There were five major items addressed by GEAC at its October Meeting. They are: (1) an update on the continuing revisions to the AP and IB exams. We have asked for Faculty Appointments to a review and recommending body for AP-Physics (algebra-based) sequence, AP-US History, AP-Chemistry, IB English (high level) and other languages. We believe that the 2011 revisions to AP-Biology, AP-Latin, and AP-Spanish Literature and Culture have all previously been addressed. (2) The “Give Students a Compass” project has two new evolutions: the first is that the dissemination plan is underway, the second is that there is a new grant looking at Career-Technical Education (CTE) and its potential role in meeting both university-level requirements and, in doing so, potentially meeting GE requirements as well. (3) The new GE review process includes more involvement of the California Community College partners. (4) Concerns related to EO 1084 “systemwide nursing programs” have been addressed in an Academic Affairs resolution pertaining to GE accommodation for nursing and pre-nursing students. (5) Potential future actions to be pursued by the GE task-force include examination of a systemwide thematic GE minors/concentrations and making upper division GE expectations explicit.
Item 1.
- Approval of agenda for meeting of 10/29/2013
  - Added Challenge Exam (#11) – Mark Van Selst

Item 2.
- Announcements
  - California STEM conference at Sacramento Convention Center (Linked learning November 18-19)
  - CCC Success Network Group “Threshold Project” meeting in Southern California
  - GE Feedback from review: CCC/CSU Articulation officers (San Diego) April 25th
  - Academic Academy (Feb 20-21st Value of GE)
  - Statway resolution @ ASCSU
  - BSN resolution @ Sept ASCSU
  - CSU Teaching symposia March 7th at San Marcos
  - CSU GE @ Northridge (March 14th)

Item 3.
- Review of notes to meeting of 9/17/2013
  - Correction to name (Kathy Kaiser) in September draft.
  - Other minor editorial changes

Item 4.
- College Board and AP Capstone course
- Report on recent meeting of the AP group
- AP courses (and exams) are being redone to capture less rote learning and more process (deeper but narrower)
- The AP capstone (seminar plus research) sequence may be considered for GE critical thinking.

Item 5.
- Update to Coded Memo re external exams
  - We have asked for Faculty
  - Appointments to a review and recommending body for AP-Physics (algebra-based) sequence, AP-US History, AP-Chemistry, IB English (high level) and other languages. We believe that the 2011 revisions to AP-Biology, AP-Latin, and AP-Spanish Literature and Culture have all previously been addressed.
  - It would be useful to provide recommendations about each of: (i) university level credit, (ii) GE credit, and (iii)
commentary for the discipline regarding campus-based actions vis-à-vis program progress credit.

Item 6.
- Give Students a Compass
  - Steering Committee Meeting will be Feb 20-21 preceding the California Community College Academy on Feb 21-22.
  - The CCC “RP group” continues to be an excellent source of assessment data (cf., post-High Impact Practice Experience effect on persistence and graduation)
  - GE thematic pathways are receiving a lot of support
- Northridge “GE Pathways” Conference planned for March 14, 2014
- The idea of systemwide GE minors continues to percolate (cf., sustainability): a defined four lower division + two upper division GE sequence seems to work.
- GE Town Hall Meetings are similarly seen as quite an appealing model
- Community College Meeting
- Andrea Boyle and others are actively working on a distribution/dissemination/how-to-adopt plan for post-compass use.

Item 7.
- ASCSU resolution 3119 (2013) for task force to clarify the purpose and nature of GE
- Achieved clarity in that the subgroup (and GEAC) are to explicitly consider some elements beyond the defined scope of GE (cf., American Institutions)
- Cleaning up language in Executive Orders, Title 5, etc.
- Explicitly may look at defining expectations that upper division GE serve as a GE capstone (only implicit at this time – potentially explicitly referencing each of the golden four across the upper division GE requirement [likely superimposed on oft-occurring common structures with present upper division GE]
  - What makes it integrated? Focus (theme?) Possible waiver of system expectations for campus-preferred upper-division option?

Item 8
• CSU Institute for Teaching and Learning
• Broad ITL communities are coalescing
• ITL focus on assessment at the outcome of the students program
• CSU Teaching symposia March 7th at San Marcos
• Discussion of setting aside Chancellor’s Office funds for faculty development focused on GE instruction / goals attainment.

Item 9
• Revision to GE course review and orientation meeting of 11/20/2013
  o The expectation is that the new system will increase the caliber of review comments and also serve a training and awareness function that will yield benefits in future submissions.

Item 10
• GE and nursing
  o There were concerns that the system was forcing campuses to place courses within GE that the individual campuses had made the decision not to do. It was clarified that the full set would yield the represented GE areas for that student but not otherwise impact campus GE. The Academic Affairs committee of the ASCSU is pursuing a resolution on this item.

Item 11
• Credit by Exam (MOOC and non-MOOC)
  o It was represented that the “challenge exam” concept underlying individual campus based competency exams as well as CLEP / AP exam reporting was likely robust to capture student knowledge demonstrations that did not come with a university transcript.

ITEM 12
Adjourn
Some additional notes from “THE GE TASK FORCE”:

We have met twice, we are looking at strongly endorsing the LEAP side of EO 1065 over the “unit distribution” side. Chair of this task force will be Kevin Baaske going forward,
- integrating outcomes into Title 5 / EO / CSU Guiding Notes
The advantage of the current approach (with task force) is that a sub-group can continue to work on these “extra-curricular” issues while leaving the larger GEAC group to business as usual (with the occasional check in for advise).

GE Task Force (Tuesday Afternoon): First session brainstorming on function.

1) What are the intended GE goals? Do we define these goals adequately?
2) Making GE intentional
3) Alignment of Title 5 and EO + CSU Guiding Notes
4) Unit limits in GE (both within area and overall)?
5) Learning outcomes made specific and assessable outside of coursework
6) Making GE relevant
7) Comparable treatment/standards for CCC/CSU
8) Avoiding FTES based silo-generation
9) Ensuring upper division GE is capstone
10) E-portfolio as a solution
11) Restriction to little pilot projects
   a. When do we know that the approach works?
12) It is too soon for this group to be effective?
13) Are the dangers of messing with Title 5 larger than the advantages of doing so?
   a. (we already weasel more flexibility than may be nominally permissible)
   b. Alternative approach is to establish meta-goals for GE directions for the future.
   c. Here is EO 1065 we believe in the LEAP portion, the # unit distribution is less endorsed (competencies or intelligent arguments)....

GE Task Force Part II (Thursday Afternoon)
1) Big picture (redefine/reduce/learning outcome based)
2) Relationship to IGETC
3) What is the existing flexibility; is there a way to make this clearer?
4) What about existing rules restricts experimentation/progress/student opportunity?
5) Compass-type assessment outcomes (examples of measurements/assessment)