MEMBERS PRESENT: Mark Van Selst (ASCSU/Chair), Kate Fawver (ASCSU/Vice), Steven Filling (ASCSU), Andreas Gebauer (ASCSU), Susan Gubernat (ASCSU), David Hood (ASCSU), Kathy Leen (Kathy) Kaiser (ASCSU), Patricia Kalayjian (ASCSU), Barry Pasternack (ASCSU), John Stanskas (CCCAS), Christine (Chris) Miller, Terri Eden (CSU AO [Video]), Joseph Bielanski (CCC AO), Jessica Taketa (CSSA [Phone + in person]), Jeff Spano (CCC CO), Ken O’Donnell (CSU CO), Joseph Bielanski (CCC Articulation [Video]).

MEMBERS ABSENT: Christine (Chris) Mallon (CSU CO), Jackie Aboud (CSSA), Catherine Nelson (ASCSU), Elizabeth Adams (CSU AO),

GUESTS: Wayne Tikkanen (CSU CO / ITL), Michelle Pilati (CCC AS)

GE Report from GEAC meeting of Tuesday January 21, 2014

1. AGENDA
   a. Modified to add (3) Announcements
   b. Modified to add (4)(b)(vii) grandfathering of courses
   c. Modified to add (10) Task Force
   d. Modified to add (11) 120 Units/GE modifications by Engineering
   e. Modified to add (12) credit for applied learning

2. Review of notes to GEAC OCTOBER 2013
   a. Some calendar conference dates updated/clarified
   b. Minor other revisions
   c. Working notes from the GE Task Force meetings in October 2013 were appended to the OCTOBER 2013 GEAC notes

3. Announcements
   a. First Annual California STEM Conference was held Nov. 18-19 2013 at the Sacramento Convention Center. The focus was on linked learning and how linked learning is reliant on the “soft skills” of GE (cf., oral communication) and not just STEM based training. A focus seemed to be on CTE prep courses qualifying for a-g credit at the high school aligned with Golden Four expectations.
   b. 3CSN (California Community Colleges Success Network)
“Threshold Project” meeting in Southern California.
c. The Institute for Teaching and Learning at the Office of the Chancellor announces a webinar on February 7, 2014, 12:00 pm - 1 pm by Drs. Ed Nuhfer and Karl Wirth on *the application of metacognition in pedagogy to improve student success!* This webinar is modeled after their highly popular workshop at the 2013 ITL Summer Institute.
d. CCC/CSU Articulation officers will meet in San Diego on April 25
   i. Note that later in this meeting we recommended we develop a post-meeting meeting with a subgroup of GEAC to collect GE feedback from the approximately 35 Articulation Officers who participated in the 2014 GE review (and interested others). The target would be to clarify GE Guiding Notes documents.
e. Academic Academy (Feb 21-22st CCC Academic Senate Meeting on the Value of GE)
f. Compass steering committee meeting Feb 20 prior to Academic Academy meeting (above)
g. AAC&U GE Meeting (Portland, OR) Feb 27-Mar 1.
h. CSU Teaching symposia March 7th at San Marcos
   i. CSU GE @ Northridge (March 14th)
4. Updated GE course review process (for submissions of CCC courses against CSU GE standards):
   a. The process changes staff review from a small number of CSU Articulation Officers to now supplement this group with an additional approximately 35 CCC articulation officers. The CCC AOs review courses outside of their geographic areas. Approximately 10% of submitted courses are then forwarded for full faculty review for clarification.
      i. The revised review process uses Google-groups rather than OSCAR to do the reviews although all courses are originally submitted via the OSCAR interface.
   b. Discussion of issues identified by reviewers
      i. Faculty supervision requirement in AREA E is inherent in community college offerings (thus need to review for this element is eliminated)
      ii. Area D subdivisions. IGETC needs 2 course prefixes for area 4 (CSU Area D) whereas CSU GE needs two
of ten “areas” of study within Area D. There was discussion of could these be aligned? What is attempting to be achieved and should we look at how this is implemented?

1. Kathy Kaiser, Ken O’Donnell, and Kate Fawver indicated that they will come back to the next GEAC meeting with a recommendation regarding possible GEAC action.

iii. Music theory. Action taken was to strike out music theory note from the CSU GE Guiding Notes. The logic of the strike-out (following May 2013 discussion) was that there is nothing “special” about the music theory prohibition. The prohibition is for any “skills training” type course rather than music theory in particular (“music appreciation” is certainly an appropriate GE course and some music theory offerings may meet GE requirements).

1. Area C1 and Music Theory: We will strike the language from the Guiding Notes that singles out Music Theory as an unlikely fit for GE. Going forward, Music Theory will be held to the same standards of any other submission in the arts area, without bias.

iv. Research Methods in Psychology. A course offering could be Area D, could also be in Critical Thinking. It would generally not be overly useful to students as GE since most will have Area D from other Psychology content.

v. Science outcomes / Laboratory expectations. Executive Order 1065 and the CSU guiding notes appear to be underspecified regarding physical vs. life science and regarding expectations for laboratory science (this could be especially problematic when examining potential “online laboratory” submissions).

vi. Grandfathered courses. There is an equity concern that two courses offered at different campuses may be differentially eligible to offer various GE credit. Discussion started with the idea of a rolling review of all “grandfathered” courses. The emergent idea was to as CIAC to identify where such disparities exists (e.g., a course was approved under a prior GE requirement set and grandfathered but would no
longer be approved for that area of GE). GEAC would then encourage/recommend a GE review of the “old” GE authorizations for these courses since it would be more efficient that a full review of all grandfathered courses since such a review would be less targeted/less likely to identify courses that no longer comply. It was separately noted that such disparities may be particularly highlighted by the SB1400-driven course submissions.

vii. CIAC meeting of 4/25/2014: As a result of discussion (see above) on “grandfathered courses”, it is likely that GEAC will be represented at the April CIAC meeting with an explicit agenda to update guiding notes and identify where GEAC might identify other areas of concern regarding course assessments and evaluations around GE.

5. Submissions in response to the GEAC request for submissions on “online oral communication”.
   a. Three submissions were received (all from Santa Barbara Community College): COMM 122, 131, 162.
   b. The committee was unsure that the assessment requirements were met by the submissions. It was posited that the submissions were through the “normal” OSCAR process and thus did not have the same amount of information as would be appropriate to respond to the rfp request.
      i. Ken O’Donnell will follow up and ask for additional documentation on the SBCC assessment plan.

6. Update to CSU Coded Memorandum re: Standardized Testing
   a. AP Course and Exam Revision (assessment of)
      i. A group of PHYSICS faculty and ENGLISH faculty have been identified.
      ii. Each review group will ideally include a representative from GEAC (likely MVS, possibly an articulation officer as well), a presenter involved in the development of the course/exam (from College Board), an appropriate faculty member from the CCC (still to be requested by MVS from CCC academic senate), and those individuals identified by the ASCSU/GEAC as representing CSU faculty program (and extra-program in the case of PHYSICS) interests.
      iii. We will be asking the AP consideration groups for recommendations re: (1) systemwide unit credit, (2)
systemwide GE credit, and their recommendations for (3) individual campus use as part of discipline-specific (or other) programmatic requirements on individual campuses [this later recommendation is non-binding and goes beyond the scope of GEAC, but is nevertheless thought to likely be useful to our colleagues across the system]

b. CLEP Testing
   i. Across the last three years the use of CLEP tests has grown in the CSU.
   ii. Communication from the College Board indicates that CLEP use is typically much higher when explicit systemic (e.g., statewide) policies are in place as it is in the CSU system under current AA-2011-12 (current version of “Systemwide Credit for External Examinations”)

c. IB baccalaureate / AP Capstone
   i. It was represented that both might be eligible for “critical thinking” credit within the CSU GE package. No action at this time (action may be taken subsequent to output from the AP review groups established by GEAC for Physics and English)

d. Cambridge International Examinations
   i. This was a “placeholder” item to note a potential future agenda item describing the role and function of Cambridge International Examinations (somewhat similar to AP). GEAC may review the item if interest is generated based on campus need (we note the “chicken and egg” problem of ‘new’ assessments being considered for GE/Collegiate credit).

7. “PATHWAYS TO THE BACCALAUREATE” (CTE <-> degree)
   a. Irvine Foundation funded joint CCC, CSU project looking at high school & business contributions along with CCC and CSU “linked learning” outcomes (“what exists now?” + scalability of existing projects in other environments)
      i. Allied health
      ii. Engineering
   b. Feedback from GEAC on elements to consider in the composition of a high functioning advisory committee were discussed.
   c. Some of GEAC discussion focused on the potential role of Area E in CSU GE vis-à-vis linked learning.
   d. The costs and benefits of preselecting participation partners for the PATHWAYS project led to a
recommendation that encouragement to apply would be appropriate but that a well-structured and clear request for proposals could yield a better view of the current landscape through an open application process.

8. IGETC for STEM + CSU GE for STEM
   a. The proposed CHEMISTRY transfer model curricula (TMC) is currently not being distributed as the impact of the CSU revision to unit limits (the 120 unit min/nominal max for degrees) is evaluated.
   b. The logic of the IGETC for STEM proposal is that social/cultural/arts elements of GE (up to three courses) might be delayed in order to make room in the lower division for adequate preparation for upper division coursework.
      i. With the new unit limits (nominally to encourage faster graduation), the delay of lower division GE units means that "post-transfer" SB1440 work would need to leave room for:
         1. Six units American Institutions
         2. Nine units upper division GE, and
         3. Six to nine of lower division GE.
      ii. This could mean that only 36 units would be otherwise available for upper division work if there were no double-counting. Even allowing for double counting of one upper division course with major work (+3) and both AI courses with GE (+6 additional), this means that only 45 units would remain available for major-program focused coursework and any other campus degree requirements (e.g., non-GE GWAR coursework, Foreign Language, or PE).

9. Give Students a Compass
   a. WICHE Interstate Passport
      i. Was discussed at the request of several members who did not recall prior GEAC discussions of the logic and intent of the Passport.
      ii. It seems that a formal statement of why California is participating in the development of the passport but not actively seeking system-level policy guidance for Passport acceptance might be in order. Previous GE notes have alluded to the relatively low student transfer into the CSU (2000 students) and that existing GE determination of processes and responsibilities seem adequate to the task. It was
also noted that the systems in neighboring states know about CSU GE and accept GE certification pass-along (even if informally done).

b. Compass dissemination planning/execution is continuing.
   i. See ITEM 2 (Announcements) on upcoming conferences (e.g., on thematic GE)

c. The CCCSN (Success Network) “Threshold Project” was introduced and will be further expanded upon at a later meeting.

10. Task Force
   a. Kevin Baaske shared a preliminary Task Force report with the CSU Senate Chairs at their last meeting. A final version will be distributed to GEAC.
      i. The task force suggests several actions to be undertaken, most of which are currently actively or passively being pursued (e.g., upper division GE definitions; alignment of Title 5, EO 1065, and CSU GE Guiding Notes).

11. 120 Unit Engineering Degrees
   a. one issue that comes up is that if Engineering degrees are 120 units they may be subject to SB1440/440 compliance.
      i. This is not in the spirit of the law as written.
   b. There is an ASCSU Resolution on 120 unit engineering programs being presented to the senate by the Academic Affairs Committee for its January 2014 meeting.
      i. Recommendations to Amend Title 5 to Establish an Appropriate Unit Limit for Engineering Degrees (AS-3158-13/AA)
   c. We simply did not have time to fully process this item and it will return as “ITEM No. 4” on the next GEAC agenda.

12. Credit Applied for Prior Learning
   a. This item will be carried over to the next GEAC agenda. The item focus (as introduced) is on how to test and assess knowledge and mechanisms for awarding such credit.
   b. This item touches on the “competency vs. unit” issue.

13. EO 1084 “systemwide nursing programs”
   a. No discussion (time constraints). The GE concerns from the October 2013 GEAC meeting have been addressed in an Academic Affairs resolution pertaining to GE accommodation for nursing and pre-nursing students.
      i. Recommendation Related to Nursing Preparation (AS-3154-13/AA).

14. Adjourn (4:15 PM)