Chancellor’s General Education Advisory Committee
March 15, 2011
CSU Chancellor’s Office

Notes

Attendees: John Tarjan (Bakersfield), Kathy Kaiser (Chico), Michael Ault (Bakersfield, virtual), Kate Fawver (DH), Steven Filling (Stanislaus), Patricia Kalayjian (DH), Margaret Costa (LB), Catherine Nelson (Sonoma, virtual), Mark Van Selst (SJ), Gail Evans (SF, virtual), Terri Eden (SJ, virtual), Jeff Spano (CCCO), Ken O’Donnell (CSUCO), Chris Mallon (CSUCO), Jim Postma (Chico)

1. Courses below two units in GE Breadth Area C1 Arts
   a. These courses typically only focus on skills rather than aesthetics/appreciation.
   b. Many of these courses are either lab or instrumental instruction courses.
   c. There are so many of these courses that a thorough CO or faculty review is not feasible at this time. Most of these courses were “grandfathered” into the approved list and never reviewed.
   d. A request for clarification of the content of fewer-than-2-unit courses on the approved course list sent to campuses resulted in only 2 responses that really did not address the question of appropriateness for inclusion on the list.
   e. We discussed several related issues.
      i. The linking of performance, lab, and studio courses with courses with more theoretical or appreciation content would perhaps make many of these courses appropriate for GE.
      ii. Whether to limit approved courses to those carrying 2 or more units of credit.
   f. Ken will inquire about the MPC courses that seem more like humanities and/or focus history to find out what the content is. They seem like modules that could be grouped into a humanities course.
   g. We have several possible courses of action.
      i. Unit minima for approved courses.
      ii. Course self-assessment by CCCs of these courses with potential justification for retention.
      iii. Blanket delisting of courses fewer than 2 units with an invitation to subsequently submit the courses for review.
   h. The issues of units and appropriate content may be confounded.
   i. Disposition—the committee decided to proceed as follows.
      i. By December 2012—delist all current courses under 2 units. Indicate that campuses may submit for review.
      ii. Next phase—self, CO review of content of approved C1 courses.
iii. GEAC will revisit C1 courses and course guidelines after December 2012.

2. A3 Courses taken at CSUs, UCs and Private Institutions Used for Pass-along Certification, As Part of the “Golden Four” for Transfer Admission
   a. The CCCs are indicating their transfers students are being denied admission because the student is being told at the CCC they have met CSU GE A3/IGETC Critical Thinking, however this is not recognized on the front end at the CSU during admission eligibility clearance, and there is not enough time for the student to clear this up in time to be reconsidered for admission for that term. The issue is the Critical Thinking requirement is not clearly defined (as the other golden four requirements) and has content differences on the IGETC 1B verses the CSU GE Breadth. The CSUs are not consistent in their admission reviews of the critical thinking courses when not taken at a CCC.
   b. Another issue is the 2nd composition course used for IGETC critical thinking course, is not always the same course used on the CSU GE Breadth critical thinking course. 8 CSUs require 2nd English composition and prefer transfers take this prior to transfer. 166,000 enrolled students are on CSU campuses that require a 2nd composition course.
   c. Potential Recommendations
      i. Align IGETC 1B and GE Breadth A3 (to match the UC model).
      ii. Develop a list of courses approved for A3 at CSUs, UCs, and private institutions so there is better consistency across CCCs and CSUs regarding agreement of course work used to clear this upon admission review.
      iii. Change to the admissions/advising process and/or deadlines. (Perhaps notify students in a timely manner of potential delays in course evaluations/certification.)
      iv. Refer the issue to admissions/evaluation officers. (Have them share information on courses that appear to be appropriate).
      v. Ken will discuss the issue with AVC Eric Forbes. APEP Committee will also discuss with AVC Forbes.
   d. Student transcripts and certifications are typically not evaluated until they have enrolled and have paid fees.
   e. Perhaps ASSIST could maintain a database of non-CCC golden four courses articulated by CSU campuses.
      i. Mark will send John an e-mail on this subject.

3. Introduction to Business Courses in GE Breadth Area E1 Lifelong Learning
   a. The committee was given a descriptor for a course entitled “The Individual in the Contemporary World of Business.”
   b. The business discipline interest group (DIG) from the SB 1440/C-ID process requested feedback on the appropriateness of this type of a course as a part of the 1440 implementation process.
   c. Feedback: courses approved in this area should have all three components (sociological, physiological, psychological). The proposed course is not an appropriate Area E course.
d. A desire to know more about the intent of Area E was expressed. It seems like many of the approved courses do not have baccalaureate content.

e. Seems like a reach to fit the course into Area E—would open up the possibility of very many disparate courses to be included in the Area.

f. This course would not likely have enough appropriate content to be approved under current review.

g. GEAC should not be looking at individual courses. Model course descriptors should probably be looked at by faculty who review Area E courses. Ken indicated he could identify appropriate faculty if the business faculty wish to proceed further.

h. John will report the results of our conversation to the business FDRG.

4. Give Students a Compass

a. The desirability of making GE more engaging for students was discussed by steering committee members.

b. Nine CSU/CCC faculty teams met together at an AAC&U meeting in San Francisco two months ago and developed proposals for GE “experimentation” with the end goals of engaging students more fully in general education.

c. Proposals varied in level of specificity.

d. Why did this phase include new proposals rather than just building on the three funded project from phase 1 of the project?
   i. Only one of the proposals also focused on transfer students. (60% of undergraduates transfer to the CSU.)
   ii. There was a desire to generate a broader variety of projects for future funding.
   iii. Incorporating outcomes into GE and assessing them systemically is a big task requiring lots of good thinking. We may be able to take lessons learned from a number of different projects.

e. What will phase 3 look like?
   i. Articulating student outcomes?
   ii. Further improving outcomes for all students by systemwide initiative?

f. What would the Compass steering committee like from this group?
   i. General feedback on the proposals.
   ii. Thoughts about improvements to GE that are scalable on a systemwide basis.

g. How can we ensure that we these efforts are sustainable? How can we maintain a level of “excitement” across the faculty.

h. Even the faculty may have negative views about GE. GE costs money whether approaches/courses change or not. Perhaps we can learn from each other as a result of these experiments.

i. Some of these proposals may not be sustainable. Limiting options likely is the key to sustainability. We could ask proposers what they foresee happening 5 years after the outside funding runs out.

j. If we pursue articulation based on outcomes, it should be to improve student engagement and learning not for other reasons.
k. It appears the end goal is revamping the transfer GE—are we really thinking of major revision to GE? Yes, but it may be a long-term process.
l. Could we survey campuses to find out the extent to which high impact practices are incorporated across CSU and CCC campuses inside and outside of GE?
m. There was a concern expressed about campus academic freedom if large-scale changes took place at the system level. Examples may include requiring cross-disciplinary integration, or a mandated high impact practice such as service learning, etc.
   i. This is a legitimate concern and should be considered through the project’s phases.
   ii. There is always a trade-off by being in a system: campus freedom vs. systematization.

n. Our broad-ranging discussion on the structure of GE should continue on the next agenda.
o. The steering committee needs to check with campuses prior to funding to make sure the campus as a whole is “on board,” not just a subset of folks that attending the meeting in SF.
p. Discussion of pilot project proposals
   i. Suggestions will be e-mailed to Ken or John.

5. Regional and National GE Efforts: AAC&U LEAP States Summit (Chicago) and WICHE (Boulder)
a. Faculty governance structures are a big advantage in California.
b. California had more faculty/faculty engagement than all of the other state teams combined in these meetings.
c. Many states are interested in improving GE and articulation but are behind California (with the exception of Utah) in their efforts.

6. Update: SB 1440 Implementation
a. The differing unit counts for articulated courses on CSU and CCC campuses has come up but is not being pursued further within the scope of SB 1440 implementation. Perhaps this issue will arise again through the C-ID course descriptor development and approval process. It is common for CCC GE and major courses to carry more units than the courses to which they articulate.
b. US history and US, State and Local Government
   i. Without double-counting, it may be difficult for CSU transfer students to complete the transfer AA within 60 units.
   ii. Some have interpreted the legislation as not allowing the requirement of American institutions courses in the transfer AA.
   iii. This discussion touched on a number of related topics.
   iv. We will continue this discussion at the next meeting.
c. C grades in Golden Four Courses
   i. While CSU requires a grade of C or better in these courses to transfer, a student may be able to complete a transfer AA (with ability to transfer) with only passing grades.
ii. Some CSU campuses do not have a requirement of C in these courses for native students even though they require them of transferring students, as per system policy.

iii. Should we align admissions and graduation standards?

iv. Should we require the higher standard (C or better) within the transfer AA? The legislation may not allow this.

v. Should C or C- be the standard?
   1. Questions to be answered in this regard:
      a. Which campuses allow fractional grading?
      b. Which campuses accept less than a C in courses taken by their native students?

vi. Are we ready to offer advice on alignment of standards to the BOT?

d. The group voted to refer the issue to the Academic Affairs Committee for a potential resolution.

7. Update on the Statway Curriculum
   a. There was an update on the curriculum being developed on one campus.
   b. We granted a 3-year exemption for 6 CC districts to experiment with this approach for transfer students.
   c. Several CSU campuses are experimenting with this approach.
   d. There will be a related presentation at BOT next week.

8. Alignment of GE Breadth and IGETC
   a. There was an update—not much to report. The IGETC Standards Review Committee has this item on its agenda.

9. International Baccalaureate
   a. Ken found only one CSU campus that allowed standard level exams to earn credit.
   b. He will look at what other systems do in this regard.

10. Faculty Development Support for the Learning Outcomes Assessment Requirement in Executive Order 1033
    a. There is close to $200,000 in the ITL budget that could be used for some type of faculty development at the system level or other similar purposes.
    b. We have had fewer faculty development opportunities in outcomes assessment over the past few years.
    c. Ken has contacted a number of people including Mary Allen to gauge the possibilities for providing faculty workshops.
    d. Since the initiation of a GE program assessment requirement, we have done very little to assist campuses to do this.
    e. There is a desire to find out what campuses are currently doing in order to better tailor any support to better meet campus’ needs.
    f. Will our CCC colleagues be involved in this initiative?
    g. Kathy, Kate and Catherine will work with Ken to develop ideas for how this faculty development might take shape.
11. Open Forum
   a. The committee reviewed an Environmental Science course proposal. There are several similar courses being proposed by campuses for Area B.
      i. It does not appear to meet the requirements of Area B.
      ii. It might be more appropriate for upper-division GE.
      iii. It might be more appropriate within Area E.
   b. Should courses which are allowed in Area C also be allowed in Area D? EO 1033 seems to prohibit this.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.