

Chancellor's General Education Advisory Committee Tuesday, May 14, 2019

Anacapa Room, CSU Chancellor's Office 11:00a.m.-4:00 p.m.

GEAC Attendees (Members)

Mary Ann Creadon, Chair, ASCSU Senator, Humboldt
Mark Van Selst, Vice Chair, ASCSU Senator, San Jose
David Barsky, ASCSU Senator, San Marcos
Stetler Brown, CSSA Representative, San Diego
Bruno Giberti, Academic Affairs Administrator, San Luis Obispo[absent]
Gary Laver, ASCSU Senator, San Luis Obispo [zoom]
Virginia May, California Community College Academic Senate Representative,
Sacramento City
Alice Perez, Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, CCC Chancellor's Office [phone]
Jenni Robinson, CSU Articulation Officer, Humboldt State University
Susan Schlievert, ASCSU Senator, Fresno
John Tarjan, ASCSU Senator, Bakersfield
Tiffany Tran, CCC Articulation Officer, Irvine Valley
Cynthia Trevisan, ASCSU Senator, Maritime
Alison Wrynn, Interim Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Programs & Faculty
Development, and Interim State University Dean, Academic Programs
Darlene Yee-Melichar, ASCSU Senator, Chair Academic Affairs Committee, San
Francisco

GEAC Attendees (Guests)

Quajuana Chapman , CSU CO, Curriculum and Articulation Assistant
Marshall Thomas, CSU CO, Director of Active Duty and Veterans Affairs
Catherine Nelson, ASCSU Chair
Jim LoCasio, ASCSU Senator

1. Approval of Agenda (Mary Ann Creadon): Approved as Amended
2. Approval of Minutes of March 12, 2019 (Mary Ann Creadon): GEAC Minutes Version 6 approved (minor grammatical corrections pending)
3. Announcements and Information (Mary Ann Creadon): none
4. CCC proposed revisions to Title 5 Regulations. Sec. 55050, Credit for Prior Learning (Ginni May & Alice Perez)
 - 4.1. Joint Services Transcript (and Military Occupational Specializations, MOS) used to establish campus specific course credit and unit credit
 - 4.2. This is a first pass at what will be the process to be used with career technical education
 - 4.3. Concerns were raised that using veterans benefits may require the adoption and use of appropriate transfer units (and thus the section in the proposal that suggests student can opt out of credit may conflict with US Code of Federal Regulations (see <https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/38/3675>).

- 4.4. Discussion on 1:1 (institution to institution transfer) versus potentially problematic idea of “pass through” transfer (and a discussion on why ADT programs had to tackle this issue) – and implications on “units” to meet minimum 60 unit transfer requirements at most CSUs)
- 4.5. Discussion of possible use vis-à-vis “guided pathways” (and thus the CTE relevance)
- 4.6. Comment on APUS re: credit for prior learning vis-à-vis industry credentials.
- 4.7. Norco college is building a database to capture ACE content (which is historically how military communicates its training content) that makes both a more searchable and functional database; Additionally, the US Army is building a “course catalog” that pulls out information from their training materials to illuminate the content that might be academically appropriate.
- 4.8. It may be worthwhile for GEAC to discuss if there are broad GE-related recommendations to be considered.
5. Best Practices in Assessment
 - 5.1. Review and discussion of campus responses to GE Survey Question #4 on Assessment Best Practices, and next steps (Mary Ann Creadon)
 - 5.1.1. “what tools do you have in place that help with your GE assessment process that might be useful to others and what tools might be useful to your campus?”
 - 5.1.2. March meeting had requested a time for GE coordinators to talk – with concerns over the GE task force we elected to hold off for next year on this item.
 - 5.1.3. GE program review – do we have good exemplars of GE programs being reviewed w/ external experts (EO 1100 require regular external program review – with meaning quality integrity, etc.)
 - 5.1.4. E-portfolios
 - 5.2. What we’ve asked thus far:
 - 5.2.1. NOVEMBER “what processes or protocols work well, what evidence”
 - 5.2.2. JANUARY “assessment maps”
 - 5.2.3. MARCH “who is responsible for assessment of Upper Division GE assessment and is UDGE different from LDGE”
 - 5.2.4. MAY “what resources to share, what needed/useful?”
 - 5.3. Have the responses been shared with the campus respondents yet? → we ought to share all responses with all respondents [allow revision]
 - 5.4. White paper or other summary document? (thematic analysis)
 - 5.5. See if we have good contact information per campus (ask to post / note date of posting)
 - 5.6. Student success focus (testimonials/impact statement)
6. MC for Engineering–GE issues for discussion or advice on proposed AA resolution (Jim LoCascio) Time Certain 2:00 p.m.
 - 6.1. Concerns were raised that
 - 6.1.1. General Education element A3 (“critical thinking”) is required for some CSU engineering programs, but not all; However the TMC guarantee is admission to a campus in a similar program (e.g., maybe physics for business?);

7. Final discussion items:

7.1. Items for 2019-20 to include in annual report as prospective committee issues or work (Mary Ann Creadon)

7.1.1. Legislation

- Weber Bill (AB1460) – purportedly the logic to disregard faculty primary in the curriculum is similar to that of the CO re: EO1100R/1110 in that it is a “policy framework” not curriculum per se and thus not in conflict with faculty primacy in control of the curriculum. Hopefully this bill does not pass. GEAC would likely be instrumental in the ASCSU evaluation of whether or not the additional legislative overlay added to the CSU curriculum would be incorporated into CSU GE.

7.1.2. Further discussion of Best Practices for GE Assessment and then sharing these Best Practices with those responsible for assessing campus GE programs

- This is a continuation from prior years.
- How to share the best practices shared via responses to the assessment questions

7.1.3. In 2018-2019, GEAC might consider the intentionality of GE. To what extent do students and the faculty know the purpose or intent of GE?

- This is a carry-over item from prior years
- How to best transmit expectations for what GE should accomplish (integration, reinforcement of skills across the curriculum, reflection)
- Suggestion that scaffolding reinforces content at the upper division (maybe particularly focused on golden four?).
- Coordination and sharing of GE expectations across faculty is a hard problem that needs to be addressed. Faculty should take leadership in helping students develop a structured understanding of their GE choices.
- Most students transfer from the CCC (50+% transfer students) so intentionality has to start there.
- Use of guided pathways as an option for sense-making in GE requirements.
- Valuing (requiring? Recommending) first-year-experience seminar (including GE).

7.1.4. In the coming year, GEAC might also have a fruitful discussion regarding how the CSU GE Breadth program fits within campus missions.

- This is a carry-over item from prior years

7.1.5. Can English as Second Language courses be used to satisfy the Humanities requirement (C2) of CSU GE Breadth?

- This is a carry-over item from prior years

7.1.6. IGETC / CSU GE Guiding Notes

- These updates occur every year

7.1.7. External examinations (CPL w/ CCC colleagues)

- Credit by exam is reviewed on a near-yearly basis

7.1.8. Considerations derived from structures and organization of GE that were well described in the GE Task Force report. A comment was made that many ideas in the report are good, and should be discussed in committee.

- Skills (scaffolding)
- Knowledge (scaffolding)
- Values
- Integrative experiences
- Diversity requirement – arguments have been made that the breadth of human diversity should clearly be a specific GE requirement.
- Social justice / social responsibility

Meeting Adjourned at 3:37 PM