

## CSU CHANCELLOR'S GENERAL EDUCATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

### Annual Report 2018-2019

The Chancellor's General Education Advisory Committee (GEAC) met five times during the 2018-2019 academic year. Four of the meetings were held at the CSU System Headquarters (September, January, March and May), and one virtual meeting was held in November. The committee consisted of the following members:

Mary Ann Creadon (Chair)	English	Humboldt
Mark Van Selst (Vice Chair)	Psychology	San Jose
David Barsky	Mathematics	San Marcos
Stetler Brown	CSSA	San Diego
Bruno Giberti	CSU Academic Affairs	Cal Poly SLO
Gary Laver	Psych/Child Development	Cal Poly SLO
Jenni Robinson	CSU Articulation Officer	Humboldt
Susan Schlievert	Curriculum & Instruction	Fresno
John Tarjan	Business Administration	Bakersfield
Cynthia Trevisan	Physics	Maritime
Darlene Yee-Melichar	Gerontology	San Francisco
Virginia May	CCC Academic Senate	Sacramento City
Tiffany Tran	CCC Articulation Officer	Irvine Valley
Alice Perez	CCC Acad. Affairs Vice Chancellor	CCC CO
Alison Wrynn	CSU Interim AVC Acad. Programs	CSU CO

Until her retirement from the ASCSU in January 2019, Denise Fleming, Teacher Education, East Bay, was a CSU Academic Senate (ASCSU) representative on the committee. Regular guests included Catherine Nelson, CSU Academic Senate Chair, Jodie Ullman, ASCSU General Education Task Force Co-Chair, and Jason Sexton, CSU Interim State University Associate Dean, Academic Programs.

### Recommendations

**CSU Guiding Notes. The Chancellor charged the committee** to review revisions to the *CSU Guiding Notes* to “ensure that course review criteria are based solely on CSU policy.” GEAC had performed a section-by-section review and updating of the *Guiding Notes* in the previous

academic year. The committee reexamined those updates and revisions, and recommended adoption of the *CSU Guiding Notes* as published in October 2018.

**AP World History Exam.** As a result of changes that College Board is making to the AP World History course and exam, GEAC was asked to make a recommendation regarding minimum units awarded for the new exam. The existing course covers the Paleolithic era to the present, and is awarded a minimum of 6 units by the CSU for successful completion of the AP exam. The Board developed a new course and exam, titled “World History: Modern,” which begins 1200 CE to the present. They are still developing a course and exam for the Paleolithic age to 1200 CE. The question brought to the committee was how many minimum units to award successful completion of the exam for the newly developed course. GEAC discussed the change and endorsed a reduction of minimum units awarded to 3 units. The committee then surveyed CSU campus History chairs, who unanimously agreed that this reduction is appropriate. GEAC thus recommended that “AP World History: Modern” be awarded a minimum of 3 units for successful completion of the exam. The committee looks forward to being informed by College Board of progress on the development of the second World History course and exam.

## Reports

**GE Assessment Best Practices.** GEAC was charged by the Chancellor to “develop GE assessment best practice suggestions that can be shared across the California State University.” Accordingly, the committee developed survey questions for campus GE Directors that were distributed and returned before the November, January, March and May meetings. A different set of questions was distributed each time. Those questions were:

*November:*

1. Describe one GE assessment practice or protocol that works well for you.
2. What evidence can you provide to show how/why this practice or protocol works well?

*January:*

3. Please provide a matrix, graph, or other document that shows a map or plan for your GE assessment.

*March:*

4. Who is responsible for assessing upper division GE on your campus (e.g., are courses assessed by departments, by a GE or Assessment Committee, or by some other unit)?
5. What is the nature of upper division GE assessment on your campus? Does that assessment contain student learning outcomes that are directed toward development or mastery of learning? In any other way you can describe, is upper division assessment distinctly directed toward the upper division status of the courses? Alternatively, are the outcomes for lower and upper division GE courses the same? Is there some other character you can describe about this assessment as a result of the nature of upper division GE courses on your campus?

*May:*

6. What tools or support do you have in place that help with your GE assessment process and practice, and that might be useful for other campuses?
7. What tools or support do you need that could help you in your assessment of GE?

As they were received, the responses were reviewed and discussed by the committee, and a new set of questions devised for the next survey. At the end of the academic year, the collated responses were sent to the campus GE directors. During the year, the committee discussed how best to make the survey and responses useful as best practices for the campuses, and decided to provide a website devoted to best practices in assessment that could be accessed from the GEAC website. This website is in progress. In addition, the committee produced a brief white paper summary of the survey and responses that will be sent to campus GE Directors and added to the website.

**ASCSU General Education Task Force Updates.** The committee received update reports during the year on the deliberations and progress of the ASCSU GE Task Force. The Task Force first met in March 2017 and continued its work until it presented its report to the CSU Senate in February 2019. Jodie Ullman, co-chair of the GETF, provided these updates until the report was completed and sent to the ASCSU. Catherine Nelson, ASCSU Chair, then reported on the possible processes for moving forward with the report.

**CCC Online Community College.** Alice Perez, the CCC Chancellor's Office representative, reported during the year on the status of the creation of the online community college. There is a seven-year implementation plan, and a required validated business plan for the college. The college will operate with a foundation of competency-based learning. The plan for the college will contain industry-vetted and industry-approved competencies and credentials. Faculty will create the curriculum, which will concentrate on the following programs: healthcare business services; technology support; and first-line supervisor skills for multiple industries. These programs will provide credentials that are intended to be nested, with a capacity to be stacked with other credentials. This proposal will next go to the CCC Office of General Counsel. GEAC should continue to be apprised of the progress of this initiative.

### **Issues**

During the year GEAC discussed a host of issues without providing formal recommendations. The following is a partial list, either of important issues which we referred to other committees, or issues the committee discussed substantially without action, but that may form part of GEAC's deliberations in 2019-20.

**External Examinations for CSU GE Breadth. The committee was charged by the Chancellor** to review a particular section of EO 1036 (1.2.4) and provide recommendations on whether the current structure of the memorandum in that section is appropriate or should be revised. The AP and IB charts in this section contained what sometimes was a confusing designation of units awarded for *admission*, as opposed to units awarded for *GE credit*. A revision to the charts had

been made so that the chart category “Minimum Semester Credits Awarded Towards Admission” was removed, since those units are determined by the admitting CSU campus. The committee discussed the advisability of this revision and possible solutions of how best to present this information to students and to articulation officers. However, the committee concluded that the Academic Preparation and Education Programs (APEP) Committee of ASCSU should take up this item for a policy recommendation and advised the chair of that committee to follow up with a review of this revision.

**AB 705 Implementation.** This legislation, directed to mathematics and English placement, is intended to support assessment and placement strategies to increase student completion rates and close the achievement gap. It requires colleges to consider a student’s high school coursework and GPA as the primary factors for placement. Under AB 705, colleges are prohibited from placing students into a pre-transfer course in mathematics or English unless the following conditions exist: 1) students must be highly unlikely to succeed in the transfer-level courses and 2) enrollment in the pre-transfer course will improve the student’s likelihood of completing the transfer-level course within one year. A broad group of stakeholders were already preparing for this shift so that by Spring 2019 high school data would be the primary predictor for placement. The first full academic year for the implementation of this legislative mandate is 2019-20. Thus, GEAC should ask for an update on this implementation in Fall 2019.

**Credit for Prior Learning.** Discussions about the place of credit for prior learning (CPL) in the awarding of units for GE credit come up every year at GEAC. They are appended to different contexts and situations each year. Part of GEAC’s interest in the online community college, for instance, has to do with the extent to which any transferability for GE credit of coursework from that college will be related to the possible articulation of competency-based learning for GE course/units approval. Another context for discussion was the CCC proposed revision to Title 5, Sec. 55050. The revision alters the title of the section from “Credit by Examination” to “Credit for Prior Learning,” and subsumes the former under the latter in a series of language changes that center on “assessment” in various forms rather than “examination.” The proposed revision is in response to legislative mandates to the community colleges. The revision proposes that, in the case of prior learning experiences, “colleges shall consider the credit recommendation of the American Council on Education . . . . Upon a student’s demonstration of sufficient mastery through an examination of assessment, an award of credit should be made, if possible, to California Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum, California State University General Education Breadth, and local community college general education requirements or requirements for a student’s chosen program.” Because part of the impetus for this proposal derives from the passage last September of SB 1071, to award course credit for prior military education, training and service, GEAC’s discussions included issues regarding the awarding of units when students may want to choose not to add the units to their total units achieved (because of financial aid considerations), in conflict with a school’s need to use the units to receive GI Bill funding. The committee also discussed how community colleges would integrate these credits with their Guided Pathways, and how the college would benchmark learning that happens outside the classroom. General discussions were held about the academic integrity of the credit awarded, including course credit for military service, and the issue of relying on ACE descriptions to certify courses, as opposed to relying on CSU Guiding Notes. The committee

discussed as well the consequences for the CSU if there are interpretations guiding the awarding of CCC credits that the CSU as a system has not weighed in on in terms of transfer. These recent initiatives require that GEAC continue discussions on CPL next year, particularly the question of the possible need for a more general policy on CPL.

**General Education Task Force Report.** As GEAC received updates on the deliberations of the Task Force, it also learned about various elements of GE that the Task Force was considering. Some of those elements became fruitful discussion items for GEAC during the course of the year. These topics included: intentionality, campus autonomy, GEAR, double counting and overlays, Area E, the importance of upper division GE, and the process for feedback once the report was completed, including the question of GEAC's role in feedback.

### **Agenda or Action Items for 2019-2020**

Some of the possible items below may be in abeyance because action has not been taken that would necessitate any recommendation by the committee. However, GEAC should be ready to take up the following items:

- Credit for Prior Learning: Revisions to Title 5. 55050
- Updates on online community college
- Revisions to IGETC standards (regular review)
- Progress of GE Assessment Best Practices website, and any further action
- Updates on implementation issues of EO 1100R and EO 1110
- GETF Report and further action or work by GEAC
- Area E course changes as a result of EO 1100R
- Service learning and general education
- AB 1460 ethnic studies graduation requirement and the place of GE in implementation
- AB 705 implementation
- GE Breadth, campus autonomy and recent executive orders

### **ASCSU Resolutions 2018-19**

During the academic year 2018-2019, ASCSU adopted a number of resolutions relevant to general education in the CSU. All ASCSU resolutions, the resolution's originating committee(s), the status of the resolutions, and the Chancellor's response to the resolutions can be found at:

<https://www2.calstate.edu/csu-system/faculty-staff/academic-senate>

Specific resolutions identified as most pertinent to systemwide GE policies and implementation include:

AS-3344-18/EX/APEP September 6-7, 2018 COMMENDATION OF ERIC FORBES

Dr. Forbes (now retired) has been a central figure in effective partnership with the ASCSU including in work related to General Education.

AS-3354-18/FA (Rev) November 8-9, 2018 ENCOURAGING RESPONSIBLE CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT AND MODIFICATION UNDER THE HIGHER EDUCATION EMPLOYER-EMPLOYEE RELATIONS ACT (HEERA)

This resolution expresses serious concerns about the adequacy of the consultation, the content, and the timeline of revised Executive Order 1100 and newly released Executive Order 1110. Particular items call out unintended consequences of top-down curriculum revision that is rushed and poorly executed (e.g., damage to Ethnic Studies and other campus foci).

AS-3356-18/APEP/AA (Rev) November 8-9, 2018 CREATION OF CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM NETWORKS

Intra- and intersystem projects, such as Intersegmental Major Preparation Articulated Curriculum, Senate Bill (SB) 1440, Early Start, and CalState Online have demonstrated the value of communication and coordination among the individual academic disciplines in the CSU and the value of ongoing discussion and planning among the curricular experts within each of those disciplines... The current ask focusses the 'ask' to actions directly related to curriculum development and assessment, especially insofar as the curricular issues relate to SB 1440 transfer students. Other disciplinary groups could be established (or remain viable and possibly with additional support from the CSU CO) to address other, more expansive, disciplinary issues. It is assumed that GE outcomes would be positively impacted by the existence of these groups.

AS-3364-19/East Bay Delegation January 17-18, 2019 COMMENDATION FOR SENATOR DENISE FLEMING

Dr. Fleming was an ASCSU senate representative from CSU: East Bay. She contributed expertise to both GEAC and APEP.

AS-3367-19/APEP Flexibility in the Implementation of Early Start

This resolution ask for flexibility in EO1110 re: GE credit and other requirements invoked in EO1100 and EO1110 in the context of campus Early Start programs and preserving prior successful efforts.

AS-3373-19/EX Receipt of the General Education Task Force Report; and AS-3378-29/FA Resolution Rejecting the February 2019 General Education Task Force Report

Both resolutions failed. The ASCSU is continuing to collect campus and individual responses to the GETF report.

AS-3377-19/APEP (Rev) March 14-15, 2019 RECOMMENDING A FOUR-YEAR MATHEMATICS/QUANTITATIVE REASONING REQUIREMENT FOR FRESHMAN ADMISSION TO THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY: TOWARDS A RESPONSIBLE AND RESPONSIVE POLICY

This resolution supports movement towards requiring a fourth year of math requirement for incoming freshman to be CSU-eligible. This could impact expectation in GE relevant to Area B4.

AS-3380-19/FA/FGA/EX May 16-17, 2019 IN SUPPORT OF ETHNIC STUDIES PROGRAMS IN THE CSU

The ASCSU shares the concerns of Assembly members Weber, Gloria, and Medina regarding the importance of Ethnic Studies curriculum in the CSU while expressing opposition to legislative intrusion in the CSU curriculum. This is relevant to GEAC because if the Weber bill were to pass, it is highly likely that this external requirement would impact GE requirements (potentially displacing other content).

AS-3382-19/AA/APEP May 16-17, 2019 ENDORSEMENT OF CRITERIA FOR ENGINEERING MODEL CURRICULA (MC) FOR TRANSFER TO RECEIVE THE SAME ADMISSION ADVANTAGE AS FOR TRANSFER MODEL CURRICULA (TMC)

This resolution attempts to increase the message that high lower division unit programs may be best served by having their students delay some of GE until after transfer, if that delay allows the students to be better prepared for upper-division major coursework.

AS-3383-19/APEP May 16, 2019 IN SUPPORT OF “THE STRATEGIC ADVANTAGE OF THE DISTINCTIVENESS OF THE TWENTY-THREE CAMPUSES OF THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM” (BOARD OF TRUSTEES, NOVEMBER, 2008)

This resolution is about “systemness” versus campus distinctiveness. There has been a recent shift to reduce campus distinctiveness through top-down directives requiring deep uniformity. While acknowledging that there are some functions and desirable aspects that can come from a campus being part of a system (cf., library resources, purchasing power, broad outlines for General Education structures, the ability to share best practices that have worked with various campus populations, etc.), there are many strengths to campus distinctiveness that appear to be in danger. The revisions to EO 1100 and the associated new interpretations have deeply constrained what, in some cases, had been unique and effective approaches in GE.

AS-3384-19/APEP May 16-17, 2019 ON THE ACADEMIC SENATE CCC (ASCCC) RESOLUTION 5.02 S19 “SUPPORT FOR THE CSU UNITED STATES HISTORY, CONSTITUTION AND AMERICAN IDEALS COMMONLY KNOWN AS THE AMERICAN INSTITUTIONS REQUIREMENT”

ASCCC Resolution 5.02 S19 (<https://www.asccc.org/resolutions/support-csuunited-states-history-constitution-and-american-ideals-requirement-commonly>), in part, states: *“... although the United States History, Constitution and American Ideals Requirement is not a requirement of the CCC system, many students choose to fulfill the requirement through coursework at a community college before transferring to the CSU, and thus this*

*CSU requirement has been the backbone of U.S. history and civic education in both the CSU and CCC systems”*