

Chancellor's General Education Advisory Committee

Tuesday, May 5th 2020

11:00 am – 4:00 pm

Zoom Meeting

Minutes

Attendees: Mark Van Selst, John Tarjan, Mary Ann Creadon, Eniko Csomay, Julie Glass, Susan Schlievert, Stephen Stambough, Michelle Bean, Thalia Anagnos, Tyler Vaughan-Gomez, Tiffany Tran, Melissa Lavitt. Gary Laver, Eniko Csomay

Visitors: Quajuana Chapman (CSUCO). Catherine Nelson (ASCSU Chair), Alison Wrynn (CSUCO)

1. The meeting began at 11:07am
2. The agenda was approved as posted.
3. The minutes of March 17th were approved.
4. Chair's Report—Incorporated into items below
5. Other Reports
 - a. CO Report (Melissa Lavitt)
 - i. Thousands of course submissions are reviewed each year.
 - ii. On credit for prior learning (e.g., as per Title 5 changes for CCCs)
 1. Often done through exams, other assessments.
 2. Can be experiential, competency-based learning.
 3. There is separation between how a CCC and a CSU may consider credit for prior learning (there is no pass-through on evaluations of external work).
 4. We already have policy regarding learning in the US military (EO 1036).
 5. We are looking at existing CSU policy to see if updates are needed.
 6. In the fall, the CSU CO may pursue input towards drafting policies on prior learning.
 7. Should there be limits on the number of credits for this type of learning? (intertwined issues of lifetime unit maxima and use of any such units towards graduation versus excess units)
 - b. ASCSU Update
 - i. Ethnic Studies is a major focus for the upcoming ASCSU plenary
 - ii. A request to pursue any potentially-systemic substitutions/wavers/equivalencies in GE that might be recommended as a result of both CSU and CCC interest in credit for prior learning.
 - iii. No group is currently charged with oversight of the American Institutions Title 5 requirement. It was suggested that this be formally added to the charge of GEAC.
 - c. CCCCO Report (Raul Arambula):
 - i. Credit for prior learning

1. A lengthy discussion of implementation, transfer and articulation implications, etc. ensued.
 - ii. Competency-based learning—there will be a May 14 CCC webinar—open to all.
 - d. ASCCC Report (Michelle Bean)—Are working on the following issues (some of which are outside GE).
 - i. Guided Pathways
 1. Are developing a white paper, working on guidelines
 2. Have a webinar series to support local efforts
 3. There was a lengthy discussion of implementation and intent of the guided pathways on individual campuses.
 - ii. African-American Student Success
 - iii. COVID response
 1. Have a very useful ASCCC web site with lots of resources
 - iv. Faculty Diversification
 - v. Faculty Roles in Governance
 - vi. The ICAS Statement on ESL
 - vii. IGETC Standards Document
 - e. Articulation Officers (Tyler Vaughan-Gomez)
 - i. ASSIST
 1. Publishing functions have been improved.
 2. Hundreds of thousands of articulation agreements are being processed.
 - ii. Awarding AP Credit is a concern, particularly during the COVID crisis, including labs, etc.
6. AP Content and Testing
 - a. The CSU has agreed to accept College Board content and testing for that occurring in Spring 2020.
 - b. The content and accompanying testing need to be updated to reflect new standards.
 - c. IB credit also is being accepted as per prior agreements.
 7. CLEP Availability
 - a. Tests are available to be administered, but the bottleneck is limitations in the availability of testing sites.
 8. GEAC Contact List
 - a. Campuses will be requested to provide contact information in August (this request will be included in the GEAC annual report).
 9. FAQ re. GE Implementation (EO 1100)
 - a. We desire to give campuses guidance on what implementation details are up to the campuses and what restrictions may exist.
 10. Credit for Prior Learning
 - a. May be accepted by a campus based on local rules or decisions but the application of these local rules and decisions do not constrain applicability of the awarding of credit at any other campus.
 11. Modality of Instruction
 - a. There have been questions in the past about oral communication and science labs. In the past a pilot project evaluating the appropriateness of oral communication in an entirely technology mediated format was cut short by a re-interpretation of CSU GE policy that CSU GE evaluation could only focusses on outcomes, not modality, when reviewing courses.
 - b. The mid-semester change of modality in SPRING 2020 is likely to have particularly impeded attainment of outcomes for laboratory courses. GEAC is unaware of any

restriction on awarding GE credit as a result of these modality shifts. Presuming that in person labs remain the exception rather than the norm for FALL 2020, are there issues around outcomes in GE that would benefit from focused support?

- c. The CSU GE Guiding Notes do not constrain modality but may need to address outcomes in some areas where they do not exist (e.g., Lack of outcomes for B3 lab experiences).

12. GE Course Review Appeals

- a. CCC input was favorable on implementation and opportunity for GE appeals processes to occur.

13. Ethnic Studies Requirement (largely based in a discussion of AB 1460, AS 1320, and the CSU proposal [information item] for the upcoming CSU Board of Trustees meeting)

a. Discussion Topics Included

i. AB 1460

https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=201920200AB1460

ii. The potential CCC companion bill

https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201920200AB3310

iii. The ASCSU recommendation (course, learning outcomes)

https://www2.calstate.edu/csu-system/faculty-staff/academic-senate/resolutionsummaries/January_2020_Resolution_Summaries.pdf

iv. CSUCO Recommendation to the CSU Board of Trustees

<https://www2.calstate.edu/csu-system/board-of-trustees/past-meetings/2020/Documents/may-12-ED-POL.pdf>

1. This language would allow for courses from any disciplines to be included.

b. Issues to be Considered

i. Name of the Requirement (inclusion of social justice)

1. Can it be one or the other or does a course need to include both? The proposed Title 5 language seems a bit confusing.
2. There is a desire to allow campus flexibility in meeting the requirement in terms of where the course is housed.

ii. Content

1. The CO believes that campus curricular processes should be used to approve courses.

iii. Displacement of 3 Units from Area D to a new GE Area that did not previously exist

1. Discussions of possible flexibility in this requirement

- a. The flexibility to have courses displace Area C might be preferable.
- b. Could we allow a “carve out” of either C or D to accommodate the new requirement? (or other versions of campus autonomy and judgement)
- c. The question of ‘new’ versus ‘old’ courses fulfilling the requirement

2. An overlay across lower-division GE courses, as is done on some campuses, might be preferable

- a. Many current courses might be adapted to fulfill this requirement.
- b. However, it might confuse students.
- c. CSU CO represents that “*it cannot be an overlay*” (unclear if this is political or practical).

iv. System vs. Local Standards

v. Revision of ADTs

1. Some disciplines (i.e., business) may be unable to implement an ADT in 60 units under this change

- vi. Our CCC colleagues would like close consultation and collaboration as this effort goes forward since many of these courses will be taken in the CCC system.
- vii. Learning Outcomes
 - 1. The proposed learning outcomes from some groups seem VERY comprehensive
 - a. Too high a level—appropriate for an upper-division or graduate level course?
 - b. Too many to be accomplished in a 3-unit course?
 - 2. If faculty are overwhelmed by too many LOs to effectively implement, might they be likely to ignore some and focus on the ones that they feel more comfortable in delivering?

14. We adjourned at 3:08.