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Order of Business

1. Review of agenda
   A. New items added under new business.

2. Review of notes from prior meetings
   A. Notes from November 2012 reviewed
   B. Correction made to location of some information (had been miscategorized)

3. WASC and GE unit guidelines
   A. The underlying issue is that WASC was looking to revise a section of their accreditation guidelines that had previously listed both an Upper Division GE requirement and a unit count. GEAC discussion seemed to indicate comfort with the removal of quantifiable numbers and instead focus on the content.
   B. ASCSU is considering (now passed – ed.) a resolution encouraging WASC to reinsert Upper Division GE in the proposed guidelines. The Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS) and individual CSU campuses have also responded to the WASC proposal.
   C. In response to proposed revisions in WASC accreditation guidelines and recent proposed actions by the CSU Board of Trustees, the need for a coherent explanation and defense of the intentional goals of upper division general education is clearly desired. Such goals should reference appropriate integration of knowledge, LEAP outcomes, and relevant board documents and CSU Chancellor’s Office executive orders. GEAC will look to build a document establishing the desired function of upper division GE and to potentially include best practices. Discussion suggested that important points included:
      i. Liberal arts focus on the 4-year degree has been encroached upon; GE protects this element of education.
      ii. Liberal Education America’s Promise (LEAP) – evaluate GE as a program throughout the 4 years of the baccalaureate degree.
   D. GEAC to write letter to WASC cc: ASCSU in defense of Upper Division GE and the integrity of the curriculum. Framework of evidentiary support comes from the campus actions, EO-1065, etc. (note that this did not occur given subsequent ASCSU actions – ed.)

4. RFP to test on-line delivery in oral communication
   A. There have been explorations and pressure to allow lower division oral communication to be taught online. The to-be-answered question is can the requirements of oral communication reliably be met with online instruction? The online sub-group of GEAC met with the president of the National communication Association (Steven Beebe) to discuss the overlap between his presidential focus on the lower division course in oral communication and our need to clearly define our outcome expectations for online oral communication (which should be the same as
for non-online oral communication). It is likely we will want to more tightly define our oral communication expectations and to align them with forthcoming national recommendations. This goes beyond simply saying “yes” or “no” to the ability for online oral communication courses to be able to qualify for A1 credit in CSU GE.

B. The sub-committee takes it as a given that at some point in time CSU GE will allow technologically mediated instruction to be awarded oral communication GE certification. The question is if we are there yet. Evidence to inform our judgment should include: literature on online oral communication and examination of both the syllabi & outcomes from online and hybrid courses. We do believe that we know enough about oral communication to specify the required elements to be offered (i.e., to be approved online). We could experiment. Four-year authorization in return for assessment data for courses that meet our (extended) requirements (see below).

C. Of all of the communication courses, the “oral communication” course(s) have the most consistency – Public presentation (even if not entirely public speaking courses) is a central element of these courses. The sub-committee report notes that the course elements include affective, cognitive, and behavioral outcomes.
   i. There was discussion of the key role of apprehension vis-à-vis skill development.
   ii. Interestingly, and separate from otherwise stated GE objectives, social collaboration is a required element of the course(s) as taught. This student development (social collaboration & community building) portion could be a required part of the pilots but is not currently in oral communication stated requirements. Similarly, it was noted that oral communication is a very effective diversity awareness courses, but that is not an existing requirement.

D. Prior research indicates that judges could not differentiate the online vs. in person instruction when tested face-to-face.

E. In terms of moving forward, our suggestion is to be open to change. Essentially “Here is our EO, here are our guiding notes, here are some other elements of the course we want to see addressed (e.g., the role of socialization to campus experience)”... you tell us what you do, we approve your assessment plan and approve for GE for some period (four years) during which we collect data and assess (at year three – the fourth year allows the existing pilot to be taught out pending continuing approval or recommendation for change).

F. Questions were raised concerning scaling up to large class sizes, esp. with oral communication (there seemed to be some concern that online → MOOC, which is not the intention).

5. Programmatic assessment of GE on the campuses (required under EO-1065)
   A. What are campuses doing?
   B. Oct/11 conference (reports)
   C. More recent updates?
   D. (June/12 summer institution: building action plans for for GE…
   E. Assessment of GE across institutions.
   F. ITL/Tikannen) Developing programmatic GE best practices as the focus for the ITL SUMMER 2013 institute.

6. Outcomes-based Articulation
A. This item addressed a question from Excelsior College. We did not see a GEAC role (i.e., no specified systematic policy question).

7. **Mandatory Intermediate Algebra Prerequisite for CSU B4 GE certification.**
   A. The question that was raised concerned the potential de-certification of a B4 course if it did not have the intermediate algebra prerequisite. GEAC affirmed that B4 certification would be lost without the prerequisite.
   B. GEAC then addressed individual competency testing in lieu of formally meeting the intermediate algebra prerequisite via coursework. The CSU Chancellor’s General Education Advisory Committee asserts that it has no authority to comment on the prerequisite challenge process. How community colleges meet curricular requirements that are below college-transferable is up to the colleges, and not up to the receiving transfer institutions. In other words, community colleges may participate in initiatives like Acceleration in Context and the California Acceleration Project without jeopardizing articulation, because the transferable B4 course is unchanged (and still includes the intermediate algebra prerequisite).
   C. There is an underlying question of the “purpose” of the intermediate algebra prerequisite. The math council notes that the importance of the style of thinking required by intermediate algebra in the solving for unknowns and that a functional general education (or “educated person”) requires quantitative literacy. As further informed by the PASSPORT project, we may want to reexamine our definition of, and guiding notes on, quantitative reasoning.

8. **Give Students a COMPASS**
   The meetings are targeted toward helping "the California State University and California Community Colleges systems explore ways to make the General Education (GE) transfer curriculum more engaging, assess our progress to date, envision our future, and work together to plan for change."
   B. COMPASS continues to receive inquiries regarding building additional networking sites and other compass-spawned sites have been initiated in the absence of COMPASS-based funding. There is a continuing evolution of GE assessment and recommendations for building more effective GE programs. Specific areas of focus include how to most effectively share outcomes (see next steps notes) of what works and is scalable (vs. what did not work and/or was not scalable).
   - i. Integrative courses: thematically linked to outcomes (reward = either minor or GE in fewer units for demonstrated competencies) seem to be particularly promising as both effective and scalable.
   - ii. Faculty development has played a relatively small role in COMPASS projects to date. This may be an area for future attention.
   - iii. Strong student support services are clearly another very effective high-impact practice.
9. **Change to CCC policy re "repeatability"
   A. This item has a minimal impact on GE. Largely it meant that courses that were once indefinitely repeatable now require separate names. Common sense suggests that articulation will transfer to the new names.

10. Institute for Teaching and Learning
   A. ITL will have a summer workshop that will address critical thinking. It is likely that ITL will also be acting to further its work in collection and distributing best practices in programmatic assessment in GE. The summer conference may also tap future developments in the online-only oral communication pilot project requirements.
   B. Programmatic assessment of GE remains as a faculty development item

**New Business**

1. New items
   A. There will be an in-person meeting at the Office of the Chancellor, Catalina Room, Tuesday May 14, 2013.
   B. SCIGETC-type modification to CSU GE pattern is advocated by GEAC per forthcoming ASCSU resolution.
   C. Smarter Balance
      i. Replaces EAP mechanism, minimal impact on CSU GE, if any
      ii. GEAC will be tracking the implications and actions as they occur since common core standards will increase quantitative literacy expectations potentially exceeding those of our current intermediate algebra requirements.
   D. 120 unit (CSU Board of Trustee Title 5 change)
      i. Troublingly seems to remain focused implicitly and explicitly on GE waivers.
   E. SJSU’s participation in Udacity
      i. The statistics course offering is a variant of “STAT 95” which is a CSU GE course (B4). The prerequisites and outcomes hold.
      ii. Further details may be found at: [http://www.calstate.edu/acadsen/Newsletter/feb2013/SJSU_Udacity.shtml](http://www.calstate.edu/acadsen/Newsletter/feb2013/SJSU_Udacity.shtml)
   F. Confirmation that there will be a May 14, 2013 in-person meeting of GEAC