Draft Minutes

Members Present: John Tarjan (Bakersfield), Sam Edelman (Chico), Bernadette Cheyne (Humboldt), Ted Anagnoson (LA), Barbara Swerkes (Northridge), Tapie Rohm (San Bernardino), Barbara Hooper (AO—Fullerton), Greg Granderson (Santa Rosa College), Jo Service (CSUCO), Cindy Parish (San Bernardino Valley College), Hironao Okahana (CSSA—Long Beach)

Visitors: Chris Mallon Hanson (CSUCO)

1. Welcome and Introductions
2. The agenda was approved as amended.
3. Supplemental GE Review Criteria
   a. The issue of supplemental language had been tabled last academic year pending developments over the summer.
   b. The main development over the summer was the commitment of ASCSU (GEAC, Academic Affairs) to do a comprehensive review of the structure of GE.
   c. Perhaps the issues contained in the document (information competency, diversity, etc.) could be addressed in the Objectives Section (Section III) of EO 595.
4. Question: is there pressure to change GE?
   a. There is some pressure by the CSU Board and Chancellor to reduce the number of required units to the WASC-minimum 45.
   b. We have not adequately addressed the question of what preparation our students need in the 21st century.
   c. There is little momentum to greatly change the structure but perhaps the current objectives need to be expanded.
   d. The draft supplemental criteria are more geared towards clarifying course expectations rather than redesigning the structure of GE.
5. Mode of Delivery for Certified Courses (indication in OSCAR if courses employ technology-mediated delivery)
   a. The ASCCC leadership view is that normal curriculum processes should handle any problems.
   b. More detailed statements of course expectations may need to be developed in specific areas (A1, sciences, etc.). These should be developed prior to course submissions and reviews this year.
   c. The ASCCC feels that only sections utilizing alternate modes of delivery should have increased scrutiny.
   d. The check-off box dealing with mode of delivery is in the process of being deleted.
   e. A subcommittee composed of Jim Wheeler, Sam Edelman, Jo Service and Cindy Parish will attempt to solicit and develop statements from the disciplines
with concerns over mode of delivery that will be published and provided to the GE Review Subcommittee.

i. The question of which faculty should be able to speak for their disciplines was discussed. Perhaps the discipline chairs at the campuses should be polled.

ii. Courses may be articulated between campuses but not be eligible for GE certification.

iii. A call to the campuses might uncover additional curricular areas that may have concerns. Perhaps a questionnaire can be developed to be completed by campus faculty and returned to the subcommittee.

iv. The questions could focus on what works well in the current Area-Breadth package and what doesn’t work well.

v. The subcommittee will report back their findings and if necessary GEAC will refer the matter to Academic Affairs.

6. Potential Reduction in CSU Campus GE Programs

a. Northridge was singled out for praise at the Board of Trustees for reducing their GE package to 48 units.

b. There is continued interest at the CO in those programs that are over 48 units or that severely restrict double-counting. Campuses are being charged with looking at the total required units and double-counting restrictions (major and American Institutions courses also counted for GE) as a part of their facilitating graduation review.

c. The ASCSU will continue to monitor developments in this and other facilitating graduation initiatives.

d. Question: Is anyone aware of developments on the campuses? Answer: This issue will be taken up in October at Academic Council, supplemented by campus senate chairs and the ASCSU Executive Committee.

e. There is unlikely to be any movement to fewer than 120 units for graduation or to accept fewer than 70 transfer units.

7. Update on Comprehensive review of CSU GE-Breadth Written Communication Requirement (Area A2)—GEAC voted to proceed with a comprehensive review in May. This review has not yet begun.

8. SCIGETC Update

a. Dean Service has drafted some sample patterns for engineering. There are variations across engineering disciplines.

b. An ICAS subcommittee will work on implementation issues. John Tarjan is the CSU representative on this group.

c. This “pattern” for the sciences, engineering, and mathematics may need to be flexible to accommodate differing needs across majors.

9. Certification of a-g Courses.

a. UCOP generally reviews these courses. Their decisions are generally followed by the CSU.

b. We need to contact Judy Osman for issues and courses that may be unique to the CSU.


a. Brainstorming Topics

i. What is the Purpose of GE?

1. Prepare people to become life-long learners.

2. Be able to respond to your children’s questions.
3. Possess core skills basic to learning and understanding.
4. Possess skills necessary to be successful in life.
5. Be able to make connections across different ideas and different settings.
6. Students need to be able to analyze, synthesis, evaluation and interpret their world.
7. Find common ground with all different types of people.
8. Interpersonal skills.
9. Move beyond one’s own culture.
10. Be able to translate knowledge into action.
11. Be a good dinner party guest.
12. Be global thinkers/interculturally competent.
13. Be exposed to the breadth of academic inquiry/disciplines.
14. Understand the link between the disciplines.
15. Have openness and sensitivity to a breadth of ideologies and perspectives.
16. Be able to select and bring to bear a variety of discipline tools to a problem.
17. Academic exploration/breadth of exposure.
18. Becoming an interesting person.
20. Become successful in a complex and shrinking world.
22. Move beyond ethnocentrism.
23. Intercultural competence.
24. Expose oneself to a variety of sources/ideas/information before reaching decisions/conclusions.
25. Become more reflective.
26. Be able to deal with ambiguity.
27. Develop imagination/creativity.
28. Apply knowledge to real world settings.
30. Mature physically, ethically, morally, spiritually, socially, intellectually
31. Understand the world is changing
32. Understand the physical world and the limits of human control/have a reasonable basis for decision making.
33. Differentiate between the small and big pictures when solving problems.
34. Be able to set priorities and organize one’s efforts.
35. Be able to deal with different levels of abstraction and detail.
36. To become familiar with primary source materials.
37. Be adept users of technology
38. Flexible thinkers, able to adapt to change, change careers.
39. Have a reasonable basis for decision making.
40. Develop a sense of responsibility.
41. Be able to work with others who have diverse perspectives.
ii. Can We Fit the Above Purposes into Fewer Broad Categories?
   1. tools/skills
   2. competencies/knowledge
   3. values/tolerance/responsibility
   4. understanding/appreciation/reflectiveness

iii. Potential changes to the structure of GE
   2. Use popular books.
   3. Eliminate American Institutions for students who meet requirement in high school.
   4. Expand Area A definitions to include other types of communication (visual, electronic).
   5. Restructure Area E (make it more inclusive).
   6. Eliminate Area E.
   7. Align Area A3 with UC/IGETC.
   8. Base the focus of the package on learning outcomes and objectives rather than area courses
   9. Redefine areas so as to not have rigid boundaries (allow more integration and cross-discipline courses).
   10. Reinforce oral and written communication skills, quantitative reasoning and critical thinking skills in all GE courses.
   11. Substitute a minor for upper-division GE.
      a. Any minor
      b. A minor outside of the college/discipline area
   12. Reduce the number of courses taken in Areas B, C, and D to two in each.
   13. Require a culminating experience in GE as one upper-division component.
   14. Overlay other criteria (diversity, information competency) on the existing structure.
   15. Dramatically reduce the choices available within the Areas.
   16. Broaden the choices within the Areas.
   17. More flexibility in Areas C & D. (Currently 2 disciplines at least in each.)
   18. Add a second language requirement.
   19. A foreign language requirement.
   20. Align CSU requirements with IGETC.
   21. Perhaps we could tie the package’s goals and objectives with the CSU mission and the demands of employers
   22. Respond to changing student population.
   23. Build in assessment.
   24. Bridge community college GE experience with CSU GE experience.
   25. Create common course objectives for a GE area, regardless of who, which discipline teaches the courses.
   26. Reconsider prioritization of GE areas.
   27. Relevancy important to consider.
   28. Expand definition of what qualifies as a language (computer, ASL, math, etc.).
b. Observations
   i. It is impossible to enforce the language currently describing the Areas when individual courses are not responsible for any particular coverage (e.g., Western and non-Western Civilization). This is especially true when students complete GE at multiple institutions.
   ii. The package was put together perhaps for a population that does not exist now/has changed.
   iii. When the IGETC critical thinking/composition course was adopted (91-93), English began offering the vast majority of these courses.
   iv. We have not explored what is going on across the country.
   v. Before we suggest changes, we should have more information.
   vi. Students do not understand GE well.
   vii. The CSU would like students to make faster progress.
   viii. The current package does not prepare students. Financial issues and electronic technology is increasingly important.
   ix. Relevancies have changed

c. Questions
   i. How do we integrate the upper-division experience with the lower-division experience?
   ii. Should we be making decisions without involving the campuses?

d. Where do we go from here?
   i. We should coordinate with the Academic Affairs Committee.
   ii. We need to reduce the ideas to a manageable framework.
   iii. A subgroup should work on the objectives. Tapie Rohm, Sam Edelman and Ted Anagnoson will draft a comprehensive list of possible additions to Section III of EO 595.
   iv. We probably need a November meeting.
   v. Do we need to poll the campuses, other faculty groups? Should we solicit campus input?
   vi. John Tarjan and Jo Service will draft a letter to the campus senate chairs soliciting input on the strengths and weaknesses of the CSU GE package.

e. We will meet next on November 2nd at 3:00 in conjunction with the November ASCSU plenary.