Video or in person:
Margaret Costa
Terri Eden (CSU articulation)
Gail Evans
Kathy Kaiser (Vice Chair)
Patricia Kalayjian (conflict with a conference)
David Morse (CCC senate representative)
Catherine Nelson
Ken O’Donnell
Cindy Parish (CCC articulation)
Jim Postma
Romey Sabalius
Barbara Swerkes
Mark Van Selst (Chair)
Jim Wheeler

Guests
John Tarjan (ASCSU, chair)

Absent:
Kevin Baaske
Christine Mallon
Student (CSSA)

Pre-Meeting:
1) Technical Assistance re: Video-setup.
2) Introductions & background
3) No note-taker volunteered [thus MVS]

Meeting
1) Notes from prior meetings (08/09)
   a. Prior 2008/09 meeting notes reviewed.
   b. Agenda approved as modified
2) 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
   b. The defined and desired role of GE was discussed (see EO 1033)
3) What is the message from the CSU Board of Trustees re: General Education?
   a. There was limited discussion, no action was taken.
4) 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. APEP/EAP/etc. were discussed. There are new laws being promulgated. There are some legal questions re: implementation etc.  
   ii. The potential “application” aspect of GE experience was discussed.  
c. GE Affinity Group (October Meeting)  
   i. The most recent online presentations (Webinars via Elluminate) were Gail Evans and Maggie Bearshe on E-portfolio based-assessment and integration and Terry Rhodes on value rubrics. In both cases the strong alignment with strategic plans were noted.  
   ii. Any individual wishing to be added to the GE affinity group should contact Ken O’donnell.  
d. The November Compass Meeting recap.  
   i. The decline in US educational leadership was presented as well as a discussion of the changing face of international education.  
   ii. There were three demonstration projects reported.  
      1. 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.).  
      2. An example of an early stage integration of GE across campus sites was discussed (SJSU/EVC).  
      3. Integrated multi-campus GE could provide the encompassing experience envisioned via LEAP and other initiatives.  

5) Relationships with other groups, agencies, and committees (Compass, GEAC, CSU “GE affinity group”)  
   a. The decision was that the information sharing was sufficient so that no formal liaison or reporting functions were desired.  
   b. There are concerns of GE “change” by Compass but the discussion evolved into an understanding that Compass and GE affinity were “implementation” type agencies (applied component) whereas GEAC serves more of a “governing” agency function.  

6) AP/IB course-based GE credit  
   a. Terri Eden, Ken O’Donnell, and Mark Van Selst will follow-up to 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).  
   b. Mark Van Selst and Ken O’Donnell will similarly communicate the issue with credit for science laboratories.
i. The IB folks were not able to pin down whether somebody could ‘fail’ the lab component but still pass the course.

ii. 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 un-numbered memorandum (Jo Service, 1997).

1. On the 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.
   **The decision was to recommend allowing such rights for exams taken prior to the memorandum.** This is congruent with prior practice.

2. The ‘new’ memorandum provides 3 units for AP language rather than the prior memorandum which provided 6 units for AP language. It is noted that the 3 or 6 units may or may not be units within the major but would qualify as 3 units for GE regardless of the disposition of the other 3 college level units.

3. The new memo allows 6 units of baccalaureate credit but only 3 units of GE credit (humanities).

7) 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. A sub-committee of Jim Postma, Terri Eden, Catherine Nelson, and Ken O’Donnell will critically assess CLEP and will guide the process of making recommendations to the committee re: system-level guidelines (pros & cons).

8) A decision to recommend a white paper on GE-related transfer was passed along to the ASCSU executive for action.
   a. 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. Potential agencies of interest (as recipients and/or authors) include: ICAS, legislature, Assembly Higher Education Committee, and the Chancellor’s Office.
   c. Evidence may be derived from ASSIST (matriculations, % GE completions, dearth of complaints [via online feedback mechanism]), etc.
d. Dan Danini & Troy Berry (Transfer Center Directors) and Kathleen Barth (Articulation Officer) mentioned the difference between ease of transfer for GE and the more idiosyncratic transfer for the major.

9) Continued work on facilitating articulation
   a. Full completion of GE articulation works quite well.
   b. Partial completion of GE works less well.
      i. The SciGETC approach was discussed.
      ii. IGETC does permit partial certification at transfer, but does not necessarily indicate which area(s) still need to be taken (1-2 courses only).
         1. The possibility of CCC documentation of partial transfer (What is the student missing?) was discussed but not acted on via recommendation.
   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.
      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). It was decided that GEAC would not pursue any action around extending any grade minima.
      iii. A concern over “CR” grades for performance of less than a C level at the CCCs were deemed to be unfounded.

10) Further support for writing proficiency
    a. No action was recommended re: additional GE unit requirements
    b. It was noted that both LEAP and COMPASS have a focus element on writing.

11) Definition of baccalaureate credit
    a. Academic Affairs (ASCSU) has taken up this issue. Mark Van Selst, John Tarjan, Jim Postma, and Ken O’Donnell will all be extensively involved in the development of any potential new policy and will ensure communication with this body. A request will be made to Jane Patton to provide a CCC liaison to assist in providing furthering advice and input on the definitions as developed via the Academic Affairs Committee of the ASCSU.

12) 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. Potential articulation difficulties exist but have not yet been fully realized.
    c. No action was recommended

13) Workload Coordination/Reduction: Assessment Alignment
    a. No action was recommended

14) IGETC Standards
a. Symbolic logic courses are “normally” prohibited from counting in the Humanities
   i. There is uncertainty about the origin of this restriction (CSU?)
   ii. IGETC Notes include a statement on this topic
   iii. Ken O’Donnell and Gail Evans agreed to investigate this topic further.

15) Denials of GE Certification
General Education Advisory Committee (GEAC) Notes

November 4, 2009

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: