1) Technical Assistance
   a. The primary communication medium should be the campus-based video link
   b. People whose video connection doesn't work can join us by phone via a
      conference call number:

      Dial: (866) 213-2185
      Access: 5270 685 #

2) Introductions & background

3) Minutes / Notes
   a. Note-taker for this meeting
   b. Notes from prior meetings (08/09)

4) Meeting Goals
   a. Brain-Storming for November Agenda

   The remainder of the agenda is potential topics for November; each of the items will be
   discussed with an eye towards what type of action (if any) should be considered.

5) Compass
   a. The CSU continues as part of a three-state collaboration to plan, implement
      and assess innovations in General Education. Working with the Association
      of American College and Universities (AAC&U) the CSU and the state
      systems in Oregon and Wisconsin have adopted the “Give Students a
      Compass” project to foster the development of high impact practices in
      General Education across systems of higher education.

   b. All three of these state systems are characterized by a high proportion of
      student transfers and diversity. The Compass Project provides seed funds for
      sustained emphasis on equity and the success of historically underserved
      students. There is a Dominguez Hills event scheduled for November 3rd and
      4th that is related to this Compass Project. It is for this reason that the
      November meeting was moved to CSU:DH (2PM start time

   c. Expectations of outcomes and referrals within the scope of the GEAC
      mandate?
6) LEAP / EO 595 (assessment of GE package)
   a. the "overall assessment" required for the GE package related to the LEAP
      (Liberal Education: America's Promise) outcomes

7) AP/IB course-based GE credit
   a. IB exams in English. This was on the draft CSU credit by exam policy, but
      didn't make it to the final policy in May 2009. What strikes me as strange, is
      that 15 CSUs are currently accepting it for GE area A2 (highest percentage of
      agreement for the IB exams), then why aren't we accepting this system wide?
   b. Other residual IB issues?
   c. Any AP issues?

8) CLEP: the potential awarding of GE credit related to the use of CLEP exams
   a. Presentation by CLEP scheduled for the January meeting
   b. SJSU and SDSU currently follow the ACE recommended guide, local
      approvals currently in GE and course to course for these exams.

9) White Paper on GE-related transfer?
   a. Many education-related bills from the legislature focus on the ‘failures’ of
      transfer. It could be argued that CSU GE-breadth is the strongest and most
      robust element of undergraduate transfer within California. Should a white
      paper laying out the strengths of the GE program, including its efficacious
      transfer elements be produced by this group? (this is partially in response to
      the implicit description of transfer as flawed as contained in the report from
      Moore, Shulock, & Jensen among others)

10) Continued work on facilitating articulation
    a. Intersegmental collaboration through ICAS (Intersegmental Committee of
       Academic Senates) on finding commonalities for effective GE transfer at
       admission for student transfers
    b. The recent report from Moore, Shulock, and Jensen.
    c. How is partial and full completion of GE requirements indicated across
       institutions? Is the transfer problematic? Can the process be improved?
    d. 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-).
       i. These policies seem to conflict with each other. Can we discuss
          aligning the CSU GE policy to match the CSU Admission policy for
          these courses?
e. Is there any possibility to join IGETC and the CSU GE into one pattern that both campuses can use? What about grade minimums for the IGETC pattern, and none for the CSU GE patterns. Is this something that should or could be aligned? Again the CSU admission eligibility for upper division transfers require C average in 30 units of GE, however there is not a policy for grade minimums for GE as the IGETC does. If we aren't going to align the minimum grades for GE, would could align the pattern, and allow C or better for UC certification, and no grade minimums for CSU GE certification (except in the golden 4 if this gets aligned- see first bullet item).

11) Grading for GE courses
   a. Credit/No Credit; ABC/NC; A-F
   b. Restrictions?

12) Second semester composition course (require?).
   a. Do we want to see how many CSU have this as a graduation requirement or in their GE. Since 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? UC has the IGETC area of Critical Thinking - second semester English composition.

13) New Business
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.