

## Chancellor's General Education Advisory Committee

May 3, 2011

CSU Chancellor's Office

### Notes

**Attendees:** John Tarjan (Bakersfield), Kathy Kaiser (Chico), Michael Ault (Bakersfield), Kate Fawver (DH), Steven Filling (Stanislaus), Patricia Kalayjian (DH), Margaret Costa (LB), David Morse (LBCC), Catherine Nelson (Sonoma), Mark Van Selst (SJ), Gail Evans (SF, virtual), Terri Eden (SJ, virtual), Ken O'Donnell (CSUCO), Chris Mallon (CSUCO), Andrea Boyle (SFSU, virtual).

**Guests:** Jim Postma (Chico), Debra David (CSUCO), Cheryl Koos (CSULA), Scott Bowman (CSULA), Nancy Quam-Wickham (CSULB), Jeannie Harrie (Bakersfield, virtual).

### 1. Update on Give Students a Compass Pilot Projects Proposals

- a. Debra David has been hired to oversee the ongoing externally funded Compass pilot projects. She has a long history of experience in service learning, curriculum, shared governance, transfer and academic administration.
- b. The goal of Compass is to increase student engagement and persistence to graduation.
- c. Debra will be joining GEAC at upcoming meetings to provide periodic updates.
- d. A major goal of phase II is to find ways to explore the increase student engagement and persistence through the inculcation of high impact practices (service learning, learning communities, study abroad, student research, etc.) into general education.
- e. Beginning at the SF AAC&U conference, nine CSU/CCC teams developed proposals for phase II funding. Four of these proposals have been identified for potential funding.
- f. A big obstacle to achieving the goals of this project is the current budget situation, which makes it difficult to offer sufficient courses for students. This may cause some CCC campuses to hesitate to fully participate in Compass.
  - i. Most of the proposals may contain only a single yearly course/set of experiences for their pilot project.
  - ii. Many campuses/departments already have implemented low-cost, high-impact practices that may be highly sustainable. We should be sure to discover/highlight these.
- g. Evaluations should try to avoid selection bias on the part of the participating students. If only the best prepared, most likely to persist students participate, we could end up with a "false positive" effect.
- h. Teams might want to avoid only involving "star" faculty in the projects. To be sustainable, "run of the mill" faculty will need to buy into, and be able to contribute to any potential approaches being explored.
- i. Sustainability needs to be a VERY important factor in evaluating proposals. It does no good to explore innovations that will die when external funding is no longer available.

- j. It is anticipated that final funding decisions will be made and the funded final proposals will be made available for review within a month.
- k. Debra will pursue posting detailed summaries and contact information for each of the nine team proposals.

## **2. AP Updates: Italian Courses, Adoption by CCCs**

- a. The committee considered an update to the coded memorandum on systemwide credit for external examinations.
- b. The committee recommended reinstatement of Italian AP credit.

## **3. Handling of Courses in Fine Arts (Area 3A in IGETC and C1 in Area Breadth)**

- a. Art
  - i. There are three categories of art courses.
    - 1. Art history, which is traditionally allowed for GE credit by both CSU and UC.
    - 2. Practice of art for future artists, which is not allowed for GE credit for either CSU or UC.
    - 3. Practice of art for the masses with some art history. The CSU allows these but the UC does not. However, there are no clear guidelines for inclusion in area breadth. Does this committee have advice?
  - ii. There may be a parallel for inclusion of language courses. (They must have a culture component, and the perceived dividing line is expressed differently for the UC and CSU).
  - iii. Pat, David and Ken will form a task force to look into the issue and supplement the task force with members from fine arts faculty.
- b. Creative writing in Area Breadth and IGETC.
- c. Ken will take the issue to IGETC standards review committee and report back.
- d. Ken updated us on the 2 unit courses at MPC—they will appear in the humanities only and hence not be covered by our “ban” on 2-unit art courses.

## **4. Proposed/Potential Title 5 Revisions**

### **a. Waiver Provisions for American Institutions**

- i. John gave an overview of the proposed change and compared it with waiver provisions for GE area breadth.
  - 1. Dean Mallon opined that consultation on AI and GE area breadth implementation have been a courtesy in the past but are not formally required by trustee policy nor executive order.
  - 2. John opined that EO 1033 does establish GEAC as a consultative body for area breadth implementation.
  - 3. Jim indicated that the referral of this issue to GEAC is a courtesy and expedient given the time frame but is not a formal ASCSU referral.

4. Mark indicated that AI issues have traditionally been dealt with in GEAC. Dean Mallon indicated that there is no formal policy establishing this convention—most implementation issues probably rightly lie with the campuses.
- ii. Professor Quam-Wickham expressed concern about
  1. The quick pace of this proposed change.
  2. The lack of consultation with discipline faculty.
  3. The lack of appropriate justification for the waiver.
  4. The potential disparity of requirements faced by native and transfer students and implied certification difficulties.
  5. The potential for international students to not fulfill this requirement.
  6. The fact that there may be many avenues for students to demonstrate proficiency either via exam or by double-counting Area D courses, making the waiver unnecessary.
- iii. She also expressed the view that we should focus on the appropriate content of these degrees. Students should not graduate without this content. In fact, many of the outcomes of these courses are reflected in the LEAP outcomes [Chair's note: these were formally incorporated into GE expectations in EO 1033].
- iv. Professor Koos indicated
  1. That the faculty has only had two weeks to respond to the proposed change.
  2. The proposed change may be viewed as expedient by some but does not seem to have a pedagogical rationale, especially in issues dealing with civic responsibility and engagement.
  3. Many of the LEAP outcomes are included in these courses.
  4. There is concern that "opening the door" in this way may lead to "turning our backs" on important student learning objectives.
  5. Exams should be considered before granting more widespread waivers.
  6. The faculty is concerned that this is the first step towards a three year degree that might get students graduated, if not as well prepared.
  7. The chairs of both political science and history are concerned that insufficient consultation has taken place.
- v. Professor Bowman
  1. Does not believe Title 5 should be modified—there are avenues for students to fulfill this requirement and still graduate in 120 units.
  2. Cited an article decrying the relative civic illiteracy in our society.
- vi. Professor Harrie echoed the previous chairs' points and reiterated concerns about consultation.
- vii. Kathy indicated that SB 1440 had strong bipartisan support, even though there was little faculty consultation during the process.

There was a desire to have more students transfer with an AA and to do so within a lower number of units. Title 5 is often amended. The best way to handle this would be to make sure that any waivers requested by the campuses are appropriate.

- viii. Catherine reviewed local campus resolutions calling for a delay in consideration of these changes to allow for appropriate consultation. There is skepticism that this was motivated more by a desire to reduce the number of units required rather than by curricular rationale. Perhaps CCC and CSU faculty leaders can work to amend SB 1440. Many of our students already lack the skills/knowledge necessary for success in life.
- ix. David serves on the SB 1440 implementation committee with Andrea and Jim Postma. He indicated that AI is a CSU, not a CCC requirement. We must comply with the law. There are other ways to fulfill this requirement other than taking lower-division courses.
- x. Jim Postma indicated that campuses must be able to demonstrate, under SB 1440, that students can graduate in 60 additional units.
- xi. Chris acknowledged concerns about both student preparation and issues of consultation. She gave an overview of Title 5, education code and executive orders and how consultation on this proposed change has taken place. Consultation started in March during the Board meeting.
  - 1. We are not proposing to change any requirement for native students.
  - 2. There are many requests from high unit majors on the campuses for waivers. Very few of these are ultimately granted. In the past 6 years, no new GE waivers have been approved—two existing waivers were reconfirmed.
  - 3. She reviewed the suggested changes for Title 5. The waivers/changes proposed will likely result in very few waivers actually being granted.
  - 4. Social/behavioral science faculty have opposed moving AI into GE Areas.
  - 5. Legislators are impatient with the number of units our students take prior to graduation.
  - 6. The legislation and proposed Title 5 changes in response may result in a bifurcation of requirements for transfer and native students. Some transfer students may be exempted from completing some or all of the AI requirement.
- xii. Mark indicated that the high-unit major waiver provision is indeed a way to waive the requirement for a whole class of students. Perhaps communications to the campuses on the intent of these changes could be clearer. Existing waivers for GE seem to be more justified in curricular terms that a blanket waiver for high-unit majors would seem to be.
  - 1. Dr. Mallon indicated that the intent was to make this provision parallel to provisions for area breadth.

2. We have to be careful about “hidden units” if students need to take either an exam or course if they do not pass the exam.
- xiii. Kate wondered why more attention is not being paid to demonstration of competency by exam.
- xiv. John indicated that the CSUCO staff is very faculty-oriented and believes that campus faculty should take the lead in most curricular issues.
- xv. The broader context (efficiency in graduating students) makes it difficult to understand the intentions behind these proposed changes.
- xvi. Gail indicated that SB 1440 has changed the landscape. Perhaps it is time to consider incorporating the AI requirements into lower-division GE.
- xvii. Ken indicated that we need to be cognizant of the reality of student mobility and that campuses should be allowed to adapt their curricula to meet student needs.
- xviii. Nancy indicated a desire to have a firmer commitment to civic literacy in the new Title 5 language. Discipline faculty can incorporate a civic literacy requirement into their TMCs. Wouldn't the GVAR be a source of “hidden units?”
- xix. Andrea indicated that the Academic Affairs Committee will consider this issue tomorrow. She has noted the comments and suggestions shared to this point and invited attendees to e-mail her at [abolye@sfsu.edu](mailto:abolye@sfsu.edu).
- xx. David indicated that by incorporating AI into area breadth, we should not increase the total units required in area breadth. There should be no problem having the CCCs advise students to complete this requirement prior to transfer.
- xxi. Mark solicited advice for the APEP committee. Both AA and APEP will be considering aspects of proposed changes to Title 5.
- xxii. Could the legislature be requested to “fix” this provision?
  1. Jim indicated that opening up SB 1440 for fixes would likely result in more onerous changes.
- xxiii. Gail indicated that a number of CSU campuses have incorporated AI into GE since the issuing of EO 1033.
- xxiv. Kathy indicated that the implementation of the GVAR requirement is handled very flexibly on the campuses.
- xxv. David feels that an ASCSU resolution encouraging CCC campuses to advise students to complete AI would be welcome.
- xxvi. Kate expressed concern that the history and political science chairs do not have a formal avenue for sharing their concerns. Could this proposed change be postponed until next fall?
  1. Chris indicated that this item will not be acted upon until July.
- xxvii. Pat recommended that campuses consider resolutions opposing the requesting of waivers on their campuses.
- xxviii. Chris requested the political science and history faculty share some potential language for Title 5 affirming the importance of civic

literacy. The three political science and three history faculty present at the meeting caucused to develop some proposed language.

- xxix. Nancy suggested high unit major faculty work with their political science and history faculty to develop pathways, perhaps with fewer units, for their students to meet these learning outcomes.
- xxx. There is likely to be a presentation by chairs at the BOT meeting next week.
- xxxi. The attending AI faculty recommended
  - 1. That some draft language be added to the Title 5 language affirming a commitment to civic literacy.
  - 2. Language be added to require that exemptions granted under 4a and 4b of must go through standard campus curricular approval process.

**b. Minimum Grades for CSU Native Students in “Golden Four” Courses**

- i. The committee is supportive of the resolution currently being sponsored by AA and APEP that would align standards for native and transfer students.

**c. Limits on Maximum Units Required for GE on a CSU Campus**

- i. This came up in the context of SB 1440.
- ii. Most of the committee felt that such a supporting change to Title 5 would be inappropriate. Andrea will communicate this to Academic Affairs Committee.

**d. GE Waiver for second baccalaureate students.**

- i. There is no opposition to this Title 5 change.

**5. Course Substitutions: Students with Disabilities**

- a. Postponed.

**6. Symposium on GE Student Learning Outcomes**

- a. The conference will likely be held in October—the funding has been held over to support the conference.
- b. Every campus will be asked to send a team.

**7. Open Forum**

- a. Kathy shared a CAPP RFP for helping students to become proficient in mathematics prior to graduation.
  - i. There is already an ERWC course for English proficiency.
  - ii. The focus is to be on algebra literacy.
  - iii. It is hoped that teams of HS faculty and college/university faculty will apply.

The meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.