Chancellor’s General Education Advisory Committee
Chancellor’s Office, December 2, 2004
3:00-6:00 pm

Members Present: Ted Anagnoson (LA), Sam Edelman (Chico), Yula Flournoy (Mount San Jacinto College), Barbara Hooper (CSU articulation officer), John Karras (CO), Charlie Klein (CCC CO—via phone), Ken Nishita (Monterey Bay), Jeffrey Obayashi (CSSA), Cindy Parish (CCC articulation officer), Tapie Rohm (San Bernardino), Romey Sabalius (San José), Jo Service (CSU CO), Barbara Swerkes (Northridge), John Tarjan (Chair) (Bakersfield), Rudolph Vanterpool (Dominguez Hills), Jim Wheeler (Maritime)

Members Absent: Jim George (Bakersfield)

1. Introductions
2. Overview of GEAC by Dean Service
3. The agenda was approved.
4. Consideration of Amending or Clarifying CSU Executive Order 595 (Tapie)
   a. T. Rohm gave an overview of supplemental/clarifying language he developed in conjunction with other committee members.
   b. Might the language on electronic communication end up with the replacement of the oral communication requirement with an electronic-focused course?
   c. Is this not a heavy-handed way to get faculty to update their curriculum where it happens naturally within the disciplines?
   d. Is the language on electronic communication targeted toward a different form or just a different medium?
   e. There are some reservations about changing EO 595.
   f. Should these changes relate to all GE courses or should they focus on Areas? Perhaps we should focus this effort on the general skills/outcomes.
   g. Should we focus on electronic expression rather than finding information electronically?
   h. Financial issues should probably be addressed.
   i. Are we looking at a stand-alone course or the content of the GE package overall?
   j. International/global issues also need to be addressed. Finding, evaluating, analyzing, synthesizing information is much more important than retaining information.
   k. CSSA representative—electronic communications, other issues are gaining in importance. The curriculum needs to change to meet student needs. Financial planning may not need to be specified as a component of GE.
   l. EO 595 may have the status of a “constitution” that has an apparatus that supports it. It may be flexible enough to allow indicated changes. Perhaps a statement of support for the topics/courses to meet the needs of our modern students would be a better approach.
   m. We should focus our attention on “tweaking” Areas A-D and focus our efforts on amending Area E (or some other incarnation of the Area). Areas A-D will be very difficult to modify. The total number of units cannot realistically be changed.
n. Changing this order could have dramatic consequences—is there another approach such as a statement on competencies to address indicated needs of our students.
o. EO 595 never fully defines what an “educated person” is. Can we give advice on how the existing package can be modified to give students the skills and understanding they need to be successful.
p. It is difficult to believe that campus GE programs would be stagnant and not change to meet changing needs. Do we need to do anything?
q. Any communications should state that the suggested features are already in place on many campuses.
r. There is no consensus on the definition of electronic communications.
s. Perhaps we could modify the EO 595 language at least once a generation—should we do this?
t. Perhaps we should overlay changes on the existing Areas.

5. Development of Supplementary Criteria for Use by CSU Campuses in Reviewing their Campus General Education Programs (John T.)
   a. May be a better approach than amending EO 595—would also have implications for UD GE.
   b. Perhaps the supplemental criteria could be overlaid on existing courses. Financial literacy should be a part of every college student’s education.
   c. **Tapie, Barbara, Yula, Jim, Sam, Ted, John** will constitute a subcommittee which will draft a letter to be sent to campuses (CC, CSU).

6. The Existing Requirement that Community Colleges Submitting Course Outlines via OSCAR for Consideration for IGETC or CSU GE-Breadth Specify Whether the Course Might be Delivered via Distance Education
   a. CSU speech communication department chairs discussed this issue at IMPAC meetings. The National Communications Association, CSU chairs are recommending that there still needs to be a face-to-face interaction for public speaking courses.
   b. Faculty observation, audience, faculty feedback have always been a requirement of oral communications courses.
   c. Some lab courses in the sciences have been approved but there have been very rigorous requirements placed upon these courses.
   d. Current CSU practice is to require that mode of delivery be indicated.
   e. ASCCC does not want the requirement to indicate mode of delivery.
   f. The indication serves to allow the reviewer to make a more informed judgment as to whether the materials submitted are sufficient to make a determination on the adequacy of the course content and pedagogy.
   g. Verifying test-takers in on-line courses is an issue.
   h. The CCC distance education group at the CO is also opposed to this indication. But, the process does not seem overly burdensome.
   i. CC courses have to be offered on-line because of space consideration.
   j. Yula explained the process whereby supplementary information is submitted to and reviewed by curriculum committees at cc's before a course is offered via distance ed. Some members of the group asked if such supplementary information could be included with the course outline sent to CSU. Yula will take the issue back to the ASCCC.
   k. There was no consensus to change the current requirement.
7. Reciprocity in Accepting Completion of Lower-Division General Education Requirements for Students Transferring from one CSU Campus to Another—It is likely that any problems in this regard arise more from the labeling of graduation requirements, misunderstanding or upper vs. lower-division GE rather than a lack of reciprocity. The Academic Affairs Committee was requested to look at campus lower-division graduation requirements outside of GE.

8. Lower-Division Transfer Patterns and Partial Completion/Certification of GE Requirements Prior to Transfer—to be held over for our next meeting.
   a. Engineering faculty have rejected the notion of SCIGETC (which closely parallels our recommendations from last spring). Agreements on GE completion exist on some CSU campuses.
   b. There is some concern that if LDTP patterns do not include all 39 units of GE that students may be exposed to additional requirements upon transfer.

9. Double-Counting of GE Courses for other Requirements (US History/Constitution/American Ideals)
   a. Almost all CSU campuses allow double-counting of American institutions courses.
   b. No action is indicated.

10. Updates on IGETC and CSU GE-Breadth, OSCAR, United States History/Constitution/American Ideals
   a. The review cycle is starting very soon. The deadline for submissions in December 17th.
   b. Since 1998, all existing and American institutions courses are sequentially being reviewed. Campuses that have not submitted courses for review have found blank lists on ASSIST.

11. Changes to the ELM
   a. Jim Wheeler presented an overview of ELM and the changes
      i. What is the ELM designed to do? Probably measures the preparation of students to perform in baccalaureate courses utilizing mathematical reasoning rather than specific skills relating to algebra, trigonometry, etc.
      ii. Is this in our purview? Likely yes.
      iii. The studies done to date seem to indicate that ELM still does a good job of predicting performance.
   b. No action is indicated.