

**Chancellor's General Education Advisory Committee
YEAR-END REPORT**

MEMBERSHIP

Chair

Mark Van Selst	Psychology	San José
----------------	------------	----------

Vice-Chair

Mary Ann Creadon	Literary Studies	Humboldt
------------------	------------------	----------

CSU Academic Senate Representatives

Robert Collins	American Indian Studies	San Francisco
----------------	-------------------------	---------------

Susan Gubernat	English	East Bay
----------------	---------	----------

David Hood	History	Long Beach
------------	---------	------------

Kathy Kaiser	Sociology	Chico
--------------	-----------	-------

Catherine Nelson	Political Science	Sonoma
------------------	-------------------	--------

Barry Pasternack	Business	Fullerton
------------------	----------	-----------

Mark Wheeler	Philosophy	San Diego
--------------	------------	-----------

Academic Senate CSU Academic Affairs Committee Chair *Ex Officio*

Bill Eadie	Journalism & Media Studies	San Diego
------------	----------------------------	-----------

California Community College Academic Senate Representative

John Stankas	Chemistry	San Bernardino Valley College
--------------	-----------	-------------------------------

CSU Campus Academic Affairs Administrator

Elizabeth Adams	CSU Northridge
-----------------	----------------

CSU Articulation Officer

Terri Eden	San José State University
------------	---------------------------

CCC Articulation Officer

Joseph Bielanski	Berkeley City College
------------------	-----------------------

CSSA Student Representative

Michael Adams	Cal Poly Pomona
---------------	-----------------

Monique Reyna	CSU Channel Islands
---------------	---------------------

CCC Chancellor's Office Representatives

Jeff Spano	Dean, Student Services
------------	------------------------

CSU Chancellor's Office Representatives

Christine Mallon	Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Programs and Faculty Development
Ken O'Donnell	Sr. Director, Student Engagement and Academic Initiatives & Partnerships

Guests:

Wayne Tikkanen	Chancellor's Office	re: ITL (teaching & learning)
Debra David	Chancellor's Office	re: Give Students a COMPASS
Dolores Davidson	CCC Academic Senate	re: WICHE Passport Project
Pamela Kerouac	College Board	re: AP courses
Michelle Pilati	CCC Academic Senate	re: CTE/GE pathways project
Carolina Cardenas	CSU CO	re: credit by exam policies
Emily Magruder	CSU CO	re: ITL (teaching & Learning)
Ivona Gregory	CSU: CI (Math Council)	re: STATWAY
Kate Stevenson	CSU: N (Math Council)	re: STATWAY
Steve Stepanek	ASCSU	re: CCC degrees, WICHE, etc.

Meeting Schedule 2014-15

1. (Tue) September 2, 2014
2. (Tue) November 4, 2014
3. (Tue) January 20, 2015
4. (Tue) March 17, 2015
5. (Tue) May 12, 2015

Meetings Schedule 2015-16

Assuming that GEAC stays with the same "day before ASCSU committee meetings."

The May GEAC meeting is a relatively new meeting for the committee, it has been successful and I would recommend keeping it.

Tentatively:

- Tuesday Sept 1
- Tuesday Nov 3
- Tuesday Jan 19
- Tuesday Mar 1
- Tuesday May 17

Scope of Responsibilities of the Chancellor's General Education Advisory Committee

Part 1. Membership and Charge of the Committee

The current chair is unaware of documentation explicitly describing the role of the committee. Nevertheless, the committee title itself suggests the primary function to advise the (office of the) Chancellor on issues pertaining to GE. Given that curriculum is the domain of faculty, the majority faculty composition (and chairmanship) of the committee makes sense as does the frequent referral and recommendation of items to and from the Academic Affairs (AA) and Academic Preparation and Education Programs (APEP) committees of the Academic Senate CSU. Given that much of GE involves intersegmental transfer, the CCC, articulation officer, and others similarly make sense. Historically, GEAC was entirely within the domain of the Academic Affairs committee of the ASCSU. More recently, the renaming of TEKR (Teacher Education K-12 Relations) to APEP and the renewed charge suggests, as recommended in 2014, that revisiting the logic of within-senate ex-officio membership may be in order. Care should be taken in committee composition to ensure that both AA and APEP are represented. Similarly, the recent close alignment with the efforts of the Institute for Teaching and Learning (ITL) within the CSU CO similarly suggests that membership overlap of at least one representative is desirable.

Part 2. Purpose of General Education

Executive Order 1100 includes:

Article 3. Premises of CSU General Education Breadth

3.1 Background

CSU General Education Breadth requirements have been designed to complement the major program and electives completed by each baccalaureate candidate, to assure that graduates have made noteworthy progress toward becoming truly educated persons.

These requirements are designed to provide the knowledge, skills, experiences, and perspectives that will enable CSU students to expand their capacities to take part in a wide range of human interests and activities; to confront personal, cultural, moral, and social problems that are an inevitable part of human life; and to cultivate both the requisite skills and enthusiasm for lifelong learning. Faculty are encouraged to assist students in making connections among disciplines to achieve coherence in the undergraduate educational experience.

Courses approved for GE Breadth should be responsive to the need for students to have developed knowledge of, or skills related to, quantitative reasoning, information literacy, intellectual inquiry, global awareness and understanding, human diversity, civic engagement, communication competence, ethical decision-making, environmental

systems, technology, lifelong learning and self-development, and physical and emotional health throughout a lifetime.

3.2 CSU Student Learning Outcomes

Each CSU campus shall define its GE student learning outcomes, to fit within the framework of the four “Essential Learning Outcomes” drawn from the **Liberal Education and American Promise (LEAP)** campaign, an initiative of the Association of American Colleges and Universities.

LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes Framework

1. *Knowledge of Human Cultures and the Physical and Natural World*
2. *Intellectual and Practical Skills*
3. *Personal and Social Responsibility*
4. *Integrative Learning*

Within the LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes framework, campuses may identify more specific outcomes, such as students’ ability to:

- *think clearly and logically;*
- *demonstrate information competency—finding and examining information critically;*
- *carry out effective oral communication;*
- *write effectively;*
- *apply quantitative reasoning concepts and skills to solve problems;*
- *make informed, ethical decisions;*
- *understand and apply the scientific method;*
- *apply learning from study abroad experiences to general education areas;*
- *utilize technology in pursuit of intellectual growth and efficacious human interaction;*
- *demonstrate understanding of human beings as physiological and psychological organisms;*
- *demonstrate understanding of the physical world in which they live and the life forms with which they share the global environment;*
- *demonstrate knowledge of cultural endeavors and legacies of world civilizations;*
- *demonstrate understanding of how human societies have developed and now function;*
- *apply socially responsive knowledge and skills to issues confronting local or global communities;*
- *demonstrate life skills such as financial literacy;*
- *understand and apply the principles, methodologies, value systems, ethics, and thought processes employed in human inquiry;*

- *engage in lifelong learning and self-development; and*
- *integrate and apply the insights gained from general education courses.*

3.3 Entry-Level Learning Skills

3.3.1 Minimum Competency

Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations, Section 40402.1, provides that each student admitted to the California State University is expected to possess basic competence in the English language and mathematical computation to a degree that may reasonably be expected of entering college students.

3.3.2 Remediation

Students admitted who cannot demonstrate such basic competence should be identified as quickly as possible and be required to take steps to overcome those deficiencies. Any coursework completed primarily for this purpose shall not be applicable to the baccalaureate degree.

Part 3. Additional Responsibilities

the bylaw modification in **AS-3073-12 “Internal Actions Following the Disposition of Resolutions”** which states, in part,

All standing and special committees shall report to the senate and unless otherwise specifically directed by the senate, shall take appropriate action to follow-up on resolutions which they sponsored, and will note in their committee minutes the results of this follow-up action. Where appropriate, follow-up actions shall be carried forward to future agendas and shared with other committees and entities. Committee recommendations shall not be considered policy statements until formally approved by the Senate.

GE-Relevant RESOLUTIONS FROM THE 2014-2015 ASCSU PLENARY SESSIONS
--

AS-3195-14/AA Approved by Acclamation November 2014	Commendation for Wayne Tikkanen (pdf)
AS-3216-15/CSU Chico Del. Approved by Acclamation May 2015	Commendation in Honor of Academic Senator and Faculty Trustee (Emerita) Kathleen Kaiser (pdf)

Both of these former members of GEAC have made a substantial portion of their service to the CSU focused on issues relevant to student success via appropriate and effective GE programs.

AS-3206-15/AA (Rev) Approved Unanimously May 2015	CSU Involvement in the WICHE Passport Project (pdf)
---	---

A central idea of the WICHE Passport project is to facilitate transfer of coursework across states. Although it is not anticipated that California would sign anything like a blanket passport agreement (for a variety of reasons including the lack of transparency in competency evaluation and the questionable “gains” versus “losses” that would be had from such an agreement), faculty-based discussions on academic expectations around GE constitute at least one element of the project content. The WICHE group needs to do better at demarcating contribution to the project from being a signatory to any such agreement.

AS-3209-15/AA (Rev) Withdrawn May 2015	Towards a Culture of Assessment in the California State University System: A Call for Faculty Professional Development
---	---

The underlying issues became tangled such that a revision was not able to be completed in a timely fashion, but following CSU: Bakersfield action (qualification minima and expectations to teach in GE) and their preceding CSU ITL discussions, the notion of competency achievement to support GE education is likely worth pursuing in the future. Note that this is a larger issue than a GE specific one but the implementation tends to focus on GE and thus is of relevance.

AS-3211-15/AA (Rev) Approved Unanimously May 2015	Expectations for Upper Division General Education (pdf)
---	---

This resolution should provide both a framework and starting place for concerted action by GEAC over the summer and next academic year. At the present time campuses are already being asked to indicate “by area” where their upper division content fits. There is a default assumption (despite EO 1100 wording) that upper division GE should “automatically” transfer across institutions regardless of campus required overlays or campus-specific outcome expectations. There are some delicacies involved but the protection of campus autonomy and the ability for a campus to require more than the minimum lowest common denominator needs to be defended – failure to do so could dramatically undermine campus control of quality and could lead to a push for more stringent system standards for (and standardization of) upper division GE content.

AS-3212-15/AA/FGA Approved Without Dissent May 2015	Call for Adequate and Appropriate Consultation Regarding the California Community College Pilot Baccalaureate Degree Programs (pdf)
---	---

The Board of Governors of the CCC system have consistently failed to engage in adequate and appropriate consultation in the development of pilot baccalaureate programs. The relevance to GE is that, regardless of the perceived quality of the CCC baccalaureate programs, they (CCCs) may now be in a position to offer upper division transfer coursework (which has its own set of problems) and, more specifically, may attempt to offer upper division GE coursework useable by CSU-bound transfer students. Constraints on upper division GE expectations (see prior item) may limit this possibility but it is an area of emerging concern and should be watched carefully. CCC constraints on enrollment in upper division coursework (as a whole), and for GE specifically, should be encouraged.

Other continuing issues from the 2014-2015 academic year

1. Discipline Councils

For several of the issue that GEAC has looked at over the just concluded session we have sought input from discipline councils. Where such formal or informal councils do not exist it is hard to ensure that we have adequately addressed the needs of the discipline/field. Having formal supported structures to support communication would be advantageous to increase the effectiveness of GEAC. Action on these items has been a meeting with Gerry Handy where several disciplines were selected as pilot projects. Further work has stalled.

- 2. Building FTES for small programs via GE** (this pertains to the “Advancement of Ethnic Studies” report / *American institutions outside of Political Science & History / Oral Communication outside of Communication Studies / rules on GE transfer across institutions (esp. online)*).

The third-rail of academic is where “small enrollment” programs develop sufficient full-time equivalent student (FTES) enrollments to allow the upper-division content of the program to be offered (generally somewhat parasitic on lower-division enrollments). Programs and/or departments sometimes go “shopping” in GE in order to build-up lower division enrollments by offering courses that fulfill university graduation requirements. Different institutions have different rules, procedures, and practices on how a course gets certified (and maintains certification) to meet various GE areas.

- *Ethnic studies is traditionally a service course within CSU GE and is a required element of some campus GE programs. An earlier ASCSU recommendation, in part, is “Given the vital role that Ethnic Studies Departments have in fulfilling the mission of the CSU and preparing students to confront the complex challenges created by social and economic diversity in the 21st century, the CSU as a whole and individual campuses should reaffirm and expand their commitment to maintaining the status and resource base of Ethnic Studies departments and programs.” The recently released task-force report looking at advancement of ethnic studies has perfectly captured this “third rail of academia” in advocating for ethnic studies to teach oral communication, history, political science, and other disciplinary content while simultaneously suggesting that the discipline of ethnic studies is unique and unlikely to be effectively present outside of ethnic-studies offered coursework. Actions in response to the task-force report could impact how GE is offered on the campus.*
- *American institutions outside of Political Science & History (cf., recent discussion of ANTHROPOLOGY course at CSU Sacramento) – evaluated as an instantiation of a campus-specific policy. GEAC looked at the issue of “who gets to teach what” and noted differences in campus policies and practices. The issue was determined to be a campus-specific and thus not of interest as a systemwide action item.*
- *Oral communication. Most institutions (and GE policy for all CCCs not explicitly part of an endorsed pilot project) prohibit online oral communication courses from counting for area A1. Humboldt offers an online A1 course. This campus-specific policy has systemwide implications given that EO1100 endorses mandatory campus-to-campus transfer of lower-division GE content. This lowest common (uncommon?) denominator approach has implications for the quality of the outcome of GE programs across the state.*

- 3. STATWAY** (and CSU expectations for quantitative reasoning more generally)

Algebra competency continues to be a vexing problem for the CSU. As an entry requirement it is undoubtedly clear. For transfer students we take fulfilling quantitative

reasoning as somewhat of a proxy for meeting the algebra requirement (now defined via state standards vis-à-vis common core). The CSU adoption and extension of the STATWay pilot project had put us in conflict with the UC, which had not acknowledged STATWay as meeting UC quantitative reasoning requirements. Boars has reversed course and accepted STATWay but we are still in our consideration of the pilot project. A priority item for the September 2015 GEAC meeting is to ensure that we have data (from California – the CCC and CSU pilots) as a preface for a NOVEMBER 2015 decision on the long-term fate of STATWay. This calendar is built on the calendar for the academic year catalog copy.

4. Continuing pilot trial of offering **online oral communication** as counting towards CSU GE.;
5. **System Minors** (likely thematic minors in GE)

A consistent concern arises on the question of “do I have to do it” and “do I have to change my minor in XXX in order to accommodate the proposed system minor?” the answer to both questions is that it is voluntary. There is a schism between the LEAP/GE-oriented faculty (often most represented on GEAC) and those wary of system imposition.
6. **Credit by examination** (AP/IB/CLEP/...).

Concerns include the possibility of looking at the Cambridge Exams, AP Seminar/Research, challenge exams for GE areas, etc.
7. Addressing **expectations for critical thinking**;

This is partially in response to the near systemic appeal to waive Critical Thinking for Engineering programs “since it is already covered in the major” (and in every other major?). The most recent letter to the Chancellor on the topic of the San Bernardino request acknowledged that the “waiver” is largely for incoming transfer admissions but suggested that the critical thinking assessments should be performed even when the content requirements for A3 (critical thinking) are distributed across several courses/content within the program. The term “waiver” should really only be used when it is actually an element of GE that is truly waived (not as otherwise achieved).
8. **GE Course Review**
9. **Coordination with ITL**
10. **GE Guiding Notes / Standards**
11. **Joint meeting or having an observer/representative at BOARS**

The Board on Admissions and Relations with Schools does the equivalent of our Admissions Advisory and some of GEAC / APEP on standards)
12. AS-3119-13/AA (Rev) [Clarifying the Changing Expectations for General Education \(.pdf\)](#)

The disconnect between the expectations for General Education as derived from the wording in Title 5, Executive Order 1065, and GE Guiding Notes remains. The Title 5 language regarding General Education (Title 5, California Code of Regulations, Sections 40402.1, 40403, 40405, 40405.1, 40405.2, 40405.4, and 40508) is most often interpreted in the context of Executive Order 1065 [now EO1100] as further informed by the latest (continuously updated) revisions to the CSU Guiding Notes. The direction

provided in the guiding notes is historically focused on evaluating individual courses against content as informed by prior review cycle interpretation of content described in Title 5 and the executive order. Given that the language in the later documents was written with a content rather than outcome focus, it is unsurprising that the guiding notes content is similarly content-focused. With the development of a stronger assessment knowledge base and more holistic approaches to GE becoming prevalent, it argues for the merits of looking at revisioning and refocusing GE-based guidance. In this context it is noted that the GE-related descriptions within Title 5 have been described as both dated and underspecified.

Additionally, it is noted that true programmatic assessment of GE as a program has been mandated since 2008 (with the introduction of Executive Order 1033, since replaced by Executive Order 1065) and yet there have been no strong examples of programmatic assessment across GE from any individual campus. “The Give Students a COMPASS” project has yielded many positive results with integrative learning among other high impact practices in producing more intentional learning and greater engagement along with concomitant increases in retention and graduation rates – these (and other) high impact practices are currently, typically seen as an overlay to GE and as potentially diluting content area requirements.

The GE task force suggests several actions to be undertaken, most of which are currently actively or passively being pursued (e.g., upper division GE definitions; alignment of Title 5, EO 1065, and CSU GE Guiding Notes).

13. AS-3101012 [Support for Alternative General Education \(GE\) Pathways for Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics \(STEM\) Transfer Students \(Attachment 1\), \(Attachment 2\), \(Attachment 3\), \(.pdf\)](#)

The CSU pathways to GE were implemented in EO1100, but continue to be somewhat less developed, adopted, and understood as they might be.

14. AS-3092-12 [Faculty Consultation on Baccalaureate Unit Limits \(pdf\)](#)

Much of the tension in GE waivers comes from the existence and campus implementation of the 120 unit “limit” imposed by the Board of Trustees. Related issues concerning GE continue to be brought forward as surfaced or exacerbated by this policy decision.

GENERIC AGENDA (suggestion for 2014-2015 year)
--

MEMBERSHIP:

MEMBERS:

< list with titles/role>

GUESTS <with titles and time-certains>

<list with titles/roles/time-certain events>

1. Approval of the Agenda
2. Review and approval of prior notes
 - a. encourage preview/pre-edit to minimize time cost
 - b. encourage chair to write "verbal" (paragraph) overview to include with notes
3. Chair report (includes items from executive)
4. Segmental updates (as appropriate)
 - a. Seek out items in advance via listserv and tentative agenda
5. Review of GEAC charge and year-end report (Sept. only)
6. Review of prior ASCSU actions relevant to GEAC
7. Upcoming Board of Trustees agenda
8. 120 unit associated concerns (impact on GE)
9. Articulation Concerns
10. Coordination with ITL
11. WICHE Passport
12. CSU GE Review & Guiding Notes
13. CSU job-postings or grant-type request for proposals relevant to GE
14. Ongoing GE-relevant projects/pilots (cf., student success initiative/graduation initiative)
15. AP/IB/CLEP and other "testing" or "outcome-evaluation" items
16. Online Education vis-à-vis GE
17. Legislative Report (re: items relevant to GEAC)
18. Admissions-Related GE Content
 - a. Admissions criteria changes
19. SB 1440 GE-Related Content
 - a. Delayed completion of GE
20. Strategic Directions
 - a. Access to Excellence