

General Education Advisory Committee
Agenda-Setting Agenda
October 23, 2009
1:00 PM – 3:00 PM
(by video)

Video:

John Tarjan (Guest)
Mark Van Selst (Chair)
Margaret Costa
Catherine Nelson
Romey Sabalius
Jim Wheeler
David Morris (CCC senate representative)
Ken O'Donnell
Jim Postma

Phone:

Kevin Baaske
Kathy Kaiser (Vice Chair)

Absent:

Patricia Kalayjian
Barbara Swerkes
Christine Hanson
Gail Evans
Terri Eden (CSU articulation)
Cindy Parish (CCC articulation)
Student (CSSA)

Deleted: Jim Postma

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
 - i. no one volunteered
 - ii. Mark Van Selst will take notes

- b. Notes from prior meetings (08/09)
 - i. 2008/09 meeting notes are currently under review but should be posted shortly.

4) Meeting Goals

- a. Brain-Storming for November Agenda

The remainder of the agenda covered potential topics for November; each of the items was discussed with an eye towards what type of action (if any) should be considered. Actions to be undertaken appear in bold.

5) Compass (see external links at end of these minutes)

- 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. 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; 5PM finish time)**. Many of the committee members will be able to meet “in person” in the video room of CSU:DH.
- b. Ken O’donnell provided an overview of the Compass Project desire to encourage “high impact educational practices” with a particular emphasis in the presentation on the role of General Education. High impact, in this context, means improved retention, persistence, and completion – especially those interventions that are particularly beneficial to historically under-served groups.
- c. The presentation was followed by a discussion of assessment metrics and what data did or could exist that would support or allow testing of the “high impact” claims and the claims of disproportionate benefit. The best existing data appears to be a NSSE (national survey of student engagement) analysis. **Ken will email this analysis to the committee members (Kuh analysis)**.
- d. Compass will host a GE conference (May, 2010).
- e. The distinct but parallel roles played by Compass and GEAC were discussed.

- f. Common questions around GE were discussed. “what is the function of GE?”, “how can we make GE more relevant”, “how can perceptions of GE be changed such that GE is seen as more than the sum of the parts (courses and equivalencies).”
 - g. Compass “adds on” to GE to make GE more relevant.
 - i. What are the outcomes?
 - ii. What are the assessments?
 - iii. What is the “value added” by GE to a degree?
 - h. It was noted that CPEC data strongly indicates that employers desire GE type of outcomes
 - i. There is the potential for a disconnect between both how various faculty groups may wish to see GE develop (professional school needs vs. liberal arts-based perspectives) and what students may desire.
- 6) LEAP / EO 595 (assessment of GE package) (see EO 1033 and LEAP links at the end of these notes).
- a. the "overall assessment" required for the GE package related to the LEAP (Liberal Education: America's Promise) outcomes
 - b. GEAC and Compass will both be working to encourage efforts (regional or otherwise) to work on outcomes-based assessment of GE.
 - c. It is noted that GEAC will NOT setting “THE” metric to be used, rather, to encourage the campus or collaboratively based development of a set of potentially effective assessment tools.
- 7) AP/IB course-based GE credit
- a. IB exams in English.
 - i. An early draft of the CSU credit by exam policy included English in area A2 but didn't make it to the final policy as promulgated in May 2009.
 - ii. 15 CSUs are currently accepting it for GE area A2 (highest percentage of agreement for the IB exams)
 - iii. why aren't we accepting this system wide? Statewide inclusion would mandate acceptance everywhere. The English council suggests that the IB course does not necessarily require “writing in a variety of domains”, rather, it appears to have too narrow of a focus on literature to merit blessing IB English for statewide acceptance via inclusion on the list.
 - iv. **At this time, Mark Van Selst and Ken O'Donnell will follow-up and ensure that the rationale for this rejection be made clear to**

the IB folks such that they have an opportunity to respond (via appeal or course requirement change if appropriate).

- b. Other residual IB issues?
 - i. In the prior year an issue with credit for science laboratories was identified. The IB folks were not able to pin down whether somebody could 'fail' the lab component but still pass the course. Based on this, last year's decision was to not allow IB courses to count for the laboratory requirement in GE. **It is likely that this decision and its underlying rationale should be similarly communicated to the IB folks.**
- c. Any AP issues?
 - i. Movie theatre credits were discontinued based on faculty feedback. Other discontinuations followed only from the exams no longer being offered.

8) 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. SJSU and SDSU currently follow the ACE recommended guide, local approvals currently in GE and course to course for these exams.
- c. **It was asked that GEAC members bring relevant questions and concerns to the November and January meetings.**

9) 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 was argued for.
 - i. This is partially in response to the implicit description of transfer as flawed as contained in the report from Moore, Shulock, & Jensen among others.
 - ii. IGETC vs. GE (see later item) was discussed
 - iii. 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)

10) 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.).

11) 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
 - i. Historical development of CSU-GE and IGETC produced a fairly minimal number of discrepancies. Further alignment may be possible.
- 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?
 - 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).
- 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?
 - ii. It was noted that CCCs are well-aware of the difference between “GE certification” and “eligibility for transfer”. This remains a potential area for confusion for students and a burdensome area of analysis for CSU graduation evaluation.
- 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).
 - i. There was only very limited discussion on this item

12) Grading for GE courses (Credit/No Credit; ABC/NC; A-F; Restrictions?)

- a. This item was addressed last year.
- b. It was noted that “pretty sure almost all” CCCs required at least a C for CR grade (not a C-). **We need to know if there are 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. 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.
- b. 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.
- c. **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.**

14) Definition of baccalaureate credit

- a. EO 167 defines baccalaureate credit.
- b. The ASCSU has a position paper (“considerations of ...”, 1987) that (evidently somewhat controversially?) expands upon the definitions in EO 167.
- c. These two CSU definitional documents are often used by the CCCs to determine if a course is appropriate for baccalaureate level units (or if it is pre-baccalaureate coursework).
- d. **There is a referral to revisit this definition**
- e. **Mark Van Selst will coordinate efforts with the Academic Affairs committee of the ASCSU to ensure that wires do not get crossed.**
- f. **Jim Postma volunteered to take the lead on this item**

15) MOU with the University of Maryland: University College

- a. Aka “Troops to college” MOU
- b. History
 - i. was signed without much faculty input
 - ii. extends CCC processes to an external non-CA agency
 - iii. component recommendations (not part of formal MOU) do NOT follow faculty-derived coursework preparations paths (e.g., LDTP patterns).
 - iv. Earlier drafts of the MOU specified a requirement for double-counting GE and American Institutions; this was removed before the now-signed version was finalized.

- c. UMUC provided a list of their desired GE articulations, this list was scrubbed by the chancellor's office to remove obvious misalignments. This is the current status.
- d. These (suggested) articulations will be statewide (facilitate college-going behavior of veterans and other military) but will not be represented within ASSIST nor is this an IGETC approval process.

16) AP credit: minimum scores

- a. 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)
- b. 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 <specify>).
- c. 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 with the "new" (summer/08) memorandum.
 - i. the 'new' memorandum provides 3 units for AP language rather than the prior memorandum which provided 6 units for AP language.
 - ii. 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).

External materials:

Executive Order on GE implementation

<http://www.calstate.edu/EO/EO-1033.html>

Moore, C., Shulock, N., & Jensen, C. (2009). Crafting a student-centered transfer process in California: Lessons from other states. Institute for Higher-Education Leadership and Policy (CSU: Sacramento).

<http://www.collegecampaign.org/assets/docs/2009-IHELP-Transfer-Report-FINAL-08-09.pdf>

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.