
Chancellor's General Education Advisory Committee

Tuesday, January 17, 2023

11:00 am – 4:00 pm

Zoom Meeting

Minutes

Attendees: Eniko Csomay (Chair), Nancy Counts Gerber (Vice Chair), Mark Green, Gregory Wood, Gary Laver, Rick Ford, Elaine Newman, LaTonya Parker, Kate McCarthy, Jose Lozano, Michelle Plug, Dixie Samaniego, Caron Inouye (CSUCO)

Standing guests: Beth Steffel (ASCSU Chair), Mark Van Selst (ASCSU), Quajuana Chapman (CCCCO), Marci Sanchez (CSUCO), Bob Quinn (CCCCO), Raul Arambula (CCCCO),

Invited guests: none

Action items are in bold

1. Call to order and roll call (11:05)
2. Chair's welcome and introductory comments (11:05)
 - a. Agenda updates
3. Approved Agenda with modifications (11:10)
4. Future meetings (all will be zoom accessible) (11:15)
 - a. March 14 (modality = TBD) - has not been decided yet whether there will be an in-person option. If so, it would be at the Chancellor's Office from 11-4.
 - b. May 16 (modality = TBD)
5. Approval of November Minutes (Dropbox January/Minutes folder) (11:20)
 - a. Approved unanimously with one change – added "to meet UC requirements" in 8.a.v after "CCC will need to offer those courses".
6. Announcements
7. Segment reports of items relevant to GE (11:30)
 - a. [CCC System Office \(Lowe\)](#)
 - i. AB 928 (Berman, 2021) – Cal-GETC – impact analysis taking place due to the loss of Area E. Implementation group will meet virtually January 26 from 10-3. Asking what infrastructure changes are going to be needed. <https://www.ab928committee.org/> Area E Questions to answer:
 - Number of courses impacted.
 - What effect the removal of Area E will have on students?
 - ADT completion impact.

- ii. Ethnic Studies – CCC passed an Ethnic Studies graduation requirement. Looking at the CSU & UC core competencies to develop theirs. Hoping that Cal-GETC will move towards one core competency.
 - ASCCC is also pulling together a work group to vet the core competencies. We are mindful of the potential changes that Cal-GETC and the common course numbering projects may have on the ethnic studies requirement but are focusing on alignment today.
 - ASCSU passed a resolution that states if a course meets one set of competencies (CSU or UC), it will be accepted by the CSU and the UC will accept the CSU competencies so using the standards interchangeable (but not mixed) will work for the CSU. This is also been agreed upon by the system.
 - ES Core Competency requirements please see IGETC Standards 2.3, page 35 (middle of page) https://icas-ca.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/IGETC_STANDARDS-2.3_02June2022-Final.pdf
- iii. Baccalaureate Degree Program
 - Cycle 1: 8 programs have been fully approved; 1 still needs intersegmental agreement.
 - Cycle 2: Application deadline closed January 13. We will evaluate the 29 applications received and initiate intersegmental review. (Need more reader volunteers)
 - Cycle 3: Streamline application and intersegmental review process in preparation for next release in March 2023
- iv. AB 1705 – Companion to 705 re: remedial education. Will have follow up on how that impacts transfer GE.
- b. [CCC Academic Senate \(Parker\)](#)
 - i. Through resolution F22 15.01, the delegates of the ASCCC voted to endorse the proposed Cal-GETC and urge that CSU make the Lifelong Learning and Self-development (LLSD) area a graduation requirement—similar to American institutions—instead of restricting it to an upper division general education requirement.
 - ii. In addition, three other resolutions—F22 7.14, F22 09.02, and F22 15.06—were adopted to support maintaining LLSD opportunities for community college students. ICAS will consider the feedback from the academic senates from all three systems in establishing the final Cal-GETC pathway.
- c. CCC AO report (Plug)
 - i. Articulation Officers are continuing discussions regarding AB 928 and AB 111 and are anxiously awaiting any updates or progress on these areas of concern.
- d. CSU AO report (Lozano)
 - i. Waiting on CalGETC decision. Nothing new to report.
- e. CSU Office of the Chancellor (Inouye)

- i. Alison Wynn retired from the CSU and Brent Foster will serve as the interim AVC Academic Programs and Caron is stepping in on GEAC as his replacement.
 - ii. Search for the CSU Chancellor is moving forward. <https://www.calstate.edu/csu-system/chancellor/chancellor-search/Pages/default.aspx>
 - iii. 3700 total proposals submitted for GE approval (200 for Area F). Reviews are going on. New guiding notes are posted. <https://www.calstate.edu/csu-system/administration/academic-and-student-affairs/academic-programs-innovations-and-faculty-development/geac>
 - iv. CSU GE breadth – AVC Alva will address in her ASCSU remarks.
- f. CSU Students (CSSA) (Samaniego)
 - i. CSSA reps are on the Chancellor's search committee as well as other CSU searches.
 - ii. CSSA plenary at SJSU on January 27. Faculty Trustee Sabalius will speak.
 - iii. CSSA are close to the end of a Student Trustee search, applications are due January 30th, 2023, and more information can be found at this link <https://calstatestudents.org/involvement/student-trustee-search/>
- g. CSU Academic Senate (ASCSU) (Steffel)
 - i. Cal-GETC has been affirmed by all three segments (CCC, CSU, and UC).
 - ii. ICAS will likely take action on Cal-GETC at the February 1 meeting. The system senate chairs are working on a Cal-GETC statement.
 - iii. The system senate chairs will be giving a presentation on Cal-GETC at the AB 928 Implementation Committee on January 26. Although the AB 928 committee doesn't have purview over Cal-GETC, quite a bit of public comment at the AB 928 Implementation Committee has been regarding Cal-GETC.
 - iv. Cal-GETC builds on IGETC which never included Area E Lifelong Learning and Self-Development. Additionally, CSU IGETC had to get three units smaller (37 to 34 units). Area E Lifelong Learning and Self Development was never a part of IGETC and Cal-GETC had to have less units than CSU IGETC in order to comply with AB 928.
- h. Liaison to ASCSU JEDI committee (Nakano)
 - i. Recapped work from fall (Iranian women support, housing resolution, accessibility font resolution, Title IX investigation resolution, preferred names and pronouns, expansion of independent doctoral programs, heritage month celebration)
 - ii. Q: Is an American Institutions requirement that can or can't be double counted an equity issue? CCC mostly allow double counting. Constrains transfer students in a way that freshman don't.
 - iii. Comment: note that UC has a 2nd language graduation requirement

8. LUNCH (12:02)

9. CO charge discussion (1:00) (Dropbox GEAC Main folder)

American Institutions (AI) – One of our charges is to look at AI and how AB 928 might impact it. Below are notes on the discussion that occurred and some of the questions that came up. Our charge: *Provide recommendations on Title 5 § 40404. Requirements in United States History, Constitution and American Ideals - Although the current Title 5 § 40404. Requirements in United States History, Constitution and American Ideals policy is not general education, it has, for most students, been double-counted with their lower-division GE requirements. As the new unified GE policy will meet both CSU and UC requirements, and the UC does not require students who graduated from California high schools to meet the US History and Institutions requirement (except for UC Santa Barbara) how shall we incorporate US History and Institutions into CSU degrees in a manner that is equitable for both first time students and transfers?*

<https://calstate.policystat.com/policy/6591022/latest/>

- i. Cal-GETC is the pathway at the CCC that will clear all LD-GE for UC and CSU. How can we respond about UD-GE if CSU GE has not changed?
- ii. Different populations explain why the difference in UC and CSU. Less prepared in general for those in the CSU system and not in the UC.
- iii. If a student doesn't take AI at CCC then it can cause issues for high unit majors. Not sure how many allow it to be fulfilled in UD.
 - Two campuses don't allow AI to double count
 - Nine campuses allow one to double count
 - Eleven campuses allow both
 - One campus has a 3-unit AI, all other campuses have 6
- iv. The CSU has AI as a grad requirement while the UC has an AI and a language requirement.
- v. Q: Is there a list of programs with an AI exemption? Particularly for ADT transfers.
 - Could there be a process developed for programs to apply for an exemption? What about students? Could a student with an "A" in high school US History apply to get exempt?
 - Right now according to Title 5 it is only the CSU who can exempt a program. Campuses can waive it for individual students who have a hardship. There are not currently any program-level waivers right now.
- vi. History Council wants to meet with us. What do we want to ask them to reflect on?
 - AI not in GE but often treated as if it is and is double counted for GE on some campuses (see above). There are a couple of 3-unit courses that meet all of AI requirements (AIR) at SLO. What is the assessment of those courses? They folded it into lower division D. A set of criteria that SLO developed to assess that was shared.
 - What is different about our AI courses from what is offered in the high school curriculum (e.g., American History)?
 - What is the harm in asking campuses to develop their own requirements for AI?

- vii. Q: Why are we worried about this? Do we have to have all the same requirements? High unit majors are the ones who will have the biggest issues. Some say that AI has to be covered in UD-GE so transfer students on ADTs can take it. But how will that affect Community colleges?
 - viii. Q: If CSU GE has to align with Cal-GETC, then does the double counting of AI with GE have to be eliminated?
 - ix. CCC impact of AB928 – Probably won't be a big change in terms of their advising or on their students. They'll double count with GE as they always have. There will be an impact on other courses in Area C and D as long as AI is double counted, especially in D.
 - x. CCC would prefer Area E to be a graduation requirement now that's being pulled out of GE.
 - xi. Because a lot of majors have intro courses in LD-GE, we may see more students transferring into the CSU without AI.
 - xii. CCC pathways include AIR and they are encouraged to take it in the LD. Many CCC majors need to take additional units to get to 60 to transfer anyway, so for most majors it's not an issue.
 - xiii. Q: Do any CCC have a single course that meets the AIR? There are four that have a single course.
 - xiv. Q: Why do we need to do anything about AI right now? It seems to be working, so why mess with it?
- b. Upper Division GE
- i. About 10 years ago there was a BOT item to remove UD-GE. That resulted in the 120 unit limit. UD-GE is the common experience in the CSU given we have so many transfers.
 - ii. Q: Could we give the campuses more of a free hand with UD-GE? It's already pretty diverse so it isn't really a CSU-wide requirement. Get rid of B, C, D?
 - iii. Q: What is the compelling argument for keeping the B, C, D in the UD-GE?
 - iv. Does removing the B, C, D diminish the GE program? Wouldn't programs design GE courses to keep everything in their major?
 - v. Really the issue is to get folks out of their comfort zone. Scientists should be taking more C/D and humanities majors should take more B. More breadth. How can we accomplish this?
 - vi. Segment 3 (SFSU) was a set of three UD courses linked thematically that had to be interdisciplinary but not a B, C, & D. So maybe there are other ways to go. Colleges/departments are already gaming the system by developing GE courses that meet major requirements in their programs and/or encouraging students to take their GE within the college.
 - vii. Q: UD-GE does reduce the ability for high unit majors to take more advanced coursework. Is this making our degrees lesser than the UC degrees?
 - Ultimately it's the 120 that's the problem. Linking FTE to GE also is always going to cause problems.
 - viii. Q: Are high unit majors disadvantaged when students "can't take" additional courses to be competitive with others in applying to post-graduate programs?

Not necessarily, but it does lead to students taking way more than 120 units to complete entrance requirements to Ph.D. programs, medical/pharmacy schools etc.

10. Follow-up (2:30)

- a. AP credit
 - i. AP Pre-calculus and AP African American Studies are with other committees right now. APEP will pass a resolution approving the AP list (and other credit by exams). Math Council is likely to be supportive but we don't know anything about the AP AAS.
- b. Cambridge International
 - i. Five CI courses have been approved by campuses in the CSU. They are talking to SFSU this week.
 - ii. Not clear why they don't want to go through ACE which would be a clear path for them and they already have a few courses approved by them. They would like the CSU to adopt them – system wide. Likely that CI wants us to approve them so that they could have leverage with the school boards as that's how they get most of their money.
 - iii. This is the same group that have administered the exams for the British educational system for many years (40+) so they've been around for a while and likely offer a high quality program.
 - iv. Questions about Cambridge International
 - They are meeting with SFSU and there are five courses being accepted in the CSU.
 - Math Council likely to reject CI for math courses.
- c. CLEP report (2:55) (Dropbox January/Documents folder)
 - i. This is the type of report GEAC would like to see from CI but we would not encourage them as yet to compile it since we voted down the system-wide adoption last time.
 - ii. CLEP is basically \$85 for the test, \$85 for the testing center, and another \$25 for the study materials. CI is \$120. CI is linked to a course like AP. CLEP is completely separate.
 - iii. AP exams are heavily subsidized. A school board might pay \$12,000 for all of its exams. So many students don't pay much – students who economically may need it most can come down to \$5 per exam.
 - IB and CLEP are not as broadly distributed as AP.

11. New Business (3:10)

- a. Work to get the draft guiding notes by our March meeting to review them.
 - i. <https://www.calstate.edu/csu-system/administration/academic-and-student-affairs/academic-programs-innovations-and-faculty-development/geac/Documents/GE-Reviewers-Guiding-Notes.pdf>
- b. Gary asked about pending legislation to require Golden Four be completed in their first year.

c. There shouldn't be any controversies with IGETC this year.

Adjournment (3:23)

ECS/NCG 1/18/2023