

CSU General Education Advisory Committee
Notes from January 19, 2010
10:30 AM to 3:30 PM
Catalina Room, CSU Office of the Chancellor

Committee Members:

Mark Van Selst, San José State University (GEAC Chair)
Kathleen Kaiser, CSU Chico (GEAC Vice Chair)
Ken O'Donnell, CSU Office of the Chancellor (primary CO liaison)

Kevin Baaske, CSU Los Angeles (**by phone, after meeting start**)
Margaret Costa, CSU Long Beach (**by video, after 1:00**)
Terri Eden, San José State University (**by video**)
Gail Evans, San Francisco State University (**absent due to furlough**)
Dunixi Guereca, California Maritime Academy
Patricia Kalayjian, CSU Dominguez Hills
Christine Mallon, CSU Office of the Chancellor
David Morse, Long Beach City College
Catherine Nelson, Sonoma State University
Cindy Parish, San Bernardino Valley College
James Postma, CSU Chico
Romey Sabalius, San José State University
Barbara Swerkes, CSU Northridge
James Wheeler, California Maritime Academy (**by phone**)

Guests:

Pamela Kerouac, CLEP Senior Policy Analyst, The College Board
Raul Ramirez, Test Center Director, Cal Poly Pomona
Marc Singer, Associate Director, CLEP Academic Initiatives
John Tarjan, Chair, Academic Senate CSU
Kate Fawver, CSU Dominguez Hills (ASCSU)

Order of Business

1. **Call to Order, Welcome and Introductions, Approval of Agenda**
 - A. Notes from November 09 meeting reviewed
 - B. Agenda approved
2. **CLEP (College-Level Examination Program) Policy**
 - A. General Discussion
 - i. EO 1036 sets up systemwide acceptance of CLEP in a manner that is comparable to AP and IB Programs, but it is very limited at the current time (Chemistry and Calculus). The authority to award CLEP credit is included in EO 1036 in Section 1.2, 1.2.1 CLEP). At the last GEAC meeting, a CLEP subcommittee was formed to take a critical look at expanding the use of CLEP. A focused examination of four or five of

the CLEP tests led to the decision that it was worth looking at all of the tests for potential inclusion in an expanded CLEP list.

- ii. The distinction between CLEP and other tests (AP, IB) is that both AP and IB exams are only taken after high school courses, and thus indicate both seat and faculty interaction time. Given this, there is a perception that the reliability of the test scores and the validity of the test itself as an indication of competence is somewhat more of an issue with CLEP than AP or IB exams.
- iii. The deep issue for GEAC is that campuses of the CCC system cannot certify CLEP, but CSU campuses can accept CLEP independently. This can mean that a student cannot be certified to have completed GE at the CCC; but may be certified at the CSU, although their GE package is then (re)assessed based on the CSU campus requirements since they were not certified in GE by their CCC.
- iv. CSU system policy is different than campus policies. For example (hypothetical), San Diego accepts all but one CLEP exam, East Bay accepts all of them. Thus, across the system, expanding the system list of CLEP exams will make it easier for campuses of the CCC system to certify GE and thus facilitate student transfer evaluation. Without the expanded list, the campuses of the CCC system are restricted to the current list which only includes GE credit for Calculus and Chemistry.

B. College Board Presentation on CLEP, Kerouac and Singer

- i. Discussion of history of exam, constituencies, test development and review.
 - a. The goal of the College Board was to align the content of CLEP exams with the curriculum for their purported comparable course.
 - b. The idea was to ensure that what the exam measures tests the knowledge provided via the course.
 - c. Stated in reverse, the intent was to ensure that passing the CLEP exam indicated that the individual had learned (on their own or through whatever means) corresponded to the relevant college outcomes).
 - d. The college board provides advising workshops for campuses and has a number of studies suggesting that CLEP scores provide a good predictor of future performance in courses needing that “CLEP” course prerequisite and did yield faster progress to degree for students who passed their CLEP tests.

C. Q&A

- i. How do we (GEAC) propose to integrate CLEP credit with existing avenues by which we accept credit for prior experience?
- ii. We already have policies on campus-based “Credit by Examination” (EO-1036, Article 1.1)

- iii. There were discussions about the conversion of raw scores to reported scores.
- iv. There were questions on the various background and motivation of the individuals who elected to take the CLEP exams
- v. There were questions about how a passing score on the current iteration of the test(s) were deemed comparable to future scores
- vi. What is the frequency with which test can be taken if student fails?
- vii. There was a side discussion on CLEP credit towards the major (less common, but some examples exist) vs. as GE credit (more common)
- viii. Commentary was provided that GE broadens the elective experience of the student. This was argued to be inconsistent with the use of a test as a replacement for experience since it is the process of learning that is fundamental to GE. Shortening the time to graduation (via this “test out” procedure, shortens in-class learning time, but could be argued to reduce the breadth of experience for the student). [there is a counter-argument that the test illustrates that the breadth was already achieved but it was not made at this time]
- ix. The Statewide GE package guarantees a relation to real life – this is not necessarily the case in knowledge as assessed by the CLEP process.
- x. How can we be sure that CLEP measures whether the students understand the role that science plays in understanding? (that is, how does CLEP access the broader question of applicability and understanding versus rote test-taking skill + discipline knowledge)
- xi. Questions were raised about the security of the tests themselves and of the association between the test and the correct test-taker.
- xii. Additional questions were raised about the alternate forms reliability of the various versions of the “same” test.

D. Preliminary Recommendations: Committee Discussion

- i. Should there be limits on the total amount of GE credit awarded?
 - a. concerned with nature of credits, esp US History and completing American Institutions requirement through this exam,
- ii. We will need to have faculty from all of the potential disciplines look at the CLEP tests to verify that the rigor and content matches the relevant GE domains.
- iii. The reality that GE not only tests content but also skills needs to be addressed.
 - a. CLEP is not the only exam-only process that a student can use to “test out” of a course with.
 - b. Generally the basic GE requirement normally requires sufficient written work to demonstrate complex thought processes
- iv. Are there advising challenges that will be mitigated or produced by expanding the use of CLEP?

- a. These already exist for AP and IB exams where there is differentiation of use for GE and in the major.
- v. It was noted that transfer into the CSU is more difficult without standardized policy, especially for military personnel
- vi. GEAC envisions that we will adopt a mechanism similar to that for AP and IB courses
 - a. The systemwide policy on maximum number of units by exam is 30
 - b. Unit credit and GE area credit can match up to campus requirements if individual campuses want to match courses; It is always up to campuses if they want to match courses rather than limit to undergraduate and GE credit.
 - c. The CLEP test, as it is currently utilized, applies to a fairly narrow clientele. If we limit the number of units it is very unlikely that CLEP would cause many students to hit the existing 30 unit limit.
 - d. At the current time, most CSU campuses accept at least some CLEP courses in addition to those already on the EO-1036 approved list.
 - e. if military with active duty, CCC can certify area E with military credit.
- vii. Encourage the idea of a writing component – send message to CLEP that encourage their move to implement a writing component;
- viii. GE (units per bin, units overall)
 - a. Proposal 1: use CLEP, but can't clear any area entirely with CLEP (this would be equivalent of limiting units); this would allow for skills can't demonstrate, get with exam; alternative language: 3 units for any one test, 6 in any one area; or for areas ABCD, must have at least 3 units of course based behavior in order to meet criteria; it was noted that this may not impact any/many students.
 - b. Proposal 2: no limits on CLEP beyond existing "30 units of examination credit". This emerged as the consensus view. There are few (if any) students that would be impacted by limitations on CLEP to GE transfer and it is not clear that the restriction would be warranted. The issue should be reexamined if large numbers of students start to use CLEP to meet large swaths of GE credit.
- ix. What "bins" do CLEP exams meet for GE?
 - a. Process: fill out language and then send out to appropriate groups for feedback; then draft policy and circulate that, then final policy;

3. **Defining Baccalaureate Credit, EO 167 January 1973**
 - A. Background: Some CCC folks seek improvement in clarity of the guidelines.
 - B. Academic Affairs (ASCSU) taskforce with representation from AA, articulation officers, an undergraduate dean, and CCC faculty will meet; Their charge is to provide advice to improve EO 167 if warranted; The target date for task force completion is the end of 2009/2010 academic year. Commentary can be addressed to any or all of Van Selst, Postma, and O'Donnell since all three of them sit on this task force.

4. **Compass Project**
 - A. AACU compass project handout is in packet;
 - B. Trying to expand best teaching practices into lower division GE;
 - C. High engagement practices disproportionately benefit high risk students;
 - D. AAC&U request for additional funding to expand project from from 3 to 10 CSU campuses, involve CCCs in official way, address GE reform in whole transfer apparatus; additional funding directed to one region, one campus at a time;
 - E. update at every meeting so don't get ahead of where GEAC wants it to go;
 - F. next meeting of Steering Committee May 3, 4 at Fullerton

5. **University of Phoenix Math English Articulation**
 - A. Region 9 articulation officers asking questions about courses, most troubling is math; what do with these courses? The University of Phoenix is fully accredited; in 2006 Chico State determined that there had not been a problem in the past with these courses.
 - B. At the current time, these proprietary institutions generate a burden on the state to review courses. This could be done on a one-off basis at the campus level; by campus level policy, or by a statewide certification list. We have, in the past, held campus autonomy as sacrosanct and will continue to do so. Nevertheless, should there be systemwide guidance provided to the CCCs re: GE? Such courses are used in fulfillment of CSU GE and for admissions to Chico and San Jose (presumably among many others) without substantial problems having developed.
 - C. CCC's want guidelines for pass along;
 - D. The underlying issue was determined to go well beyond GE and thus was referred to the ASCSU academic affairs committee (which may, in turn, refer it back to GEAC for advice if GEAC has more expertise on the topic);

6. **Credit by Exam policy for International Baccalaureate tests "Language A1 English" and "Language A2 English"**
 - A. Why are these courses not awarded expository credit?
 - i. Historically the content focuses too much on "critical literature review"
 - ii. High school AP teachers are devotees of the "critical literature review", the AP exam reflects their approach and their perception of

what an educated person needs to know; This is not what we (CSU) think they should know vis-à-vis GE requirements;

- iii. Suggestion: we should ask appropriate discipline group(s) to see if this should be reexamined;
 - a. It has been vetted before and recently
 - b. no change; no action is recommended.

7. Proposed communication to articulation community about “grandfathering” additional AP units for GE

- A. Background: See chart in agenda packet, on the third page of AP GE Breadth Certification section. The Number of units awarded prior to Fall 2009 exceeds what we are giving now.
- B. GEAC felt that grandfathering the prior “Jo Service Memo” was reasonable. So long as student took exam before Fall 2009 (for the six exams indicated) the “old” number of units can be awarded.
- C. Ken will issue a “grandfather” clarification memo re: “old” exam units being allowed to count for more than current exam units would.

8. Report on IGETC prohibition of symbolic logic courses in Area 3B Humanities

- A. Contradictory guidance for CCCs, no symbolic logic counts as humanities, but have 3 courses in Assist data base at CCCs that earn humanities credit;
- B. GEAC suggests that we obtain some outlines from CCCs to see if do fit humanities (this is still under review);
- C. It was noted that the underlying issue seems to be one of culture – the GE guidelines have to feature great works of human imagination, which symbolic logic typically and inherently does not;
- D. No further action at this time.

9. Update on annual review of community college GE courses

- A. Going great; ahead of schedule;

10. Update on IGETC subcommittee of ICAS

- B. There are to be 9 units per area, but we do not specify the number of units per course; in IGETC, the minima is 3 semester/4 quarter units per course – this shuts out people at quarter campuses where 3 quarter units are awarded for courses;
- C. Another difference between IGETC and GE is how liberally CCCs are allowed to pass on courses from other institutions; GE breadth follows guidelines, with interpretation up to articulation officer; for IGETC there has to be an equivalent course.
- D. This distinction is one of many subtle variances between CSU GE and IGETC.
- E. At the next articulation officers meeting (April 20), the articulation officers will be asked which differences between GE Breadth and IGETC they'd like to see kept in any merged GE transfer curriculum

11. Toward a common GE pattern: CCC, IGETC, CSU

- A. Ken O'Donnell's counterpart at the UC is under pressure to come up with a common GE course package – the perennial questions about what differences are, why they are there, etc. are involved. At same time, there is some movement in the ICAS subcommittee on transfer in the same direction. In essence, there is the potential that IGETC is moving toward GE Breadth.
- B. The CCC GE requirements for their degrees can vary by region.
- C. As always, it is important to note that all CSUs will take the generally more restrictive IGETC or our own GE Breadth as covering lower division GE, whereas the UC will only take IGETC;

12. ASSIST Revision

- A. There is a move to re-think the structure and support mechanisms for ASSIST
- B. There is a RFP for a new vendor – the intent is to move the database to a more interactive format;
- C. The current database configuration is both obsolete and produces difficulties in navigation
- D. It is important to note that ASSIST encompasses the interrelationships across people as well as the “data” itself.

New Business

1. Military area E 6 units in GE

- A. Do we want policy statement or leave at current situation where each campus goes through its own program? (CCCs have direction, but CSUs don't);
- B. Chris Mellon will send a follow up email to campuses clarifying what the CSU campuses are allowed to do; The follow up stated:
 - a. EO 1036 authorizes elective credit for military coursework, and directs campuses to follow ACE guidelines
 - i. It also encourages CSU campuses to accept military discharge (DD-214) to satisfy Area E for the natives (most universities of the CSU system do so)
 - ii. For transfer students, all CSU campuses will accept a GE certification that uses DD-214 to clear Area E.
 - iii. That last point isn't policy, but campus discretion. The CSU's systemwide office of Student Academic Success publishes it here:
 - 1. <http://www.calstate.edu/sas/annual-publications/documents/CSPTransferAdmission.pdf>
 - 2. You'll see the notice at the bottom of page 7.

Meeting adjourned at 3:38p.m.

MVS thanks Catherine Nelson for taking notes – it is much easier to run a meeting without also keeping minutes/notes of everything