

Chancellor's General Education Advisory Committee
Tuesday, November 6, 2018
Anacapa Room, CSU Chancellor's Office
1:00-4:00 p.m.

Mary Ann Creadon, Chair, ASCSU Senator, Humboldt
Mark Van Selst, Vice Chair, ASCSU Senator, San Jose
David Barsky, ASCSU Senator, San Marcos
Denise Fleming, ASCSU Senator, East Bay
Gary Laver, ASCSU Senator, San Luis Obispo
Susan Schlievert, ASCSU Senator, Fresno
John Tarjan, ASCSU Senator, Bakersfield
Cynthia Trevisan, ASCSU Senator, Maritime
Darlene Yee-Melichar, ASCSU Senator, Chair Academic Affairs Committee, San Francisco
Virginia May, California Community College Academic Senate Representative, Sacramento City College
Tiffany Tran, CCC Articulation Officer, Irvine Valley
Jenni Robinson, CSU Articulation Officer, Humboldt
Alice Perez, Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, CCC Chancellor's Office
Alison Wrynn, Interim Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Programs & Faculty Development Interim State University
Dean, Academic Programs
Jason Sexton, Interim State University Associate Dean, Academic Programs

Minutes

1. Approval of Agenda (Mary Ann Creadon). MSP
2. Approval of May 2018 Minutes (Mary Ann Creadon) MSP
3. Approval of September 2018 Minutes (Mary Ann Creadon) MSP
4. Report of survey of CSU History Chairs on AP World History Exam changes (Mary Ann Creadon)
 - Consensus that 3 units makes sense for AP World History Exam (formal recommendation)
 - Other comments re: does a reduction in units mean lower demand?
 - Discussion of how to outreach to a discipline (GEAC appears to have pursued an acceptable path on this issue).
5. GE Task Force Update – time certain 2:15 p.m. (Jodie Ullman)
 - GETF has had a number of difficult discussions – we have not made any decisions (which will arrive in the form of recommendations). We put out the principles in October, and we've tried to keep the central focus on the outcomes for the students. Mapping back to our principles – is student centered, etc. The specific task force principles distributed in October are:
 1. The GE program must indeed be a CSU systemwide program, with internal coherence and consistency, and with its goals and relationship to other aspects of higher education understandable to students, faculty, and external stakeholders alike (e.g., legislators, taxpayers, and employers).
 2. The GE program must align readily with the curricula offered by the California Community Colleges and, when possible, the University of California, so that transfer among these sister institutions is in no way impeded and, ideally, enhanced.
 3. The GE program should meet all three goals of higher education, i.e., familiarization with “ways of knowing,” proficiency with fundamental skills, and enhancement of the dispositions of an engaged citizenry.
 4. The GE program should contain clear learning outcomes and be reviewable and subject to assessment and alteration where and as needed.
 5. The GE program, in particular, campus course offerings, should allow for appropriate campus autonomy within the systemwide GE program to express the uniqueness and strengths of each campus without hampering student transfer.
 6. The GE program should be coherent, easy to navigate, and consistently provide high quality learning experiences for all CSU students.
 7. The GE program should lead to persistence to degree completion and increased confidence in the students' ability to succeed in college.
 8. The GE program should be delivered in a context relevant to students (e.g., by encouraging campus-driven “themes” and “pathways” that link and provide multiple angles of view on a topic of significance).
 9. The GE program and related graduation requirements should be properly proportionate in number of required units to the entire undergraduate curriculum.
 10. The GE program should consist of the highest-quality educational experiences and high- impact practices: encouraging multi-disciplinary efforts, establishing student-student and student-faculty interaction, amplifying the creativity and energy of faculty, instilling curiosity in students, and enhancing their joy of learning.

Aligning UC and CSU needs: (1) language requirement into CSU, (2) writing intensive critical thinking, (3) area E (drop from CSU, out of alignment with most GE programs outside of the CSU), (4) add oral communication, (5) Area by area certification, (6) American Institutions.

What are the precise problems that the GETF, the CSU CO GE implementation of EO1100, and GEAC are trying to address?

6. Survey Results of Campus GE Coordinators on best practices in assessment; next steps (Mary Ann Creadon)

- Internal vs. public web-site
- What constitutes a best practice (who curates?)
- What is the mechanism for queries, etc. re: assessment?
- Using the system as an asset (discipline groups, assessment coordinators, e.g.) [cf., WASC ARC pre-convening] – do CCC assessment officers (faculty and admin at course and program level) share GE related assessment. ACCJC (WASC junior) – professional development on assessment meeting in early May (Santa Ana). ASCCC working on white papers on SLO assessment (Ginny May)
- A good practice: Three program outcomes per year, nine total outcomes, quick turn-around on closing the loop.
- Areas (not courses) to GE outcomes (too much variation per course and too many options in setting specific SLOs).
- “What are you doing on your campus to not disadvantage transfer students?”
- Next steps: re: assessment in GE
 - might be to ask for curriculum maps (e.g., <https://www.csulb.edu/assessment-office/creating-a-curriculum-map>)
 - ask how assess five core competencies
 - might be to show how GE is assessed elsewhere
 - build towards an affinity group for GE Assessment
 - program review for GE (are campuses doing it? Is GE efficacious?)
 - is there a system map for GE (this is also advice for GETF proposal)
 - the request from August look for campus trends in GE implementation.
 - Bakersfield revision to GE grounded in persistence towards graduation – intentional, useful, coherent...

7. Update on online community college (Alice Perez)

- CEO search unfolding (likely January hire)
- Will be a busy time for the online college (spring 2019)
- Seven-year implementation and validated business plan for the online college.
- Student centered design, competency-based learning in the online college (“the stranded worker”)
- Industry-vetted, industry-approved competencies and credentials (pathways most likely to focus on nested/scalable content)
 - Healthcare business services (e.g., \$32 @ entry... stack to higher level support)
 - Technology support (e.g., \$28 @ entry... stack to higher level IT support)
 - First line supervisor skills for multiple industries (e.g., @\$23/hr → \$35/hr)
 - The Board of Governors of the CCC is currently acting as the online college board but a new campus-specific board will be impaneled.
- Industry-informed (but not industry developed)... faculty have to create the curriculum.

8. New Business/Discussion

- CSU CO actions are undoing what campuses have seen as effective GE programs/policies in the service of standardizing GE across campuses. This is in the context of an ASCSU/CO task force that looks to improve the clarity of GE outcomes and a more effective pattern for students writ large.
- What is the current status?
 - 1) CSU CO is enforcing deep standardization in GE across campuses of the CSU.
 - 2) GETF will come out with a report and recommendations at some point.

9. Adjourn