesn't have a definition for a quantitative reasoning course that the QR posits such as a personal finance course or Math for Humanities. The UC considers it a pilot until 2019.

Math Council met and put forward three resolutions. One requests more guidance defining the purpose and outcomes for what constitutes of a B4 course. English council has not recommended professional development for EO 1110. English Council has been moving away from language about remediation for some time now.

Academic Prep work group has been discussing the issues. Much of the discussion has focused on Math. Less conversation has taken place regarding English. It is encouraged that English colleagues share innovation. A coded memo will come out soon that has to do with the multiple measures. Early Start questions should keep coming.

- B. Consideration of External Approaches for CSU Breadth: Time Certain 1:00pm
Patrick O'Rourke Director, Active Duty and Veterans Affairs can be present to answer questions.

- (1) US DOD Defense Language Institute courses (DLI)
- (2) US DOD Defense Language Placement Test (DLPT)

Discussion:

P O'Rourke was present during the discussion. He is requesting that DLPT test scores would be given GE credit based upon the ACE (American Council of Education) guidelines.

Current practice: We have two CSU Campuses that currently grant Area C for these courses and tests (Pomona and Channel Islands). Alison had conversations with S. Perez and P. O'Rourke to discuss the degree to which written communication and culture are addressed in the courses. O'Rourke stated that ACTFL sets the standards for Foreign Language learning and these courses/tests meet the ACTFL standards. It was indicated that the Chair of the World Language Council had some concerns about writing. In the syllabi, it was reported, there were writing assignments. The misgivings were that the amount and kinds of critical cultural analysis that we often see in our diversity courses and the amount and kind of writing.

The syllabi that was reviewed last year didn't specify writing. It was reported that in the Chinese class, they would be required to write a few pages. In the Spanish course, there may be more. If GEAC recommended this, a coded memo could be written allow all the campuses to accept these (courses or placement test).

Action:

It was decided that we would consult with other campuses to determine how they came to the conclusion that they would accept the test/courses would be worthwhile in order to give the best possible advice to offer credit by exam (DLPT). We examined the DLI information sheet and came to the conclusion that we should decide what the numeric score should be accepted.

In January meeting, it was decided that GEAC would:

1. Have a Pomona Representative (and possibly Channel Islands) come to consult
2. Have S. Perez Zoom in

In order to get necessary consultation.

(3) 2016 College Board AP Computer Science request for CSU GE B4 credit

Discussion:

GEAC's criteria for a course that meets GE B4, required intermediate Algebra prerequisite. GEAC did not fully evaluate the course when it was developed because it didn't meet the baseline requirement for intermediate algebra. It was argued we go back and edit the GE Guiding notes so that they give criteria that clarified the EO 1100 language. It was asked what status should the Guiding Notes have?

If we approve the course, it would begin being accepted Fall 2018. If it gets listed on the CO chart, it will be accepted as per the active date indicated. The course was presented and discussed in last November's meeting.

A possible next step is to invite the AP Computer course presenter (P. Kerouac, College Board) back and a computer science ASCSU faculty (S. Stapanek). The concern was raised that there was not a standard by which we could determine if the course met GEAC standards. It was suggested that we could look at the AP exam. We are not debating that it is College level Computer Science. In GE Area B4, in the EO 1100 Revised, it says that computer science courses can meet QR.

Action:

Maggie and Alison will look at the course, obtain the standards, and other appropriate evidence, and determine if it meets the Guiding Notes requirement for the GE B4 standard and report findings to GEAC in January.

C. Examination of CSU campus-based GE assessment practices

A. Wrynn reported that the WASC Indicators of Educational Effectiveness (IEEI) are being collected by campuses. Campuses are reporting that they are assessing GE but all campuses need to submit information. GEAC needs to check to see if the campus GE Program itself is being assessed (not just individual courses) in order to engage in:

- (1) Identification of trends
- (2) Development of suggestions of "best practices"

It was suggested that we ask for how universities are assessing, what innovations are being employed, what has been done to respond to the assessment data found in the interim WASC reports. Mary Ann will talk to Kevin to ask him about requesting that the GE directors on each campus send their most recent interim WASC reports.

D. Review and make recommendations regarding revisions to the Guiding Notes

Discussion:

GEAC may want to consider doing a new revised GE Guiding Notes document for Fall 2018. CCC need more guidance for the prerequisites for QR. AB 705 says the CCC cannot require anything additional that the CSU requires. Elementary Algebra is stated as a prerequisite for a Math GE B4 course. Students might have to take co-requisite support or supplementary instruction if they don't have the prerequisites. Finally, it was agreed that if the students pass the GE B4 equivalent course in the CCC then they have met the standard for QR for the CSU. It was discussed that a set of outcomes could be set for each of the possible courses: Financial Literacy, Computer Science, etc.

Questions:

Assuming the Guiding Notes are useful, what should be our process for thinking about new language for them regarding B4? There still seem to be a lot of questions about what would be acceptable for a B4 course.

What are the specific questions from the CC that could be addressed? There is a lot of discussion about kinds of courses that are acceptable.

What are the options that can better fit our CC students' goals? What is the QR that advances the students' goal?

How shall we go forward in a course of action? When CC are creating courses, what are the guidelines CC could follow? Suggestion: CC should follow their Title 5 guidelines—they are in line with the CSU. If you follow Title 5, it will be acceptable. From the Guiding Notes: Students should be able to do "...Quantitative analysis, use and criticize quantitative arguments." Discussion ideas: In the future, we will have examples and can put them in the notes. Students don't have to use the Guiding Notes—Faculty experts do.

Action:

Suggestion: Look at the Guiding Notes before the March meeting and have them ready for clean up over the summer and posted in time for the CC.

6. New Business

Update on the GE Task force: Ullman reported that the Task Force met in Sacramento. Divided into groups to discuss transfer, assessments, purpose. Each group gave reports. The key will be that there is ample communication, everyone has had consultation, and input. A product is a ways off. Students, faculty, administrators, CO representatives are on the committee.