

Chancellor's General Education Advisory Committee

Tuesday, September 4, 2018
Anacapa Room, CSU Chancellor's Office, 11:00-4:00

MINUTES

GEAC Membership Attendees:

Mary Ann Creadon, Chair ASCSU Senator, Humboldt
Mark Van Selst, Vice Chair ASCSU Senator, San Jose
David Barsky ASCSU Senator, San Marcos
Gary Laver ASCSU Senator, San Luis Obispo (via ZOOM)
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 CCC Academic Senate Representative, Sacramento City
Bruno Giberti, Associate Vice Provost Academic Programs & Planning, Cal Poly SLO
Tiffany Tran CCC Articulation Officer, Irvine Valley
Alice Perez Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, CCC Chancellor's Office (via Phone)
Alison Wrynn Interim Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Programs & Faculty Development
Interim State University Dean, Academic Programs
Stetler Brown – CSSA representative
Jenni Robinson – Humboldt

GEAC Membership Absent:

Denise Fleming ASCSU Senator, East Bay (conflicting meeting on campus)

Guests:

Quajuana Chapman – re: GE Review
Karen Simpson-Alisca – CSU CO
Jodie Ullman – ASCSU

1. *Introduction of Members; Announcements (Mary Ann Creadon)*
2. *Approval of Agenda (Mary Ann Creadon)*
 - 2.1 ACTION: Approved as amended (MSP)**
3. *Review of 2017-18 GEAC Annual Report (Mary Ann Creadon; Mark Van Selst)*
 - a. Reviewed.
 - b. Clarification was made on the following relevant to this review:
 - i. CCC courses may be submitted to meet any area of GE. There are some courses that are better natural fits to areas than others.
4. *Review of Chancellor's Aug. 21, 2018 Memorandum with tasks For GEAC this year (Mary Ann Creadon and Alison Wrynn)*

- a. CSU Guiding Notes – “to ensure that course review criteria are based solely on CSU policy”
 - i. This was not presented as a change in policy. The Executive Orders are inherently broad – expert review remains a preferred method of resolving ambiguity.
 - ii. The concern / issue is illustrated in the former oral communication prohibition against online courses that appeared to generate policy via the guiding notes rather than a limitation stemming out of EO1100 and/or other CSU policy.
 - b. External examinations and GE Breadth credit – EO 1036 (Section 1.2.4) and coded memorandum on Systemwide Credit for External Examinations (AA-2018-06) – are the current structures appropriate or should there be revisions?
 - c. Campus-based GE Assessment Practices – develop best practice suggestions that can be shared across the CSU.
5. *Review EO 1036, sec. 1.2.4 and current coded memorandum on Systemwide Credit for External Examinations (Karen Simpson Alisca, Time Certain 11:30 a.m.)*
- a. reviewed
 - b. Possible referral to APEP re: units at admission versus GE units – how to best present this information to students and to articulation officers (CCC and CSU)
6. *Lunch (12:15 to 1:00)*
7. *Review AP World History Exam changes and make a recommendation regarding “minimum semester credits earned” (Alison Wrynn).*
- a. **GEAC recommendation: endorse reduction of “minimum units awarded” from 6 semester units to 3 with the change from AP World History to AP World History: Modern; the AP World History: Modern will retain GE units at 3.**
 - i. Note that individual campuses can retain awarding 6 units of credit for the AP World History exam (now AP World History: Modern) . AP world history (as currently awarded) will end at an appropriate year (when the exam is last offered).
 - ii. **ACTION: Mary Ann will distribute an inquiry re: this possible action on AP World History: Modern to CSU History Chairs. This item will come back for the November GEAC meeting.**
8. *Identifying trends in CSU campus-based GE assessment practices: what process to follow? (Mary Ann Creadon)*
- Possible actions:** (what can we do to help provide clarity for students and faculty):
- a. How are advising sheets (or equivalent) used by campuses in explaining GE to students (and faculty).
 - b. Short presentations per campus (conference? ITL?) (the question of the value of Narrative vs. collection of artefacts of GE assessment/implementation processes)
 - c. We want to collect the outcomes and the assessment practices – how best to do this?
 - d. System conference on GE? (CSU CO? ITL? AACU? WSCUC?)

- e. Tying into student success
 - a. “how does a student develop an understanding of GE?”,
 - b. “How do faculty learn about/envision GE?,”
 - c. “How are GE outcomes assessed (reporting out to WSCUC)?”
- f. Who to approach with what question (preferably direct). EO1100 asks five things of a campus:

- a. Aligns the GE curriculum with campus GE outcomes;
- b. Specifies explicit criteria for assessing the stated outcomes;
- c. Identifies when and how each outcome shall be assessed;
- d. Organizes and analyzes the collection of evidence;
- e. Uses the assessment results to make improvements to the GE program, courses and pedagogy.

9. *Introduction to revised version of Guiding Notes (Alison Wrynn)*

- a. Changes:
 - i. Reformatting of structure for readability
 - ii. Corrections or queries welcome before SEPT 14 (publication date)
 - iii. Introduction of “recency of publication” requirement
 - iv. Introduction of lab manual requirement.
- b. ACTION: GEAC recommends publishing as revised (pending further updates) MSP.**

10. *Update from GE Task Force (Jodie Ullman, Time Certain 3:00)*

- a. An overview of the scope and goals was presented.
- b. A tentative recommendation is being developed. This model will be shared broadly in the near future. The GETF wants to ensure that it models appropriate consultative processes.
- c. Feedback from GEAC:
 - i. Increase relevance as a dominant theme (core competencies/skills) is one of the most promising pathways for change.
 - 1. Bakersfield model: reflections on a pathway at freshman, sophomore, and senior level. INTRO/DEV/MASTER (all upper division courses reinforce lower division elements) – a lot of use of overlay requirements
 - ii. Pathways – seen as desirable by the GETF as a way of building intentionality/structure.
 - iii. Is the goal to simplify the structure and reduce units? But I hear a resistance to the complexity of overlays... A separate overlay structure (one course, two objectives) is one model. A distributed model is to have the outcome met by infusing the outcome across a larger set of courses.
 - iv. How will “technology” as an area be incorporated into GE requirements?
 - v. Flexibility in units (e.g., re: transfer degrees) that can count for GE per course which can limit ADT authorization given that the content courses + GE minima exceed 60 units.

11. *NEW ITEMS*

- a. Current placement guidance for the CCC System (Ginny)

i. AB 705 and July 10 AB 705 Implementation Memo

The overall movement away from calculus preparation style preparation sequences is a common one across higher education. Questions remain regarding the efficacy and long-term outcomes for student learning surrounding the plethora of changes related to mathematics/QR preparation.

b. SB 1071 – course credit for military service (see:

https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180SB1071

- i. “the right thing to do” (award appropriate credit for experience) but “the wrong way to do it” (the bill is not logically congruent with how GE transfer is evaluated).
- ii. There seems to be poor alignment to CSU GE guidelines and the ACE descriptions (most seem to be in Criminal Justice). Most are career-education type courses and thus the “push” to legislate “assistance” to veteran students may work against quality degree attainment.

12. *Adjourn*