

Chancellor's General Education Advisory Committee

November 1, 2011
CSU Chancellor's Office
Notes

Attendees: Kevin Baaske (LA), John Tarjan (Bakersfield), Kathy Kaiser (Chico), Kate Fawver (DH), Patricia Kalayjian (DH), David Hood (LB), Catherine Nelson (Sonoma), Mark Van Selst (SJ), Martin Linder (SF), Terri Eden (SJ, virtual), Ken O'Donnell (CSUCO), Andrea Boyle (SF), Joanne Benschop (Mira Costa C), Jeremy White (LA) Jeff Spano (CCCCO) Martin Linder (SF, virtual), David Morse (LBCC)

Guests: Wayne Tikkanen (CSUCO), Debra David (CSUCO)

1. **The meeting was convened at 11:08 am.** Chair Tarjan welcomed the participants and the participants introduced themselves.
2. **Approval of Agenda** The agenda was amended to move up the presentation on the GE assessment conference and to add WASC benchmarking to the Open Forum section. Subsequently, critical thinking in Area Breadth was also added to the Open Forum section.
3. **Review of Notes of Meeting of 9/14/11** The notes will incorporate one change previously suggested regarding campus identification.
4. **ITL Symposium on GE Outcomes**
 - a. It was held in conjunction with the WASC Outcomes Assessment Conference in Berkeley
 - b. Dr. Tikkanen, ITL Director provided an overview of the conference.
 - i. 15 CSU and 3 CCC campuses (Compass partners) participated.
 - ii. The goal was to have campus teams develop action plans for the assessment of general education.
 - iii. Conference survey results (20% response rate to date) show that most participants believed the conference was helpful in moving campus assessment plans forward. The CSU participants felt that the campus team meeting times was the most valuable aspect of their time in Berkeley.
 - iv. Web resources:
 1. Conference: <http://www.calstate.edu/itl/symposium/2011/>
 2. WASC Resources: <http://www.wascsenior.org/seminars/assessment2>
 - v. One committee member was a bit surprised that some campuses are at such a rudimentary stage of GE assessment.
 - vi. The participation of junior faculty was viewed very positively.
 - vii. A major theme was the need for ongoing funding for assessment.
 - c. The next GEAC agenda should include GE assessment, including coordination with CCCs. GEAC leadership has been tasked with providing some background materials.

5. Review of EO 1065

- a. Main changes in EOs 595-1033
 - i. Clearer formatting
 - ii. 3.2—incorporation of LEAP outcomes. “Each campus shall” incorporate them.
 - iii. 6.2.2—need to adhere to 120 units when developing new degree programs.
 - iv. 6.2.5—mentions assessment of outcomes when discussing program review.
- b. Change in EOs 1033-1065—added 2.2.5 c
 - i. **c.** A student who has been admitted to a baccalaureate degree program is exempt from additional general education requirements if:
 - 1. (i) The student has previously earned a baccalaureate or higher degree from an institution accredited by a regional accrediting association; or
 - 2. (ii) The student has completed equivalent academic preparation, as determined by the appropriate campus authority.

6. American Institutions Policy Revisions—Implementation of SB 1440, Transfer Model Curricula

- a. There have been no TMCs rejected by CSU campuses specifically because of AI considerations.
- b. CCC campuses have begun implementing transfer AAs.
 - i. Over 200 transfer AA degrees have been approved.
 - ii. Almost all of the degrees are following the TMCs.
 - iii. 77 campuses have at least 2 approved degrees (as required by SB 1440). Most of the others are working to have at least 2 shortly. 4 campuses have yet to submit.
 - iv. The latest edition of the ASCCC *Rostrum* is dedicated to SB 1440. http://asccc.org/sites/default/files/Rostrum/Rostrum_Nov11.pdf
- c. The conversation continues with some CSU campuses who feel they are unable to implement particular TMCs.
- d. Question—will the CCC campuses also be conducting assessment of LEAP outcomes as required of CSU campuses?
 - i. CCCs are assessing their AA degrees broadly. GE is a big part of the degrees.
 - 1. These efforts are at the campus level. There is no system-wide effort.
 - ii. Many CCC faculty are unaware of the LEAP outcomes. One of the goals of Compass is to align CCC and CSU GE outcomes.
- e. Many CCC campuses have liberal arts AAs.
- f. There was a discussion about the history of TMC development and current developments and challenges.
 - i. No AI waivers have been requested to date.

- ii. The legislation does not prohibit double-counting of AI with GE. The CCCs intend to continue to counsel their students to complete AI prior to transfer if possible.
- g. It is hoped that the CSU will coordinate GE assessment with our CCC partners.

7. Review Criteria for Community College Courses Proposed for Area C1 Arts

- a. Ken O'Donnell provided some background on this item and the reason why clearer criteria are needed.
- b. The CCC and CSU have provided names of professors to work on criteria.
- c. The group decided it would be best to include UC faculty when developing guidelines to see if parallel guidelines for IGETC and Area Breadth could be developed.
- d. It has been referred to the ICAS ICETC Standards Review Subcommittee, which has faculty representatives from each system. We are awaiting their recommendations. The next meeting of ICAS is next week. Professor Morse chairs the subcommittee.

8. New CLEP Exams in College Composition and College Composition “Modular”

- a. ASCSU chair Jim Postma requested that the CSU English Council provide faculty reviewers,
- b. Names have been provided and Ken has forwarded confidential materials from the College Board for review by arts faculty. He will also provide copies for members of GEAC.
- c. Ken expects to have recommendations from the group by our next meeting.
- d. Question—can we identify a method for students to demonstrate learning of foreign languages?
 - i. Perhaps we can look at military proficiency standards/courses.
 - ii. Teri and Mark will do some background research on potential challenge exams. The inclusion of a cultural component will be an issue to be addressed.

9. Give Students a Compass Project Update

- a. Deborah David gave an overview of the project.
 - i. \$1,000,000 in external funding has been pledged by outside foundations.
 - ii. We will be adding more CSU-CCC team projects due to the significant commitment from the Irvine Foundation.
- b. We would like input from GEAC and the expanded Compass Steering Committees regarding new proposals and criteria.
- c. We hope to have enough funding to allow any CSU-CCC partnerships to receive at least some money to facilitate collaboration.
- d. A major focus is on the incorporation of “high impact practices” into the GE curriculum.

- e. AAC&U has provided \$120,000 from the Lumina Foundation to work on the degree qualifications profile.
 - i. Northridge and Pierce College will receive funding to explore articulation based upon demonstrated proficiencies rather than coursework.
- f. WICHE is working with the Carnegie Foundation to explore ways to do interstate articulation of GE.
- g. There is a proposal for funding from the Carnegie Foundation for networking partnerships and faculty development support for central California collaboration.
- h. Jane Wellman of NASH is helping us with looking at whether HIPs are cost-effective in terms of persistence to degree rather than for offering a particular course. While it may require some expense initially to incorporate things like service learning, they may be a worthwhile investment because of improved student outcomes.
- i. Interesting question—should we articulate learning at some point in time (traditional approach) or at transfer or at some other time?
- j. The Gilbert Foundation sponsored a reception at a grant funders conference in LA. Two CSU and two CCC faculty presented on Compass and general education in our systems to potential funders.
- k. Ken and Debra were recognized for their efforts and success at lining up funding for the Compass project.
- l. Funders are very impressed by the strong leadership roles faculty have played to date in our Compass project.
- m. David Hood mentioned that National U was very interested in the Degree Qualifications Profile at a recent WASC meeting.
- n. Debra shared the agenda for this afternoon's Compass steering committee meeting.
- o. There is a tight deadline for the next round of proposals. We hope to have criteria posted by the end of this week, proposals in by the beginning of December and word back to the campuses on funding by mid-December.
- p. We are very interested in developing evidence of the effectiveness of the innovations and collaborations in the project. Research is an important focus of the project. We will be looking focusing on a number of research questions and objectives.
 - i. Learning outcomes, persistence and completion of degrees are all potential success measures for the projects.
 - ii. We should work with faculty and administrative leaders as we research these outcomes.
 - iii. Perhaps we could look specifically at the effect of HIPs on the gender gap (low participation, completion rate among males).
- q. A GE conference "Engaging from the Start" is planned for next Feb. 13-14 at CSULA including CSU and CCC representatives.
 - i. The committee was asked to provide ideas for topics and structure of the conference. Some ideas:
 - 1. Continue to build upon existing faculty governance structure (senates).

2. Include students in the planning and implementation of the conference.
 3. Sponsor a discussion on the connections between HIPs and other initiatives such as SB 1440, Access to Success, etc.
 4. Perhaps we can explore how online/hybrid instruction affects learning outcomes, high impact practices, GE certification, etc. at the February meeting and beyond.
- r. There was a lengthy discussion of on-line education.
 - i. It can be done with quality.
 - ii. Perhaps better for content than skills and engagement.
 - iii. The for-profits will move into the market. Can we do it better, with higher quality, with a focus on students?
 - iv. Some leaders seem more interested in revenue potential than on student learning.
 - v. The CSU may better serve the military with more on-line programs.
 - vi. Many people interested in degree completion would like more on-line offerings.
 - s. Perhaps a presentation could be made to the BOT about Compass—it seems like a great complement to the Access to Success initiative.

10.

Course Substitutions for Students with Disabilities

- a. The issue was a referral related to students with a mathematical learning disability. CSULA has encouraged CCCs to substitute a critical thinking course for the quantitative reasoning course.
- b. Other CSU campuses do not appear to be in favor of allowing these substitutions by CCCs.
- c. Learning disability (LD) testing is very expensive. Colleges and universities are not mandated to provide testing. They are required to provide accommodations for LD students.
- d. There are several questions.
 - i. Should there be a substitution?
 - ii. What should be substituted?
 - iii. Should CCC determinations of LD status be honored by all CSU's.
 - iv. Should the substitution fulfill the "Golden 4" requirement for transfer.
- e. This item will appear on our next agenda.

11.

Open Forum—to be continued until the next agenda.

- a. WASC Benchmarking Initiative
 - i. CSU perspective
 - ii. GE outcomes
 - iii. Traditionally focused on time to degree, etc.
- b. Question—Many sources have identified the need to educate students in creative thinking/problem solving methodologies to be effective in the 21st century. Where in the GE requirements is this included?

- c. Critical thinking—is the definition in EO 1065 appropriate? It does not map to LEAP outcomes.

12. The meeting was adjourned at 3:35 pm.