Meeting Notes

Members Present: John Tarjan (Bakersfield), Bernadette Cheyne (Humboldt), Ted Anagnoson (LA), Tapie Rohm (San Bernardino), Barbara Hooper (AO—Fullerton), Jo Service (CSUCO), Hironao Okahana (CSSA—Long Beach), Ken Nishita (Monterey Bay), Mark Van Selst (San José), Jim Wheeler (Maritime Academy), Cindy Parish (SBCCD), Ted Lucas (Channel Islands)

Visitors: Jim Blackburn (CSUCO); ASCSU Executive Committee: Marshelle Thobaben, Hank Reichmann, Cristy Jensen

1. Welcome and Introductions
2. Time Certain—3:30 Mary Gill call on AB 2168
   a. Carol Liu was interested in doing something on transfer, but not major preparation, which had been the focus of Senator Scott (LDTP).
   b. Some students have expressed confusion over the differences between GE-Breadth and IGETC.
   c. This legislation was discussed with Jack Scott and Jason Murphy before drafting.
   d. We will be introducing amendments next week.
   e. IGETC has been unsuccessful in its intent (common GE pattern across the state) during its 15 year life.
   f. We believe there should be a common pattern across systems. Still, there should be some flexibility across majors.
   g. Academic senate approval is required for any changes to take effect.
   h. We are aware of the potential of UC intransigence. The law will protect CSU students. If the UC won’t compromise, we need to report it.
   i. An objective is to organize the pattern by areas and align the areas between systems as much as possible. There may be some differences between areas across UC and CSU.
   j. The committee was invited to come up with a more realistic implementation timeline.
   k. A CCC representative indicated that more counselors would be needed to implement and would be too costly for the system.
   l. Ms. Gill hopes to address ICAS on the issue. Is hoped that the UC will be a player.
3. CCC CO Representative
   a. No progress to date. Cindy Parish will follow up.
4. SciGETC Update—John Tarjan indicated that the intersegmental implementation workgroup is still awaiting a UC appointment.
5. Update on LDTP, LDTP Course Reviews: The major topic of discussion are:
   a. The naming of discipline facilitators
   b. The naming of reviewers
   c. The appropriate honoring of existing CAN articulation
   d. It was pointed out that many LDTP courses also count for GE
6. Update on AB 2168—There was a lengthy discussion of the nuts and bolts of GE and GE transfer in California.
7. Discussion of the campus GE survey results—a preliminary analysis was begun. Dr. Rohm will work on a summary of the quantitative results and Dr. Van Selst will look at the comments.