Chancellor's General Education Advisory Committee
Tuesday, November 12, 2019
11:00 am – 4:00 pm
Zoom Meeting

Minutes

Attendees: Mark Van Selst, John Tarjan, Mary Ann Creadon, Eniko Csomay, Julie Glass, Gary Laver, Susan Schlievert, Stephen Stambough, Michelle Bean, Thalia Anagnos, Tyler Vaughan-Gomez, Tiffany Tran, Melissa Lavitt, Desiree Cuevas (CSSA)
Visitors: Quajuana Chapman (CSUCO)

1. The meeting began at 11:04AM

2. The minutes of September 17, 2019 were tentatively approved pending any other changes that might be recommended by Friday, November 15 (ed: no further changes were made).

3. The agenda was approved with the additional of course denials, credit for prior learning and ethnic studies as discussion items.

4. Standing reports
   a. CSU
      i. CSUCO
         1. September 1 is the deadline for removal of C-ID TMC "similar status" by campuses for the coming academic year. Up-to-date information is required for transfer students who may be applying to that campus for the coming year.
      ii. Academic Senate
         1. AB 1460 (ethnic studies)—unclear what the future might be at this point. The author may be less receptive to changes/other avenues to get to get the goals of the bill implemented without legislation and may be forging ahead with the bill. ASCSU will continue our efforts to document current campuses responses to the Ethnic Studies Task Force Report and the survey of current practices and preferences

at the campuses. There appears to be a divide between ethnic studies faculty across the CSU and other faculty about the preferred way forward. "Diversity" requirements are seen by many ethnic studies faculty as incompatible with the outcomes desired relative to ethnic studies.

    iii. CSSA
1. Nothing directly related to GE to report.
2. CSSA is likely to oppose the 4th year of quantitative reasoning a-g revision.
3. A couple of ASIs are supporting the requirement of an ethnic studies requirement for HS students (AB 331).

b. CCC
    i. ASCCC
1. Open Educational Resources Initiative—RFPs went out last year. There will be another round this year. OER texts are an emphasis of the project.
2. The Guided Pathways approach continues to be a strong focus for the system. This is a framework for students to ensure a clear path to success, ensured learning, and completion of the student's academic and career goals. A key component to this framework is the implementation of AB 705, where students are placed into transfer-level math and English courses. Like in the CSU, all students will have access to now enter into credit-bearing courses immediately after entry into a community college. AB 705 is legislation requiring alternative measures for placement (e.g., HS GPA) and that students complete transfer-level coursework within one year. Information was shared regarding support for students at lower level placement points at CCCs (tutoring, labs, co-requisite courses, supplemental instruction, etc.). On at least some campuses, students can self-place into below-transfer-level courses (given their HS academic

record). Equity gaps are persisting even as overall pass rates and progress in math and English are increasing. This is a source of ongoing concern. At the CSU, self-placement has caused more problems for students placing into advanced math courses (e.g., second semester calculus) than those beginning at lower levels of mathematics.

3. Grades at different high schools may be more or less useful for placement.
4. The Board of Governors and ASCCC is emphasizing diversification of the faculty, support for equity, and anti-racism efforts.

   ii. AOs

      1. Credit for Prior Learning is an ongoing issue (see discussion below).

5. Transfer Student Performance
   a. The CSU student success dashboard can be used to examine the progress of subgroups, including transfer students. IPADS data may also be useful.
   b. It may be interesting to look at differential performance of transfer students across CCC campuses. This is possible using the CSU student success dashboard.
6. Discussion of CLEP Spanish with Writing Exam, Recommendation viz a viz GE Breadth
   a. Concerns
      i. Has there been sufficient piloting of this test? Is what is being measured relevant?
      ii. It appears that there may be insufficient time for the writing prompt to be addressed. Timed writing tests do not really reflect the types of writing competencies in language programs.
      iii. The e-mail prompt does not seem appropriate for a writing assignment/evaluation.
      iv. The prompts do not contain directions suggesting that the student begin with planning/outlining prior to writing.
      v. The assessment questions asked of students seemed to presume the time allocated was appropriate.

3

    vi. This prompt allows significantly less time than, for example, the TOEFL.

   vii. Note: some of these concerns were addressed in a communication to the committee from the College Board.

  b. Vote—GEAC voted to accept this credit as fulfilling the CSU GE Breadth Area C2 requirement (analogous to existing CLEP Spanish).

7. CSU Campus-Based GE Assessment Practices—all carried forward to our January meeting. Mark will send a follow-up request to campuses for information on the following.

  a. GE Program Goals

  b. Perceptions of/ Design for Cohesiveness

We will also discuss other information we might want to request after reviewing the results of campus requests as of our January meeting.

8. Campus Flexibility in GE

  a. Question: Is there still flexibility in distribution of units within areas? Specified units are now maximums, not minima. The answer may be no. As long as the number of units remains the same, why wouldn't overlays, other requirements be allowed? It appears there has been some inconsistency in interpretation of EO 1100R. Transfer students will not be affected by overlays because of reciprocity and certification. Perhaps we need clarification of exactly what principles are being enforced and/or make a statement about the need to preserve campus unique learning outcomes. It appears FYE may not be allowed. Why not? Where are these rulings coming from? Why is the collective judgment of the faculty regarding student learning and development being overridden at the system level with no clear evidence that there is any positive impact on student success?

    i. Response: the CSUCO is very interested in not disadvantaging transfer students.

      ii. Anecdotes by BOT members may have provoked policy/implementation without careful consideration of advisability/appropriateness.

      iii. Faculty increasingly feel that they have lost control of the curriculum and learning outcomes.

  b. Ongoing Questions

      i. Is it permissible to incorporate FYE, diversity, other campus learning outcomes? Limits?

      ii. Can sequencing be incorporated to reinforce skills, other outcomes?

      iii. Is campus upper-division uniqueness possible?

      iv. What is the potential impact of Cal State Online? Can students bypass campus requirements?

        1. This might affect campuses' ability to do required WASC-mandated assessment in the upper-division.

  c. Is there still flexibility in distribution when the units required do not change? What are the rules? Examples of requirements not allowed were shared. Campuses have received inconsistent and contradictory advice.

  d. We will draft a set of questions to pose to CO representatives relative to flexibility.

  e. Question Topics

      i. FYS

      ii. OK for native students and transfer students to have a different experience?

      iii. UD GE uniqueness on campuses.

      iv. Additional distribution requirements within areas

      v. Overlays (diversity, etc.)

      vi. Replacing former GE requirements with a graduation requirement

9. Follow-up to Prior Actions/Requests

a. Campus responses to the GE Task Force report (now neither accepted nor rejected by the ASCSU) were requested to be submitted by October 2019.
    i. A link to the campus responses will be broadly shared by Chair Van Selst.
    ii. Committees can consider portions of the GETF Report without taking a stand on the report itself.
b. GE and International Programs—deferred.
c. Appeals of course denials by CCC campuses.
    i. The UC does not allow appeals but encourages resubmissions.
    ii. Given the ASSIST Next Gen Project, it may be appropriate for us to reconsider curricular timelines with an eye towards how we can best support student success.
    iii. We might want to differentiate between "major" and "minor" changes needed for approval. For example, updating a lab manual is much easier to do than to redesign learning outcomes.
    iv. There is some support for some type of appeal or clarification mechanism in the committee. Establishing appropriate timelines is one task that would need to be accomplished prior to a change in procedures relative to course denials to allow faculty enough time to follow-up during the review period with a revised submission.

10. New Business
    a. Ethnic Studies Update
        i. There are two parallel inquiries from the CSUCO/ASCSU (partially in response to Senator Pan's letter)
            1. Follow-up on campus responses relative to the Ethnic Studies Task Force Report
            2. Request to CSU campus senate chairs to provide responses to specific questions relative to ethnic studies/diversity.

      ii. More information will likely be forthcoming at the ASCSU plenary. Chair Van Selst will send the committee an update.

     iii. "Ethnic studies" and "diversity" are looked upon as distinct by many ethnic studies faculty.

     iv. Some feel that by not including LGBT, religious groups, etc. in this requirement, our students are not best served.

     v. Course outcomes might be broadened to include other groups.

     vi. There is a difference of opinion as to whether all 4 specified groups or only one need to be covered in the 3 units.

    vii. It is unclear to committee members how much flexibility would be allowed to campuses in meeting this proposed requirement for 3 units of ethnic studies.

    viii. Campuses might do what happens on many CCC campuses—combine ethnic studies with AI courses.

b. Credit for Prior Learning (from CCC AO report)

     i. Using prior learning as fulfilling prerequisites may be more appropriate than awarding baccalaureate credit.

     ii. The CCC BOG is interested in campuses providing increased pathways to credit, especially for veterans and adult learners for all types of programs, not just GE credit.

    iii. GEAC would welcome a tangible proposal in this regard from the CCC.

11. The meeting adjourned at 3:27pm.