

## GEAC MINUTES

### PRESENT:

**Mary Ann Creadon (chair / by phone)**  
**Mark Van Selst (vice chair),**  
**Bill Eadie,**  
**Steven Filling,**  
**Ceci Hermann,**  
**Chris Mallon,**  
**Virginia May,**  
**Susan Gubernat,**  
**Barry Pasternack,**  
**Paula Selvester,**  
**Tiffany Tran,**  
**Jodie Ullman,**  
**Alison Wrynn**  
**Margaret Garcia (for Michelle Hawley)**

### ABSENT:

Jackie Escajeda,  
Michelle Hawley → Margaret Garcia (Cal State LA)  
Denise Fleming,  
Sarah Bentley (Zoom),  
Stachia Boykin

### GUESTS:

**Claudia Pinter-Locke (CSU CO),**  
**Christine Miller (ASCSU),**  
**Karen Simpson-Alicia (CSU CO),**  
**Kate Stevenson (CSUN, by phone)**

1. Approval of Agenda (approved as amended)
  - i. Added chair's report
  - ii. Added c/c- discussion
2. Chair's Report  
Mary Ann Creadon – important to get through the Oral Comm, Math 110, QRTF, C/C- business for the Golden 4. The agenda is full.
3. Approval of November Minutes (held to after lunch) (approved as posted)
4. C/C- update: C/C- discussion (at this time the C- memo is still in effect, so C- does count for golden four GE even if it was not supposed to on the campus when and where the course was taken (i.e., for *pass along*). This is in conflict with

the ASCSU resolution (AS-3269-16/AA/APEP (Rev)) and the prior agreement discussed with the CSU CO that a course should count if it counted where you took it. Campuses should have been able to restrict locally against the C- when taught on their campus and the ASCSU has encouraged CSU campuses to do so when no longer in conflict with the Chancellor's Office memo. The reality is that if a campus does not award credit for C- then the instructor knows that and would have graded accordingly. It was noted that the grade of C- is restricted from being offered in the CCC system and two CSU campuses do not use +/- grading. [note: A later (post-geac) communication from the CSU CO revealed that the CSU CO will require that a grade of c- to count as a golden four course regardless of where taken even if the grade of C- was not supposed to count for Golden Four GE credit when the course was taken. At this time there is no action to revisit the CO memo that permits C- grades to count - MVS]

5. Online Oral Communication Pilot – Update and Report  
Bill Eadie

This is an update following up on recommendations from the Oral Communication group (see “guiding notes for fully online oral communication” – Bill, Kevin, Anthony (GEAC monitors for the pilots) – discussion of draft notes from MAY 2016 as posted.

Next steps:

- (1) GEAC guidance to allow fully online oral communication if use new guiding notes; or,
- (2) More info (pilot good to Fall 2017); or
- (3) Should not pursue.

The primary question/challenge for online oral communication is how to address the question of audience.

QUESTION: Do we know that learning is occurring (what assessment data is present)?

QUESTION: Are the A1 requirements sufficient or should the “new” version be required for the pilots?

QUESTION: should we require in-person vs. online comparison of learning outcomes?

QUESTION: What does it take to move from pilot?

COMMENT: the existing pilots terminate MAY 2017 so action is needed.

Currently, a fully online communication course will not transfer from CCC to CSU but:

- i. Hybrid courses are ok.
- ii. Humboldt has a fully online GE Oral Communication course
- iii. there was a pilot with three schools participating for the past three years (online oral communication pilot)

For the pilot, one professor had taught online and was and remains an advocate. At another institution, a faculty member who did not teach online and was skeptical, now thinks that online oral communication can work in a technology mediated fashion. The core issue appeared to be one of “Audience.” The audience problem was solved in three different ways across the pilots. The results of the pilot (of the three choices: 1. Pilot was not successful; 2. Pilot was inclusive and continue and open it up to other schools; 3.

Pilot was successful, and write up Guiding Notes) the pilot group recommends modifying CSU GE Guiding notes to better define oral communication expectations to explicitly include the possibility that online oral communication be permissible.

Q: Did the students in the pilot learn equally vis-à-vis in person?

A: Same or better.

Q: Are there WASC requirements re: online oral communication?

A: WASC is unlikely to provide much guidance given that the UC does not require oral communication in its GE package.

Q: Given that grades alone do not indicate learning, can we get assessment data that shows relative efficacy of online oral communication vs. comparable non-online comparison

A: A related concern is that we do not have this data now nor it likely to appear.

Q: How might we best address the question of “speaking in front of a live audience” as the hallmark of oral communication ability if there is no live audience to speak to?

A: We could pilot test a revision to the Guiding Notes to be used with an expansion / continuation of the Online Oral Communication pilot groups (i.e., use the new-to-be-developed guiding notes to evaluate the online offerings).

Q: if we allow CSUs to do online oral communication (default since a campus can approve online oral communication but campus decisions are not reviewed at the system level whereas the existing prohibition on online oral communication in the guiding notes does apply to community college review), does this put us in danger of standards differences CSU vs. CCC?

A: Possible. We likely need to tighten up the Oral Communication definition to ensure that the stated standards are what we hold as student learning outcome expectations.

Q: A decision needs to be made today because the pilot is over and the CCCs need to know. Do we accept the recommendation from the GEAC appointed oral communication group? (Recommend with revision to expectations to address audience)

Q: What it would take for GEAC to make a decision on oral communication.

A: Ideally we would want to see that obtained learning assessment results are comparable to the in person course.

**ACTION: Allow pilot to continue. Ask for assessment data on student learning. If available, may recommend that the CSU CO open an option for more pilots on online oral communication (May 2017 decision). Otherwise, the same set of three original pilot offerings could be recommended for extension through the 2017/18 academic year with expectation that by accepting the extension the pilot offerings would provide data (learning outcomes) comparing online vs. in person student learning outcomes. Our future actions may depend heavily on the comparability of the populations/data that we are provided. (Passed)**

6. Lunch

7. Math 110 – C-ID Descriptor and C-ID Approval—Discussion  
Mark Van Selst

From NOVEMBER 2016 GEAC MEETING:

*C-ID MATH 110: descriptor may change from “intermediate algebra” as a prerequisite to “that which is required as a prerequisite for CSU GE”.*

*This is fine for GE but may compromise ADT and SB1440 content that requires intermediate algebra.*

*The new descriptor is an attempt to accommodate the [Statistical Pathways] pilot to allow a course to be used as part of an ADT as meeting a GE requirement.*

*Such a change may mean that the UC eligibility of the C-ID course is similarly compromised.*

**ACTION 1: Query of the Statistics Pathway Pilot Sites – What is the SLO assessment data and how does it compare to the skills and practices spelled out in the foundational expectations in the QRTF report. (Passed)**

**ACTION 2: Query of Statistics Pathway Pilot Sites; How is the appropriateness of course selection addressed for different student audiences (i.e. feedback on how STEM//Health Science/BUS are advised to avoid) (Passed)**

**ACTION 3: hold off on any new Statistics Pathway Pilot participation heretofore until the MATH 110 issue is resolved (and larger context of QRTF action). The intent is that no new submissions will be considered as of January 24, 2017. (Passed)**

NOTE: The continued misrepresentation on STATWAY vis-à-vis CSU by Carnegie was noted. We will further reinforce our request to clarify at winter institute (this perspective has been reinforced by Julie Bruno and there is a formal letter in response out to the CCC audience re: the role of Statway).

NOTE: There was a request to encourage the ASCSU chair/executive committee to produce commentary on the negative impact of external agency involvement (e.g., Governor Brown) on issues of GE transfer and in navigating issues of mathematical proficiency. This request was passed along to the chair of the ASCSU.

8. Beginning QRTF Implementation – Review and Revise Area B4 requirements: foundational requirements vs. baccalaureate requirements  
Kate Stevenson and Steven Filling

Recommendations I and II of the QRTF: Foundational (pre-baccalaureate) versus Baccalaureate level competencies

- i. The idea is that both exist semi-independently. One could achieve a new version of B4 but then return to capture foundational aspects otherwise missing prior to further developing baccalaureate level proficiencies (possibly at the upper division?).
- ii. Baccalaureate QR competencies require reinforcement at the upper division (e.g., post-transfer) to move from “introduce and develop” to move towards “mastery”.

Possible equity issues vis-à-vis the fourth year math course

- i. Advocacy and partnership will be required for success.
- ii. There is an analogy to ERWC courses. ERWC courses also require both commitment and resources from the school districts.
- iii. There is a potential SES-related limitation on access to the ERWC (and 4<sup>th</sup> yr math) course.
- iv. What are the equity issues regarding requiring a 4<sup>th</sup> year of math in HS and could they be better spelled out (and by whom? This seems to go well beyond a GEAC issue).

There was a discussion re: the advisability of having a GWAR-type requirement around quantitative reasoning (i.e., of rising juniors).

- i. Are we going to give an assessment for QR at the senior year of a student's university experience (or other time)? At CSU Northridge the writing assessment has critical thinking expressed and requires the use of QR to complete the essay. This is a very rich, complex, two-fer assessment.
- ii. The context of financial planning could also be used in assessment of writing + QR.

The idea is the B4 course gives one the first two-year QR. One may have had the broad, but not the deep. When should these be constructed?

- i. In order to transfer to CSU a B4 course must be completed and student must also demonstrate (QRTF Recommendation IIC? or Foundational?) Achievement.
- ii. CSU could establish a test similar to the writing exam. The CAI test was mentioned as a possible contributor in this role.

9. GE Assessment – Update on campus assessment practices for GE, including articulating the distinctiveness of upper division GE  
Mary Ann Creadon and Alison Wrynn

The GE Task Force is also interested in upper division GE requirements so there will be some overlap between this item and the GE task force. Some GEAC members feel this is more of a GE Task Force item whereas others felt it was a central role of GEAC. Alison read the charge for GEAC and it is within the purview of GEAC.

Upper division GE is the depth part of GE. Lower division GE should be prerequisite for upper division GE. It doesn't have to be a narrowing in order to give it distinctiveness. Addressing a higher level of Bloom's Taxonomy was suggested.

Upper division GE:

- i. Has the potential for strong campus-identity based overlay elements (e.g., multiculturalism).
- ii. Campus-based cyclical review of GE can be a constraint on change.
- iii. Will it be integrated into the degree vs. separate from major (it is the "depth" element)

- iv. Higher level of Bloom's taxonomy (GEAC can weigh in on the need for depth)
- v. Should protect regionality /distinctiveness/flexibility of what is possible.
- vi. Campus role for GE can protect the restriction of offerings to those that are most campus-specific.
- vii. Needed for mastery attainment (Writing and Quantitative Reasoning)

A suggestion was made to have the CSU Faculty on GEAC report out to Mary Ann and Alison re: assessment of their home campus GE programs in their most recent WASC report?

10. Review, update, and clean up of Guiding Notes – Discussion and development of process  
Mary Ann Creadon and Alison Wrynn

There is no formal appeals process in GE certification (large volume, informal process to correct for mistakes but not on expert judgment)

Questionable cases (after staff review) have always been put out for CSU disciplinary faculty review

The initial thought with this item was that GEAC might discuss the proposal for the updated proposed guiding notes for Oral Communication, but the proposal was not in a form amenable to such discussion.

11. Other reports/new items

- i. GE Task Force: Christine Miller talked briefly about the GE Task Force; it will be finalized tomorrow when the Executive Committee meets.
- ii. Coursematch: There was a recent CSU CO memo (under Gerry Handley) on cross-campus enrollment (Coursematch), with a particular emphasis on GE and lower-division preparation. There is a requirement for sharing online coursework opportunities, much of which developed out of AB386

12. Adjourn – 3:49PM (with 11 minutes to spare)