

## General Education Advisory Committee

January 15, 2019 Meeting

Anacapa Room, CSU Chancellor's Office

### Minutes

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Mary Ann Creadon (ASCSU, Chair), Mark Van Selst (ASCSU, Vice Chair), David Barsky (ASCSU), Susan Schlievery (ASCSU), John Tarjan (ASCSU), Cynthia Trevisan (ASCSU), Darlene Yee-Melichar (ASCSU), Virginia “Ginny” May (CCC Academic Senate), Tiffany Tran (CCC Articulation Officer), Stetler Brown (ASCSU), Gary Laver (ASCSU) [via Zoom], Jenni Robinson (CSU Articulation Officer) [via Zoom], Bruno Gilberti (CSU Campus Academic Affairs Administrator) [via Zoom]

**MEMBERS ABSENT** (meeting conflicts): Alison Wrynn (CSU CO, Interim Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Programs and Faculty Development and Interim State University Dean, Academic Programs), Alice Perez (CCC CO, Vice President for Academic Affairs)

**GUESTS:** Catherine Nelson (ASCSU, Senate Chair), Jason Sexton (CSU CO, Interim State University Associate Dean, Academic Programs), Jodie Ullman (ASCSU)

1. Approval of Agenda (M/S/P)
2. Approval of Minutes of Nov. 6, 2018 (M/S/P) (no changes)
3. Announcements and Information
  - Updates from the chair
    - Unclear if the next meeting will be zoom or in person (preference for an in person meeting)
    - Communications to the Chancellor:
      1. Recommendations from GEAC re: CSU GE Guiding Notes (publish)
      2. Recommendation from GEAC re: *systemwide credit for external examinations* that there be a change to minimum units awarded for the AP World History (reduced to 3 units)
    - No formal memo has been received yet, but Chair Creadon has been informed that both of these GEAC recommendations will be accepted.
4. Improving Visibility, Understanding, and Assessment of GE: Review and discussion of GE maps submitted by campuses (Creadon)
  - All resources/materials received from the request for campus curriculum maps for GE are now in Dropbox; this includes materials received as a result of a reminder call (nudge) last week.
  - Interim AVC Wrynn will be commissioning a website on which the “Best Practices” can be posted

- ... but what do we mean by ‘best practices,’ who gets to decide whether a practice is best, and how is that decision made.
- It was noted that the GEAC-led project of collecting assessment information is taking place while there is concern (and some anxiety) about both a change to a more “compliance mindset” than historically true and in the context of potential upcoming GE Task Force recommendations that may well impact GE programs.
  - Regardless of the contextual concerns, both accreditation and other normal campus processes will continue to drive the need for assessment. In particular, it was noted that all campuses will need to do assessment in the five core competencies (WSCUC), and the system has a role in assisting to increase the likelihood of meaningful assessment products.
- Information dissemination and sharing is important, and the website will promote this. We should continue collecting the plans from the campuses that haven’t yet shared theirs. Perhaps, when this is reported at the Plenary, the delegations from the campuses that have not yet sent their materials should be notified of this and their assistance solicited.
- GEAC members do not perceive any of the plans as something that couldn’t be posted. Of course, there are difference between campuses and so some models may turn out to be more useful for a particular campus than others.
- Once a full complement of plans is obtained and posted, will GEAC be responsible for regularly putting out calls to campuses to update their material on the website?
  - No, this should be a staff function; GEAC should still ‘keep track’ of what’s on the website, but it won’t manage the website.
- Concern was expressed that this might be a first (or additional) step toward standardizing GE across the entire system.
- What is the goal? If the concern is that not all campuses are doing GE Assessment and this is supposed to help them do it, then maybe there are better ways to help campuses, e.g., WASC ARC, ITL, and bringing together GE Program Directors and GE Assessment Directors (like a disciplinary council). Campuses that are trying to build their own assessment capacity need experts with whom they can consult more than a static website showing what other campuses are doing.
  - GEAC should advocate for structures that will allow GE Program Directors and GE Assessment Directors to come together, share ideas and forge networks.
- Dr. Yee-Melichar will follow up with Dr. Magruder regarding a potential GE focus to the ITL Summer Academy focused [e.g., on GE Assessment].
- GEAC should continue asking for GE maps; we already have about half of these and this information will be useful to compare how campuses conceptualize GE; it will also serve an archival purpose.
- What should GEAC ask campuses about next? After discussion, GEAC arrives at:
  - Who is responsible for assessing UDGE? For example, is it done at the level of the departments offering the courses? Is it done at the level of the three different GE Areas? Is it done at the level of the entire GE Program? Is it done is some other way?

## 5. GE Task Force Report (Ullman)

- An overview of the current thinking and direction of the GE task force report were provided. The presentation focused on a theoretical structure in which a revision to the CSU GE curriculum could be formulated (see **UPDATE** below).
- Concerns were expressed, particular comments addressed
  - Support for the necessary function and role of upper division GE
  - The need for any first year experience to yield intentionality and direction (vs. more of a formulaic degree planning exercise)
  - “the devil is in the details” – a model largely following current GE structures could provide a modern dynamic GE program if allowed to do so; similarly, a “system-driven” package with the types of restrictions now being promulgated re: EO1100 (Aug 2017 revision) could provide a poor fit to campus priorities.
    1. Campus-specific GE variations are good – with the caveat that transfer of courses at the lower division should follow within the respective category at the home institution.
  - Upper division GE should be the domain of the students matriculated campus (online offerings elsewhere could otherwise gut an otherwise promising and integrative high-quality GE implementation)
  - GE-fatigue following the continued repercussions of EO 1100 (revision of Aug 2017).
  - A historical note that the “unit issues” that were the original indirect cause of the Board of Trustees 120-unit limit (and supposed allowable variation) were generated by a previous BoT agenda item attempting to remove UDGE (ostensibly to speed time to degree).
  - **UPDATE:** the final GE Task Force Report is available (FEB 13, 2019): [http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Reports/GE Task Force Final Report 2019.pdf](http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Reports/GE%20Task%20Force%20Final%20Report%202019.pdf)

## 6. ASCCC Resolution 15.02 (May) “Approval and Backdating of CSU Area C2 and IGETC Area 3B Submissions of Advanced ESL Coursework for Fall 2018”

- Legislative Council Digest for AB 705 ([https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill\\_id=201720180AB705](https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180AB705)) includes

The bill would prohibit a community college district or college from requiring students to enroll in remedial English or mathematics coursework that lengthens their time to complete a degree unless placement research that includes consideration of high school grade point average and coursework shows that those students are highly unlikely to succeed in transfer-level coursework in English and mathematics. The bill would authorize a community college district or college to require students to enroll in additional concurrent support, including additional language support for ESL students, during the same semester that they take the transfer-level English or mathematics course, but only if it is determined that the support will increase their likelihood of passing the transfer-level English or mathematics course.

- for those ESL courses conforming to the GE guidelines that were approved as submitted during the SPRING 2019 cycle, the GE approval will be backdated to

FALL 2018. This is a one-time process and it is not expected that any such backdating would be approved for any future submissions.

#### 7. Discussion Item: Campus flexibility in Achieving GE Breadth (Tarjan)

- Historic data: Students do not see relevance of GE curriculum
- GETF interim report cites desirability of:
  - a coherent, consistent, and understandable program
    1. easy to navigate
    2. quality learning outcomes
    3. relevance → student success
    4. student confidence/empowerment
  - alignment with CCC transfer
  - clear assessable learning outcomes
  - campus autonomy without harming transfer
  - appropriate balance of units vs. outcomes
- Quality Educational experiences:
  - High impact practices
  - Multi-disciplinary perspectives
  - Student-centered and faculty-centered interactions
  - Faculty creativity, buy-in, energy
  - Student curiosity & joy of learning
- Bakersfield model
  - Appears to target all of above
    1. Relevance: reinforcement of foundational skills through the curriculum
    2. Intentionality: through student reflection, planning (First year seminar, Junior year directed reflection, GE capstone)
    3. Coherence: via themes (introduced during freshman year, thematic minors)
- A Discussion of what changed in EO 1100 (AUG 2017 revision)
  - Unrestricted Upper Division Reciprocity across CSU Campuses
  - Deletion of LEAP outcomes as required (mainly symbolic)
  - Units deemed maxima rather than minima
  - Mandatory double-counting within GE
  - Explication of unit distribution within areas
- Related Questions
  - How can programs best address GE outcomes while still promoting appropriate progress to degree?
  - How can GEAC and system level initiatives help campuses to achieve their outcomes?
  - What should GEAC and system NOT do so as to not interfere with campuses ability to achieve desirable outcomes?

#### 8. Discussion Item: Upper division GE reciprocity (Creadon)

- See commentary above re: item 4 (assessment of GE) and item 7 (Campus Flexibility)
- Blanket UDGE reciprocity could undermine the autonomy of campus GE programs and prevent them from requiring a signature experience or other campus-specific elements.
- While reciprocity may make sense in special cases, it could also be subject to widespread abuse, especially with students taking online courses in order to avoid some aspect of a campus GE program.
- UDGE can serve as effective campus-based inculcation of values and perspectives, it can also be a magnet for FTES; as such, campuses should take the role of UDGE programming seriously.
- It is clear that the EO 1100 (Aug 2017) revision & subsequent interpretations are producing consequences that the campuses are finding to be deeply problematic re: yielding coherent campus GE programs (might it be the case that campus-specific interpretations were applied to the system without appreciating the larger impacts?)

9. New business. None

- UPDATE (Jan 16, 2019): As an update to the recommendation that GEAC is recommending that the CSU invest in building community in the area of GE Assessment (and that ITL had already been contacted), EVC Blanchard encouraged the use of webinars as another venue for exchanging information and building assessment capacity.

10. Adjournment (M/S/P) 3:43pm