Chancellor’s General Education Advisory Committee
December 2, 2010
CSU Chancellor’s Office
Notes

Attendees: John Tarjan (Bakersfield), Kathy Kaiser (Chico), Michael Ault (Bakersfield, virtual), Kate Fawver (DH), Steven Filling (Stanislaus, virtual), Patricia Kalayjian (DH), Catherine Nelson (Sonoma, virtual), Mark Van Selst (SJ), Andrea Boyle (SF), Gail Evans (SF, virtual), Terri Eden (SJ, virtual), Stacey Howard (Cypress CC), Chris Chavez (CSSA, LB), Jeff Spano, (CCCCO, virtual), Ken O’Donnell (CSUCO)

1. Update: SB 1440 Implementation
   a. There is some good work building upon past IMPAC, LDTP, C-ID efforts being accomplished in developing transfer model curricula patterns (TMCs).
   b. Cooperation is a key to making this work.
   c. CSU participation is important. We need to make sure there is representation from CSU faculty in all of the disciplines.
   d. Professors Boyle, Postma and Baaske are members of the SB 1440 Work Group.
      i. Faculty can either develop a local degree or participate in a “model” transfer degree that would be statewide.
      ii. It is clear how folks can share comments; less clear how the ultimate model curricula will be approved. Will “late” comments be considered?
      iii. An FDRG will review the model curriculum including descriptors after full vetting by the faculty at large.
      iv. How the curricula developed by north and south faculty groups will be reconciled? This needs to be addressed. The workgroup (system faculty representatives) will be the ultimate arbiters of curricular disputes among the discipline faculty.
      v. Pre-convening work (finding representatives, etc.) for some disciplines like business should start soon if the process is to be successful even though the spring meetings are months away.
      vi. The issue of US history and government has not been addressed by the group nor in the legislation. There was much discussion about how these courses should be addressed in this process.
         1. The CSU has some concerns about this.
         2. The inclusion of American Institutions into GE Breadth should appear on a future committee agenda.
vii. As we move into implementation, many new issues to be tackled are becoming clearer.

viii. Some CCCs are waiting to submit courses pending developments in SB 1440 implementation.

2. Recommendations from the IB Diploma Task Force (whether the diploma could be used for some type of GE certification) (Eden, Filling, O'Donnell, Van Selst)
   a. The IB program was reviewed.
   b. Notes from a task force call (with an IB representative) and an e-mail from Mark Van Selst were distributed to the group.
   c. Currently we only allow credit for “high level” courses. We may wish to allow credit for the completion of the diploma even if it includes “low level” courses. We currently do not give any credit for the low level courses even though the content overlaps with the high level courses.
      i. Currently students can earn 6 units of university credit per high level course completed (including 3 units of GE credit).
      ii. Should we allow more credit for the completion of the diploma even though it includes some low level courses?
      iii. Some CSU campuses currently allow credit for completion of low level courses.
   d. This CSU has struggled to find a composition exam that we feel would be appropriate for awarding of composition credit. We probably should be cautious about allowing composition credit. Perhaps we can explore what other universities are doing in this regard.
   e. One problem is the treatment of students who cannot complete the entire curriculum or who only have access to low level courses. Perhaps we should consider GE credit for low level courses.
   f. One consideration for dealing with the diploma is the fact that study in the arts is optional.
   g. The issue was referred back to the task force. Ken will attempt to compile data on the use of IB in other systems and across our CSU campuses. If it is found that low level courses are accepted for GE widely, Ken, in coordination with John, will have discipline faculty review the curriculum with an eye for awarding of GE credit.

   a. Math faculty were asked to review the applicability of this curriculum for B4 credit.
   b. It was anticipated that this pathway would be used by non-stem and majors.
   c. The proposed Statway sequences (4 of 5 reviewed) have a two course mixed (bac and pre-bac) sequence in which students would only get ½ of their units being accepted for baccalaureate credit.
   d. The committee members generally agree that the coursework is appropriate/the equivalent of current courses.
   e. There may be a problem in implementation if these courses have differing levels of course credit across campuses.
   f. Another issue is the use of the curriculum on CSU campuses. Would other campuses be required to accept these courses under reciprocation?
   g. The committee recommends going forward with the experiment.
   h. Parameters for the experiment that the committee needs to consider.
i. It was agreed to limit the experiment of accepting the Statway curriculum for B4 credit to 6 community college districts for a period of 3 years.

ii. Assessment—data the task force was interested in
   1. Persistence
   2. Subsequent GPA
   3. Graduation
   4. Ongoing assessment issues were delegated to the task force.

iii. Credit awarded—the committee recommends
   1. 3 unit maximum GE B4 credit
   2. And 3 unit maximum of baccalaureate credit

   i. The courses need to appear on ASSIST and the CSU-approved transfer list
   j. Ken will draft a related communication and share it with the committee.
   k. Academic Affairs will consider a resolution on the Statway experiment.

4. Give Students a Compass Update (O'Donnell, Spano, Tarjan)
   a. Ken provided an update on the AAC&U conference in January and teams that have been funded to attend.
      i. We discussed team composition and break out sessions.
   b. John gave an overview of the Oregon Compass Institute.
      i. The major focus was on accreditation and assessment.
   c. Andrea gave both an oral and written report on the Wisconsin Compass Institute.
      i. There are a number of initiatives/research results outlined in her written report.
      ii. Ken mentioned that Wisconsin is also working on graduation initiatives. Both of our systems have come to the conclusion that high impact practices are key to improving graduation rates.

5. Incorporation of Student Outcomes Into Campus GE and GE Program Review (Van Selst)
   a. What is the purpose of GE?
   b. Is GE an end in and of itself or is it a foundation for future study?
      i. Perhaps it is both.
   c. CSU stakeholders (employers) look for ___ in our graduates
      i. Oral communication
      ii. Written communication
      iii. Critical thinking
      iv. Organization and self-direction
      v. Teamwork
      vi. Appreciation for diversity
   d. What should this committee do in this regard?
   e. This will be carried over to the next meeting.

6. Potential Alignment of GE Breadth and IGETC
   a. Students may be ill-served by the bifurcation of GE Breadth critical thinking and IGETC composition intensive critical thinking.
   b. John will ask if there is interest in pursuing this item at ICAS this month.

7. Open Forum Items
   a. Can this committee offer advice about courses used for pass-along certification that are from institutions from out of state (an important issue
if the course is part of the Golden Four)? Stacey, Ken and Terry will work on this issue and report back in March.

b. The committee recommended granting the engineering waiver request from SLO regarding delay in fulfilling critical thinking until after transfer.