MEETING NOTES

1. Supplemental GE Review Criteria
   a. The several versions of the letter before us was drafted as an alternate approach to modifying the language in EO 595.
   b. There are mixed feelings about sending anything forward to campuses in light of other initiatives currently underway such as LDTP and developments regarding GE at CSU, Northridge.
   c. One member feels the proposed supplemental language seems to diminish the emphasis on the traditional GE areas and skills and focuses more on specific topical areas.
   d. The Academic Affairs Committee will likely be taking up a comprehensive review of EO 595 in conjunction with GEAC over the next year in response to Board initiatives.
   e. There will be an item on GE as part of a broader facilitating progress to degree in front of the Board of Trustees next week.
   f. Executive Vice Chancellor Spence has expressed concern about the size of GE Area-Breadth, particularly as it affects high-unit majors.
   g. One member expressed a preference that information literacy be required. Ethics should also be a part of the curriculum. Having information literacy standards would be a help for the community colleges.
   h. There is a split between faculty who believe information literacy should be a part of GE and those who feel it should be part of major requirements.
   i. The language in EO 595 seems out of date and insufficient. The supplemental language further defines things.
   j. The question, “What do our students need to be prepared for the 21st Century” should guide our deliberations.
   k. It will be interesting to see if GE is “tweaked” or if we will face a paradigm shift in the approach to GE. The former is more likely.
   l. We may want to table the supplemental language pending developments over the coming year.
   m. CC students face more than 39 units of lower-division GE due to higher unit value (>3) courses at many CCs and additional CSU campus-specific requirements. Adding to the package would place a hardship on students.
n. “Life-long understanding” (Area E) should encompass things like information literacy.

o. WASC guidelines for GE include a minimum of 45 units and spreading GE throughout the curriculum. WASC expects assessment of GE. There may be a problem if there is no culminating experience in GE. If GE is not assessed in conjunction with a culminating experience, where and with what resources will it be assessed on the campuses?

p. U.S. History and American government courses may deserve attention. There is a lack of parallelism with IGETC. Also these subjects are covered in some depth in high school.

q. History courses can be considered as either social science or humanities in the CSU by agreement. If a course is accepted as humanities for IGETC, it must be allowed to be counted as such for Area Breadth.

r. The stability of the GE pattern has been a great boon to our transfer students.

s. There are no system guidelines on double-counting. They vary from campus to campus. This issue may be a focus of the CO and the Trustees. There are likely to be small shifts rather than big changes in the curricular content of GE. Double-counting and total units may be reexamined.

t. Double-counting mandates would result in relatively small changes.

u. The issue of supplemental language was tabled pending developments in GE over the summer.

2. Partial Certification of GE Prior to Transfer/LDTP Patterns

a. The committee has endorsed the concept of not holding students liable for completion of campus-specific GE requirements in an area (just completion of the statewide GE-Breadth requirements in that area) if patterns (e.g., SCIGETC, LDTP) do not require full completion of all areas.

b. No further action is needed in addition to the Senate resolution (sponsored by AA, implicitly endorsed by GEAC) that was passed last year.


a. No action is required.

b. Every CSU campus accepts double-counting for CC transfers.

4. Update on GE Course Review

a. Was mostly done on-line.

b. We will have more members on the review committee next year.

c. The reviews likely will be done exclusively through OSCAR next year.

d. Perhaps an informal review of the success of OSCAR should be undertaken.
   i. There is a different dynamic when people are not in the same room.
   ii. Dean Service: it is difficult to separate the effect of different reviewers vs. the technology.
   iii. The pros and cons of OSCAR were discussed.
      1. Being able to refer back on-line, to add comments, to be able to see others' comments, to be able to focus area by area, were listed as plusses of the system.
      2. The inability to discuss issues with colleagues quickly was listed as a minus.

e. This year's reviews and reviewers seemed to be “tougher” than those in past years.
f. It may be time for comprehensive review of courses certified for GE. This would be a major undertaking. The comprehensive review of American Institution courses undertaken 6 years ago is just coming to an end.
g. The overwhelming majority of CC campuses submitted their materials in OSCAR format this year.
h. Science courses with an applied cast (such as soil science courses) and other courses offered by application-oriented departments such as criminal justice have traditionally been allowed in GE-Breadth.
i. In response to a question about whether there is an increase in occupational courses being submitted for the natural sciences area: there have always been courses like this submitted and a few are approved if they can demonstrate that they cover basic principles of science. GIS courses have been submitted but it is unclear if any have been approved.
j. LDTP major course review may be very different from GE course review.
   i. Major courses have specific content mandates vs. general guidelines for GE courses.
   ii. The role of staff in the review process may be different as they are not subject matter specialists.
   iii. GE is a collective faculty responsibility but major preparation is discipline, campus specific.
k. The OSCAR format has resulted in campuses being more responsive to comments from the committee. It has also allowed the committee to give more effective feedback regarding resubmissions.

5. Mode of Delivery for Certified Courses—indication of technology-mediated possibilities in OSCAR
   a. Theater Arts, Dance, Communication Studies, Life and Natural Science faculties are concerned about distance and technology-mediated instruction.
   b. Communications Studies is in favor of allowing a distance lecture but requiring live body speaking (with an instructor and student audience).
   c. Perhaps agreements by all disciplines with concerns are needed.
   d. CCs are worried about a reflexive reaction to distance learning such as they experienced with UC in the recent past. The CCs have systems in place for internal review. We still need to hear from Yula about the ASCCC perspective on this.
   e. Perhaps we need a box in OSCAR where information on distance learning that is provided in the college approval process can be recorded. OSCAR presently has just a check-box: “Is this course delivered via distance education?” There was a proposal to have an indication of mode of delivery in OSCAR with an area for explanation of how course objectives are achieved through distant delivery.
   f. Verification of test-taking and the completion of other course requirements is an issue. This is an important issue for athletics eligibility. If verification is not supplied, the course cannot be used for eligibility.
   g. We will wait to hear from Yula and the ASCCC before recommending changes to OSCAR templates.

6. Potential Reduction in CSU Campus GE Programs—the Senate will continue to monitor developments.

7. CSU GE-Breadth Written Communication Requirement (Area A2)
   a. All campuses except SFSU allow this requirement to be met with one course.
b. One CC had multiple Area A2 courses which were below baccalaureate levels and which had been “grandfathered” into GE.
c. There was a challenge to a composition course that one campus in a 2-campus district considered appropriate for A2 and the other campus considered inappropriate for A2.
d. There have been no further formal challenges to composition courses as being non-baccalaureate but considerable concern about there still being a significant number of such courses on GE certification lists.
e. A big concern is the potential for non-native speakers to take non-baccalaureate level courses developed for their needs to fulfill the requirement. (There are baccalaureate-level courses designed to meet Area A2 objectives and the needs of non-native speakers of English that have been reviewed and accepted for Area A2; those are not of concern.)
f. The issue in front of us is whether to do a comprehensive review of Area 2A outlines as a way of fairly addressing the content of composition courses.
g. Such a review may encounter resistance from ESL faculty.
h. The committee voted to proceed with a comprehensive review of Area 2A courses.