

Chancellor's General Education
Advisory Committee Agenda for November 1, 2016

11:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.
Anacapa Room, CSU Office of the Chancellor

MINUTES

PRESENT:

Mary Ann Creadon (chair), Mark Van Selst (vice chair), Sarah Bentley (via Zoom), Stachia Boykin, Bill Eadie, Steven Filling, Denise Fleming, Patty Faiman (replacement for Ceci Hermann), Chris Mallon, Virginia May, Barry Pasternack, Paula Selvester, Tiffany Tran, Jodie Ullman, Alison Wrynn

ABSENT:

Jackie Escajeda, Susan Gubernat, Michelle Hawley, Ceci Hermann (replacement: Patty Faiman), Pam Walker

GUESTS:

Claudia Pinter-Locke (CSU CO), Emily Magruder (CSU CO, ITL), Christine Miller (ASCSU), Karen Simpson-Alicia (CSU CO), Pamela Kerouac (College Board, via Zoom), Rich Kick (College Board invitee, via Zoom)

SUMMARY REPORT (presented to Academic Senate CSU on Nov 3, 2016)

- 1) The committee heard an update on the online oral communication pilot. We will have a report in January, and hope to be able to do a review of Guiding Notes for the requirement.
- 2) We were introduced to Dr. Alison Wrynn, the new State University Associate Dean in Academic Programs, who will be one of our liaisons from the Chancellor's Office on GE matters, and so will work closely with our committee.
- 3) We heard a report from Emily Magruder on the successful Institute for Teaching and Learning Symposium in October at San Jose State University.
- 4) And we had a presentation on, and reviewed, at the request of a representative from College Board, a revised AP Computer Science Principles course.
- 5) Our Vice-Chair, Mark Van Selst, introduced a discussion of the complexities that will attend the implementation of the Quantitative Reasoning Task Force, and had the committee begin thinking about both the timelines for the various elements to be in place, and how we might prioritize those aspects for which GEAC might play a part in implementing.

6) We were introduced to and had some conversation with James Minor, the new CSU senior strategist for Academic Success and Inclusive Excellence, who is working in the Chancellor's Office on the Graduation Initiative.

7) We were provided by AVC Mallon with the results of the General Education Survey that was sent to all campuses this fall, and are now ready for analysis by faculty and administrators. She asked the committee for any suggestions or help in clarifying requirements as published by each campus, and in explaining the purpose of general education to external sources.

11:00	1 Approval of agenda for meeting of 11/1/2016 and of 9/13/2016 minutes November 2016 Agenda (action: approved) September 2016 Minutes (action: approved)	Mary Ann Creadon
11:10	2 Online Oral Communication Pilots--Update The continuing GEAC group reporting out on the fully online oral communication pilot – Bill, Kevin, Anthony (subgroup looking to develop) – will develop “guiding notes for fully online oral communication” or a report on such for the January 2017 GEAC meeting. An early proposal (from the MAY 2016 GEAC meeting) was made available to the committee via dropbox. Next steps could be any of: (1) GEAC invitation to allow fully online oral communication if the applicant uses new to-be-developed online-specific guiding notes; or, (2) hold off any further participation to allow the pilot programs to produce more information for GEAC (note: the existing pilot project expires in Fall of 2017 and there is start-up time required for new courses); or (3) it is a possible future that GEAC not pursue fully online communication further. It was noted that the primary question/challenge for entirely online oral communication is how to address the question of audience.	Bill Eadie
11:15 Time Certain	3 Dr. Alison Wrynn, State University Associate Dean, Academic Programs Dr. Wrynn was introduction as the new CSU CO representative on GEAC (Dr. Mallon remains as the other representative). She has prior history with campus-based GE	Alison Wrynn

processes and implementation and will be taking the primary lead of GE-related issues for the Office of the Chancellor.

Q: Is there anything afloat on systemwide revisions to the GE package? (Question to Chris Mallon, and her response)

A: There are no such discussions emanating from the Chancellor's Office. GE is a perennial topic of interest to the CSU Board of Trustees. Chair Eisen is particularly interested. The current CSU CO efforts for the Board regarding GE are currently focused on being educational, in particular to highlight that the responsibilities for GE reside within the faculty and that the current CSU GE package is effective both as an educational tool and as an articulation effort. It was also noted that the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) accreditation processes push for identifiable course skills; the relevance being that for the CSU many of these attributes will derive from expectations (and assessments) included within Upper Division GE.

There is potential legislative interest in CSU to CSU GE transfer. There are existing efforts within the CSU CO that are targeted to technological support for CSU to CSU transfer, in particular with respect to lower division GE certification and the hope is that the CSU is not further constrained by well-meaning legislative action.

A primary component of Alison's portfolio will involve GE.

11:30 4 Time Certain	CSU Institute for Teaching and Learning—Report on October Symposium	Emily Magruder
-------------------------	--	----------------

The GE/ITL relationship has continued to strengthen across time. Faculty development on GE is highlighted by efforts such as those in Bakersfield. The CSU Teaching and Learning Symposia was at SJSU. The focus of the symposia was on student success writ large from an institutional perspective (vs. course-specific focused action). At such symposia, in many ways we are representing ourselves to ourselves – making use of internal expertise. There were 225 faculty attendees (a slight reduction in attendance from prior years likely stems from the symposia being rescheduled from the spring). The faculty development council used approximately 9K funds from ITL, and, along with the registration fee of \$50 per attendee meant that the event otherwise effectively paid for itself. Katherine Plank

provided a keynote on building academic communities for success via inclusion (e.g, the query “What do you want a former student to tell you 10 years from now?” - Satisfaction, happiness, knowledge, etc.; “When did you matter?”). Other topics included:

- Developing skills in academic reading as well as writing.
- Effective use of assessment.
- Effective use of self-reflection.
- Effective use of faculty development vis-à-vis GE.

Finally, a reframe of the question of student readiness was proposed in advocating that the question be reformulated to be “*Is the CSU student ready?*” as opposed to “*Are our incoming students college ready?*”

12:00

Lunch

1:00

Time Certain

5 AP Computer Science Principles Review and Recommendation

Pam Kerouac

Rich Kick

Pam Kerouac (College Board) and Rick Kick (Course Instructor) presented background information to GEAC on the AP Computer Science Principles Course. The course was developed with the support of the National Science Foundation and addresses computer literacy, with a particular focus on outreach to students that are historically not engaged in computer science – this increase in access to the field was one of the primary motivators for the College Board to engage with this course. Online (dropbox) support materials and testimonial (Rick Kick) provide evidence for the active engagement of students towards development of computer science knowledge.

Student assessment includes both a course-based digital portfolio and their performance on a course-specific AP exam. The exam includes both a 2h 75 questions multiple-choice component and a set of performance tasks using focused on CREATE [writing software to a targeted solution and documentation of content] and EXPLORE [respond to recent innovations].

- The course can use any language that instructor/student are most comfortable with (e.g., JAVA, SNAP, etc.)
-

-
- The course demonstrably pulls “new” students into the field.
 - A feature of the course is to have students develop new knowledge from data
 - College credit for courses is a draw; GE or program credit even more so.
 - There are elements in GE area A (writing, critical thinking), B (quantitative reasoning), and E (development, commitment to success) in the course but it is not clear that it meets any particular GE area. GEAC did not recommend systemwide GE credit for any particular area. It was noted that a programming-focused course might fit GE B4 mathematical concepts/quantitative reasoning if the change in requirements posited by the Quantitative Reasoning Task Force are implemented (although the appropriateness of such “fit” would still need to be assessed).
 - Communication from Pamela Kerouac suggests that the existing course can be used towards a-g requirements for UC/CSU eligibility
 - This course may be an illustration of an area we may want to inform future GE directions if the course represents the type of experience we would like our students to have.
 - The course is approved as part of content within at least one CSU degree program (The home course counts towards that campuses’ idiosyncratic “extra” GE category [information competency and technology]).

1:30	6 Quantitative Reasoning Task Force Implementation— Update, Changes Needed Related to GE, and Implementation Process	Mark Van Selst
------	--	----------------

This item was a discussion of the complexities that will attend the implementation of the Quantitative Reasoning Task Force and asked the committee to begin thinking about both the timelines for the various elements to be in place, and how we might prioritize those aspects for which GEAC might play a part in implementing.

The full implementation of all QRTF recommendations will require a minimum of six years (e.g., developing capacity

and content for K-12 to meet the four years of mathematics/quantitative reasoning proposed requirement and then to have freshman high school students start high school with a reasonable opportunity to achieve and work towards full college readiness).

More directly pertinent to GE, even with the potential adoption of the QRTF recommendations existing Title 5 language regarding GE would likely be retained. As a description of GE the title 5 requirement that students “will have achieved the ability to think clearly and logically, to find and critically examine information, to communicate orally and in writing, and to perform quantitative functions” is likely to remain adequate.

The prerequisite requirements for mathematics/quantitative reasoning in EO1100 would obviously need to be addressed, and, more importantly, the CSU GE guiding notes would need to be reviewed and/or updated. The timeline question is “when would GEAC need to respond to the potential implementation of the B4 prerequisite change advocated within the QRTF report?”

It was noted that the QRTF deliberately tried to guard against the question of a “lesser” requirement – so any changes in GE prerequisites ought be accompanied by the increase in contextual exposure to quantitative reasoning across the curriculum (esp. within GE).

There is a tie-in of the potential shift in GE standards for B4 preparation to the current StatWay pilot (in which multi-course preparation sequences that otherwise meet GE area B4 requirements but without meeting the intermediate algebra prerequisite can be used to meet B4 requirements for CSU approved pilot programs). Similarly, with the passage of time the new math standards for K-12 will also produce differentially prepared incoming freshman (and transfer) students.

Any proposed changes to GE will necessarily involve collaborative discussions with other stakeholders (e.g., 60% of our current students are community college transfers, any GE prerequisite changes may have impacts on academic

programs that have historically used those GE courses as part of their academic programs. [ed note: this item will likely be a returning agenda item for January with the ASCSU proposal for a GE task force]

2:30

Time Certain

7 Introduction of Dr. James Minor, CSU senior strategist for Academic Success and Inclusive Excellence

James Minor

Introductions. Graduation Initiative (GI) is the flagship initiative of the CSU. The most visible goal is to double the graduation rate for the CSU (40% 4y, 70% 6y, 45% 2y transfer, 85% 4y transfer). The initial focus is on moving those 4.5y graduates to 4y graduates. Helping to even that extra half-year produces savings for students.

Each campus has submitted plans towards achieving campus-specific GI targets. There are one-time funds that have been allocated towards achieving these targets.

Academic Innovation:

- Course availability (a.k.a., “fixing” bottleneck/roadblock courses by availability)
- Courses with high DFW rates (a.k.a., “fixing” bottleneck/roadblock courses by design)

Smarter Student Support Systems:

- Graduation procedures (filing, applying, etc. for graduation)
- Academic Advisement / Academic Planners
- Non-payment “drops” and/or registration restrictions (URM are particularly impacted by pre-baccalaureate courses)
- Increasingly data-informed decision-making (dashboards, etc.)

Active and Engaged Leadership:

- “Long-term” as a term that is now unwelcome in planning (we really do not have “time” to fix things before our 2025 graduates – that is the 2021 cohort for 4y and 2019 for 6y graduation rates)

URM is another major focus (and needed to achieve the type of graduation rates we are looking for); gender disparities in graduation rates are also of deep concern and require focused

attention.

The GI clearly intersects with GE. QRTF addresses math/quantitative reasoning pre-baccalaureate work; GE can build high impact practices involving cohorts; CCC/CSU articulation mechanisms are strong in GE.

CSU online offerings via coursematch are largely used on the home campus. It is underutilized (the courses are largely hidden from students who might otherwise utilize the offerings); Gerry Handley is working to increase the visibility of the coursematch courses.

Q: From CCC to CSU transfer knowing how the CSU treats out of state coursework would be useful.

A: both CCC and K-12 partnerships would be strengthened by clearer access to policies. Similarly, CSU knowledge of assessments of preparation of our future students would be useful.

Q: Proportion of T/TT faculty has a clear impact on student retention and graduation.

A: Yes, we have to place our resources where they will have the most impact.

Q: How long does it take campuses to implement some of these changes? E.g., advising support, outreach action, delaying non-payment drops.

A: We are pushing some of these implementations to occur quickly. Campuses are being very responsive.

3:00

8 GE Survey results—Informational item

Chris Mallon

The efforts of the GE survey were targeted to look at campus GE programs and to look at compliance with system restrictions. It was noted that several campus websites were unclear on how a student could meet local GE requirements. An overview of the implications of GE Survey responses yielded the following requests/questions/queries:

1) Request for assistance in improving Clarity to Students Regarding GE Requirements

- In addressing concerns that GE requirements are too hard to understand, could GEAC provide

recommendations, examples, or templates for clear, complete, and easy to understand GE requirements?

2) To provide suggestions for Improving Clarity in GE Policy

e.g.,

- Make lab units clear among GE requirements in EO 1100 and at campus level.
- Clarify specific upper-division GE Area requirements in EO 1100.
- In EO 1100, explain better the requirement for CSU-to-CSU GE lower-division certification/transfer.

In general, recommend language that could minimize conflicting interpretations of policy

3) Clarify the Benefits of GE to Stakeholders, Internal and External, via Program Review and Assessment Evidence

- Could GEAC provide a solution or recommendation for how campuses might communicate GE requirements? (GE task force?)
- Suggestions for improving clarity in policy documents (e.g., no units for B3 laboratory, CSU to CSU transfer, generally cleaner language).
- Three units to each of areas B, C, D is declared by default distribution of units across areas (this falls out of EO 1100 section 5.3.2.3 Qualification for Full Certification)
- Efficiency, cost, time to degree are items of interest to a variety of stakeholders.

The ASCSU GE Task Force is there to address some of these issues. The distinction being a senate-owned committee (ASCSU) vs. the targeted expertise and ease of access to stakeholders with a GEAC-centered effort.

3:30

9 Math 110 C-ID Descriptor

Mark Van Selst

C-ID MATH 110: descriptor may (or did? C-ID descriptor signed 10-19-16) change from “intermediate algebra” as a prerequisite to:

Required Prerequisites: Intermediate Algebra or any CSU accepted statistics pathway curriculum prerequisite*

**At present there are two mechanisms to become accepted:*

-
- *the proposed statistics course has been accepted to meet CSU General Education Breadth Area B4*
 - *the pathway has been accepted by the CSU Chancellor's Office process per its October 20, 2015 memo (Statistics Pathways in CSU Quantitative Reasoning)*
- 4) The descriptor as revised is fine for GE but may compromise ADT and SB1440 content that requires intermediate algebra (e.g., possibly business or economics – this needs to be investigated prior to implementation of any such change).
 - 5) The new descriptor is an attempt to accommodate the statway pilot to allow a course to be used as part of an ADT as meeting a GE requirement.
 - 6) Such a change may mean that the UC eligibility of the C-ID course is similarly compromised.
 - 7) It was noted that the Statway pilots have to be part of a 2+ course sequence (not a single semester) per prior GEAC guidance.

4:00

10. Other:

Item 1: Follow-up re: StatWay Pilot

for January: Agendize a response to the November 2016 query on non-intermediate algebra prerequisite pilot standards for participation.

Item 2: Dual-enrollment rules

Dual-enrollment quality control concerns? Courses are transcribed as from the institution of dual-enrollment (college/university + high school). There exists a new requirement (statute requirement that the district and the high school have an agreement and that the faculty are hired by the college [not the high school] via an equivalent process and that the syllabus, etc. follow the course outline of record). The dual-enrollment restrictions also apply to CTE. The new pattern allows college level course credit down to junior high (these will be predominately CTE).

CSU Campuses

Bakersfield
Channel Islands
Chico
Dominguez Hills
East Bay

Fresno
Fullerton
Humboldt
Long Beach
Los Angeles
Maritime Academy

Monterey Bay
Northridge
Pomona
Sacramento
San Bernardino
San Diego

San Francisco
San José
San Luis Obispo
San Marcos
Sonoma
Stanislaus