MEMBERS PRESENT: Mark Van Selst (ASCSU/Chair), Kate Fawver (ASCSU/Vice), Steven Filling (ASCSU), Susan Gubernat (ASCSU), David Hood (ASCSU), Kathleen [Kathy] Kaiser (ASCSU), Patricia Kalayjian (ASCSU), Catherine Nelson (ASCSU), Barry Pasternack (ASCSU), John Stanskas (CCCAS), Elizabeth Adams (CSU AO), Christine (Chris) Miller, Terri Eden (CSU AO [Video]), Joseph Bielanski (CCC AO), Jessica Taketa (CSSA [after class]), Jeff Spano (CCC CO), Ken O’Donnell (CSU CO), Joseph Bielanski (CCC Articulation [Video]).

MEMBERS ABSENT: Andreas Gebauer (ASCSU), Christine (Chris) Mallon (CSU CO), Jackie Aboud (CSSA).

GUESTS: Debra David (CSU CO), Michelle Pilati (CCC AS)

GEAC report to ASCSU Plenary:

A large portion of the meeting was dedicated to a wide-ranging and involved discussion of the potential impact on GE program outcomes that could result from limiting units to 120. A letter will be send to Chancellor White indicating agreement to participate in the review of, and providing commentary on, exemption requests per the Feb 11 memo. In this letter we also highlight concerns about pressures to reduce GE elements on campuses with or without formal waiver processes being executed. We also have concerns about who “wins” in the battle of Title 5 between a full and meaningful GE program and the 120 unit limitations. We characterize current processes as heavily favoring 120 units.

The GE course review process involving the CCC articulation officers was generally a success but was very costly in terms of staff time for coordination. We are planning to capitalize on the perspective of these new group of reviewers in examining the CSU guiding notes for GE evaluation.

On oral communication, we have three community colleges who responded to the request for proposals to potentially offer online communication. The reviews of these courses is continuing with an emphasis on how the online modality is being incorporated into the course in service of meeting the learning outcome expectations.

We discussed changes to AP and IB exams and will update the credit by exam coded memo out of academic affairs.

Thematic pathways continue to propagate in implementation and interest across the system. No new action on system-wide minors.

Give students a compass is continuing in a distribution of findings mode.

A new initiative potentially tying CTE and GE via linked learning is unfolding with our community college partners.
1. Approval of the AGENDA
   a. Modified to add (3) Announcements
   b. Modified to add English IB to (7)
   c. Added (12) CSUN conference on thematic pathways
2. Review of notes to GEAC January 2014
   a. Some calendar conference dates updated/clarified
   b. Minor other revisions
   c. 8(b)(ii)(3) should read “six” not “six to nine”
3. Announcements
   a. Various minor updates and notifications (mostly tangential to GE except as noted elsewhere in the minutes)
4. 120 units and Engineering
   a. Critical Thinking appears to be a “target” for GE unit reduction in engineering programs.
      i. If critical thinking is taught, it should be assessed.
   b. Campuses, GEAC, and the ASCSU should fight the cheapening of the degree that the reduction to 120 units represents.
   c. Campus implementation appears to be all over the map in terms of processes followed (with “we will just cut the program and formalize the cut later” seeming to be a common approach).
   d. There is support for the “old” Title 5 exemption for engineering and is even called out in SB1440 as an example of a high unit degree.
      i. The motivation to apply the 120 unit restriction to engineering has not been well-defined.
         1. The “time to degree” evidence for failures to complete in a timely fashion for engineering is not persuasive.
         2. What is the evidence that there is an issue?
      ii. The possibility of non-accredited engineering programs paired with the “accreditation” carrying certificate program was floated.
         1. This seems a somewhat costly kludge to a self-inflicted injury by the CSU.
      iii.
      iv. There is a request not to penalize those campuses that are “over target” over the nominal 120 unit limit
   e. There was a suggestion that waivers be treated as such and made explicit rather than encouraging campuses to fudge GE outcomes to make it look like students are receiving a full GE package.
i. A request for assessment on GE outcomes for waiver and non-waiver programs

f. GE waiver processes
   i. On some campuses there is a move to have GE areas met “by major” completion (cf. pre-nursing)
   ii. Campus waiver requests appear to be outlawed on some campuses – this seems a violation of the spirit and wording of the BoT and EO action.
   iii. There are widespread requests for reduction in units and content in GE as part of the “drive to 120”

g. What are the “principles of GE”
   i. There are concerns that providing GE certification to courses with extensive or narrow prerequisite courses works against a more desirable GE experience that encourages diversity in interaction and opinions presented
   ii. A principle of Homogeneity of access to GE (i.e., GE equally open to all at the upper and lower division) was strongly argued.

h. On implementation and timing of the requests for GE Waivers:
   i. Discussion needs to occur when GE is “in session”
   ii. The focus should be on if the programmatic outcomes for GE are being met (vs. not being met).

i. The “February 11 Memo” (see attachment to letter) included a presentation of procedures for the 120 unit limit review and exception process. In part the memo stated

   ...The Chancellor’s General Education Advisory Committee will be invited to review and comment on each complete GE request submitted. Campus GE exception requests must be accompanied by campus-approval documents, a rationale, and a curriculum map.

j. ACTION: the Chair of GEAC will write (did write – MVS) a letter to the Chancellor accepting the expansion of role to look at campus curricular modifications involving waivers (later evidence suggests GEAC was consulted on prior campus modifications involving waivers – MVS).
   i. This letter is attached to these notes (was to include, in part: Charge taken seriously; timetable
issues; contact with campus; show how GE accommodations met at campus level; what other accommodations outside of exception might be made?)

5. GE Guiding Notes Update
   a. CCC/CSU Articulation officers will meet in San Diego on April 25th
      i. **ACTION:** A subgroup of GEAC will 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.

6. Submissions in response to the GEAC request for submissions on “online oral communication”.
   a. Three Colleges submitted requests.
      i. The submissions were from Santa Barbara Community College, Canada College, and West Los Angeles College.
      ii. Further details were requested from each.
   b. **ACTION:** a subcommittee of Ken O’Donnell, Mark Van Selst, Kevin Baaske, Bill Eadie, and Anthony Onygod will review and make recommendations for the May GEAC meeting. Ken O’Donnell will follow up and ask for additional documentation.

7. Update to CSU Coded Memorandum re: Standardized Testing
   a. Three tests need to be considered:
      i. AP Capstone (Critical Thinking?)
      ii. IB Languages and English Composition
      iii. AP Physics
   b. Previously, for such courses, each review group usually included a representative from GEAC, possibly an articulation officer, a presenter involved in the development of the course/exam (from College Board), an appropriate faculty member from the CCC (to be requested by MVS from CCC academic senate if not a GEAC member), and those individuals identified by the ASCSU/GEAC as representing CSU faculty in the program (and extra-program in the case of PHYSICS) interests.
      i. We ask for recommendations re: (1) systemwide unit
credit, [often an affirmation or assessment of current criteria standards for credit] (2) systemwide GE credit [often an affirmation or assessment of current criteria standards], 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 – any such recommendation does not become part of the CSU Coded Memorandum]

c. **ACTION:** establish group for Critical Thinking, report out to GEAC for May 2014.

d. **IB Language and English Composition**
   i. Either course meet the requirement for CSU GE C2 (at High Level)

e. **AP Physics I and II**
   i. Clearly meets CSU GE B1 (at score of 3)
   ii. Discussion on laboratory credit (AP without course)

8. Linked Learning and “PATHWAYS TO THE BACCALAUREATE” (CTE <--> degree)
   a. Project moving forward with the identification of appropriate domains.

9. **IGETC for STEM + CSU GE for STEM**
   a. **RECOMMENDATION OF Changes to EO 1065 to include IGETC for STEM / CSU GE for STEM include a new section 5.3.5:**
      i. As presented but note that: 5.3.4 (inserted where old 5.3.4 was before becoming 5.3.5) should include an explicit restriction that “two courses in **IN DIFFERENT SUB-AREAS of area C and two courses IN DIFFERENT AREAS of area D of the CSU GE Breadth curriculum”
   b. The CHEMISTRY transfer model curricula (TMC) is currently posted online but there is not yet a CCC system office template.
      i. [http://www.c-id.net/docs/NewTMCs/Chemistry_TMC_FINAL_Nov_26_2013.doc](http://www.c-id.net/docs/NewTMCs/Chemistry_TMC_FINAL_Nov_26_2013.doc)

10. **Give Students a Compass**
    a. The CCCSN (Success Network) “Threshold Project” appears to be a new central focus.
    b. Compass efforts were highlighted at the CSU:Northridge GE conference with a particular emphasis on thematic and
linked GE sequences

11. CSU Institute for Teaching and Learning
   a. No report

12. OPEN FORUM
   a. The CSU Conference on Thematic Pathways was discussed. Informal discussion was held over ways to move forward with regional or system-level linkages on themes.

13. ITEMS HELD OVER
   a. **ACTION: 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 on AREA D requirements:**
      i. 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?

   b. 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).

14. Adjourn (4:00 PM)