Video:
  John Tarjan (Guest)
  Mark Van Selst (Chair)
  Margaret Costa
  Catherine Nelson
  Romey Sabalius
  Jim Wheeler
  David Morris (CCC senate representative)
  Ken O’Donnell
  Kevin Baaske
  Kathy Kaiser (Vice Chair)
  Patricia Kalayjian
  Barbara Swerkes
  Christine Hanson
  Jim Postma
  Gail Evans
  Terri Eden (CSU articulation)
  Cindy Parish (CCC articulation)
  Student (CSSA)

Absent:
  No known expected absences at this time

1) Technical Assistance re: Video-setup.
   a. The primary communication medium should be the campus-based video link
   b. People whose video connection doesn't work may be able to access a conference call line (to be set up). The phone number provided is believed to be the direct line to the conference room.

2) Introductions & background

3) Minutes / Notes
   a. Note-taker for this meeting
      i. Volunteer?
   b. Notes from prior meetings (08/09)
      i. 2008/09 meeting notes are currently under review but should be posted shortly.
         1. not yet distributed
      ii. Notes from October 2009 meeting were distributed with this meeting agenda
          1. approval
   c. Additions or changes to the current agenda?

4) Meeting Goals
a. Action plans rather than “many reports”
   i. Streamlining Assessment and Articulation
   ii. Defining baccalaureate credit
   iii. CLEP credit
   iv. Provide a counterpoint to critics and self-identify areas of concern
   v. Defining the desired role of GE

5) What is the message from the CSU Board of Trustees re: General Education?
a. What GEAC “scope” documents currently exist? (EO 1033, article 6)
   i. GE within the LEAP as context
   ii. GE as an integrative whole
   iii. GE as integrated into the degree programs

b. Access to Excellence
   i. Commitment 1: Reduction of Achievement Gaps
      1. access
      2. retention
      3. graduation
   ii. Commitment 2: Public Accountability
   iii. Commitment 7: Globalization
   iv. Commitment 8: Continuing Education

6) Reports from other groups, agencies, and committees.
a. Academic Affairs
   i. Has taken up “defining baccalaureate credit”
   ii. Will be meeting again November 5-6, 2009

b. Admissions Advisory
   i. ?

c. GE Affinity Group (October Meeting)
   i. E-portfolio based-assessment and integration
   ii. Other?

d. The November Compass Meeting (CSU: Dominguez Hills).
   i. Recap

e. Other relevant input?

f. And “new” items to be agendized?

7) Relationships with other groups, agencies, and committees
a. Recommendations for preserving the distinct but parallel roles played by Compass and GEAC.
   i. liaison-only model

b. Recommendations for communications with the CSU “GE affinity group” (developmental GE efforts, interested parties, etc.)
   i. Liaison-only or “we’ll just share membership?”

c. Any “new” items to be agendized?

8) AP/IB course-based GE credit
a. Old items
   i. Mark Van Selst and Ken O’Donnell will follow-up and ensure that the rationale for the English 2B IB rejection (too narrow a focus in
writing prompts) be made clear to the IB folks such that they have an opportunity to respond (via appeal or course requirement change if appropriate).

ii. Mark Van Selst and Ken O’Donnell will similarly communicate the issue with credit for science laboratories.
   1. The IB folks were not able to pin down whether somebody could ‘fail’ the lab component but still pass the course.
   2. Based on this, last year’s decision was to not allow IB courses to count for the laboratory requirement in GE.

iii. EO 1036 (summer/08) specified minimum scores on AP exams to receive credit (along with requirements for other forms of non-transcript-based credit: military, work, other standardized exams)

iv. A Coded Memo (summer/08) provides a list of college AP scores and the credits to be awarded. This coded memo superseded an earlier “off the desk” memorandum (from c. 10 years earlier <we need to specify when>).
   1. There was a question of whether the ‘new’ (first) coded memorandum came with ‘catalog rights’ for students who would be disadvantaged by the potential reduction in units provided relative to the old (non-coded) memorandum.
   2. The ‘new’ memorandum provides 3 units for AP language rather than the prior memorandum which provided 6 units for AP language.
   3. A potential confusion is whether the new memo allows 6 units of baccalaureate credit but only 3 units of GE credit (humanities). This issue needs to be clarified before returning to the committee (November/09) for action (i.e., providing a recommendation).

b. Any new IB or AP issues?

9) CLEP: the potential awarding of GE credit related to the use of CLEP exams
   a. Presentation by CLEP is scheduled for the January meeting.
   b. Some CSUs follow ACE recommendations; there are local approvals currently in GE and course to course for these exams with some campuses.
   c. It was asked that GEAC members bring relevant questions and concerns to the November and January meetings.
   d. Defining a sub-committee to critically assess CLEP and make recommendations to the committee re: system-level guidelines (pros & cons).
   e. Any new items to be agendized?

10) White Paper on GE-related transfer?
   a. Many education-related bills from the legislature focus on the ‘failures’ of transfer. It was argued that CSU GE-breadth is the strongest and most robust element of undergraduate transfer within California. A GEAC sponsored white paper laying out the strengths of the GE program, including its efficacious transfer elements and their weaknesses was argued for. Such a paper would be partially in response to the implicit
description of transfer as flawed as contained in the report from Moore, Shulock, & Jensen among others. It seemed to resonate with the committee that trumpeting the successes of GE would be of value. However, it was also noted that in addition to noting what works well there would be strong value in also noting the weak portions of GE (esp. re: transfer where problems do exist).

b. Who is the audience for such a paper? (legislative educational materials)
c. Sub-committee formation?

11) Innovative Pedagogies versus Barriers to Transfer

a. It was noted that one of the barriers to GE innovation is the “transfer” nature of the GE program which precludes developing fully integrated GE packages without producing potential barriers to transfer (e.g., puzzle-piece cumulative courses may not partially transfer, etc.).

b. Are there examples of such programs that facilitate flexibility?

12) Continued work on facilitating articulation

a. Is transfer problematic? Can the process be improved?
   i. Full completion of GE articulation works quite well.
   ii. Partial completion of GE works less well.
   iii. IGETC does permit partial certification at transfer, but does not necessarily indicate which area(s) still need to be taken (1-2 courses only).

b. Upper Division CSU Admission eligibility policy states that the 4 basic skills (GE Area A1, A2, A3, and B4) must be C or better, however the CSU GE policy does not have grade minimums of C or better in those GE courses (these can be certified as complete when the grade is as low as a D-). It was noted that CCCs are well-aware of the difference between “GE certification requirements” and “eligibility for transfer”. This remains a potential area for confusion for students and a burdensome area of analysis for CSU graduation evaluation.
   i. Should there be action here?

c. Intersegmental collaboration through ICAS (Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates) on finding commonalities for effective GE transfer at admission for student transfers
   i. Historical development of CSU-GE and IGETC produced a fairly minimal number of discrepancies. Further alignment may be possible.
      1. There are grade minimums for the IGETC pattern, and none for the CSU GE patterns (except for GE certification of the golden 4). Is this something that should or could be aligned? Should GEAC pursue the possibility of further grade minima?
   ii. Grading for GE courses (Credit/No Credit; ABC/NC; A-F; Restrictions?) was addressed last year. (note: notes are not available yet – it will remain an agenda item until disposed of)
iii. It was noted that “pretty sure almost all” CCCs required at least a C for CR grade (not a C-). **Are there institutions that allow C- / D to count as “passing grades” in order to award a CR grade?**

13) Second semester composition course (should one be required?).
   a. How many CSU have this as a graduation requirement or in their GE?
   b. This course is always an approved GE course at the CCC (and we encourage student to take this), and if most CSU require this for graduation, can we look to incorporate this into a required GE Area?
      i. UC has the IGETC area of Critical Thinking - second semester English composition.
   c. This was the #1 item identified as a “likely change” to the GE pattern in last years GE survey. There is a strong CCC and CSU focus on improving writing.
   d. There was agreement that any such POTENTIAL mandated change (will be added to Nov. agenda) should NOT require additional units in the lower- or upper- division GE package.
   e. What are the models for such inclusion?

14) Definition of baccalaureate credit
   a. Academic Affairs (ASCSU) has taken up this issue.
   b. AA is seeking furthering advice and input on the definitions
      i. Note: GEAC is much more interdisciplinary that the senate and includes Articulation Officers which the Senate does not – GEAC assistance is being sought to inform the efforts of the ASCSU.

15) MOU with the University of Maryland: University College (“Troops to College”)
   a. CSU MOU with UM:UC produces articulations that are not present within ASSIST nor are part of any IGETC approval process.
   b. How can these potential articulation difficulties be minimized?

16) Workload Coordination/Reduction: Assessment Alignment
   a. In the context of dramatically diminished resources, there is pressure to eliminate, coordinate, and/or align assessments for both assessment and accountability purposes (e.g., collapsing GE assessment into Program Assessments, reuse/repurposing evaluations for different levels of assessments, etc.).
   b. What is the role of GEAC is advocating for or against such efforts?

17) CCC/CSU Pilot Projects (General Education)
   a. Moving articulation away from the “class checklist”
      i. What are successful models?

18) IGETC
   a. (?Symbolic logic?) courses are prohibited from counting in the Humanities
      i. Origin of this restriction (CSU?)
      ii. IGETC Notes (statement on this?)
      iii. Further information?

19) Denials of GE Certification
   a. Stories?
      i. Commonalities?
ii. Origins?
b. Relevant guiding documents?
External materials:

Executive Order on GE implementation
http://www.calstate.edu/EO/EO-1033.html


Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U):
Liberal Education America’s Promise (LEAP) initiative
http://www.aacu.org/leap/vision.cfm
http://www.aacu.org/leap/LEAPCSUInitiative.cfm

the “give students a COMPASS” project (tri-state partnership)
http://www.aacu.org/compass/index.cfm
Compass supports public higher education and faculty-driven reform efforts designed to strengthen the quality of student learning on campuses within each system. The broad goals of the project address AAC&U’s strategic priority to “Aim High — Make Excellence Inclusive,” (see the AAC&U Strategic Plan). This priority is a commitment to students historically underserved—first-generation students, racial and ethnic minority students, and those from low-income families. The essential learning outcomes of LEAP are thus intentionally placed for all students to achieve through general and liberal education. Compass partnerships are designed to work in multiple directions within state systems—bottom up, top down, inside out, and outside in. Communication among the partner systems encourages exchange and growth.

Key Questions:
1. How can state systems become generative catalysts for change that is also supported at the campus level?
2. How can general education be redesigned in ways that raise the levels of underserved student success within large systems?
3. How can general education become a catalyst for helping students achieve the LEAP “essential learning outcomes”? What new design principles should be applied?

Through the Compass national project, AAC&U members are poised to lead a next generation of work on the design and practice of general education. Just as the Greater Expectations project (2000-2006) set the course for LEAP, Compass moves us along a path toward excellence for all as a nation goes to college. Looking ahead, we see students in the Compass project navigating from college forward into their new global century. This initiative is funded by Carnegie Corporation, State Farm, the Lumina Foundation, and the participating system partners of the Compass project.

CSU Board of Trustee’s “Access to Excellence” documents: