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The March meeting of the CSU GE advisory committee addressed updates on MOOCs, communications reinforcing the need to maintain intermediate algebra as a prerequisite for quantitative reasoning courses, developments in the Western Interstate Council of Higher Education Passport project for intra- and inter-state transfer of some core GE requirements, future directions and important developments from the Compass project related to high impact practices and student success, an rfp to support the further incorporation of sustainability in the curriculum, the upcoming summer ITL conference, and the continued development of a document to support a pilot assessment of online oral communication (currently prohibited within the CSU guiding notes when doing system-level GE area determinations). The work on oral communication and quantitative reasoning have revealed that many of the GE requirements, such as the intermediate algebra prerequisite (quantitative reasoning) or in-person presentations (oral communication) may be proxies for the actual desired outcomes. The potential conflicting guidance of 1066, Title 5, and the CSU guiding notes was discussed and is likely to lead to setting up a small group to document and discuss the issues. A newly introduced item was to evaluate the extent to which recent BoT actions on limiting units is leading to a systemic dismantaling of GE requirements.

1. Review of Agenda to meeting of 3/12/2013
   a. Agenda reordered to bring MOOC discussion forward

2. Review of notes to meeting of 1/15/2013
   a. Yee-Melichar present in person
   b. 7.3(b) delete last clause.

3. CSU MOOC Committee
   a. Group to respond to recent developments and concerns re: MOOCs and large online offerings. They are working on establishing the committee charge and expectations/timeline.

4. Draft email to CIAC listserv regarding accelerated math remediation.
a. The concern is that some campuses had asked for authorization to offer GE courses in quantitative reasoning that did not have the intermediate algebra prerequisite. The intermediate algebra prerequisite is absolutely required; this requirement is reinforced in the letter. Also included in the letter is guidance regarding mechanisms for individual student (vs. systemic) alternatives for being considered to have met the intermediate algebra prerequisite.

b. There was also discussion of role of intermediate algebra as a prerequisite, intermediate algebra competency vis-à-vis GE expectations, as well as intermediate algebra’s role as a graduation requirement.

5. Interstate Passport and the “Golden Four” (oral communication, written communication, critical thinking, quantitative reasoning)
   a. very promising tracking data
   b. combination of LEAP, HIP, transfer facilitation.
   c. Pilot project research products may inform implications for California
   d. limitations on use in California
   e. underlying philosophy of outcomes (vs. credits)

   a. focus on intentionality in GE
   b. use of e-portfolios re: GWAR
   c. support for thematic pathways
   d. system-based tracking of sustainability, service learning, etc.
   e. can the CSU system support systemic sustainability minor? (non-academic transcript and/or ASSIST-based tracking)

7. Report on “Campus as a Living Lab” (Sustainability), meeting at Redwood City, CA March 7, 2013.
   a. pairing with FD&O on campus (internships, etc.) re: sustainability
   b. context of “real change” production for the student and for the campus
   c. Pairings with PG&E, southern Edison, etc.

8. Reduced unit/integrated GE proposal from Santa Barbara City College
   a. Committee approved as presented.
   b. Any modifications to be vetted by committee.
   c. Three year pilot approved for this one campus at this one
location, dependent upon the collection and sharing of relevant assessment data (required for year-to-year maintenance of approval over the span of the pilot).

d. SBCC may want to interact with the online oral communication group re: developing stronger (non-online) SLOs re: oral communication expectations (won’t be held to above current in-force GE guiding notes, etc.)

9. **RFP to test on-line oral communication**
   a. Continued development based on national standards to inform GE guiding notes (start with “extra” requirements at online then likely move/modify non-online expectations as specified in guiding notes)

10. **Institute for Teaching and Learning**
    a. Effectiveness of 2012 summer institute
    b. Plans for 2013 summer institute: curriculum design, program evaluation, expectations in critical thinking

11. **Recap of this year’s review of CCC course proposals**
    a. Discussion of the review process, the philosophy, some recommended specific changes to GE guiding notes and a highlighting of the issue of a disconnect between the high level Title 5 and EO 1066 language (and the continued disconnect down to the level of the specifics in the GE guiding notes)

12. **Potential Resolution on Integrative Learning in GE**
    a. Discussion surfaced (as in #11 above) underlying tensions between LEAP, EO 1066, Title 5, GE Guiding notes. This reformatted concern should be included as a future agenda item for both GE and for potential statewide discussion/evaluation/action.

13. **Discussion of a potential request for a cap on “waived” units w.r.t. the Board of Trustees actions forcing most degrees to fit within a 120 unit structure.**
    a. Although the threat to GE as a beneficial and meaningful component of undergraduate degrees was realized, there was concern that any putative “cap” could become the new “normative waiver” and thus no action was taken.

14. **Parameters for pilot projects around GE**
    a. moving to a proactive versus reactive model as a request for (non-monetary) rfp’s (task force as one option)
    b. Two separate gaps in current implementation of GE were
noted.

i. First, there was an argument that there are inefficiencies in GE (cf., math and statistics / qualitative reasoning as a bottleneck) – how would we know that the bottleneck SHOULD exist? What should our goal be?

ii. Second, the assessment of GE program outcomes is still lacking (what would successful evaluation of GE as a program look like?)

15. Open forum (Expectations for the future GEAC action)
   a. address differential requirements for GE at admission
   b. address differential success rate for math approaches
   c. address intermediate algebra as a prerequisite/requirement (central role of GEAC in addressing these expectations)
   d. address programmatic assessment of GE as a program
   e. actions to reinvigorate the image/impression/reality/buy-in to GE
   f. share the assault on GE produced by the 120 unit limit changes across campuses
   g. act to incorporate the golden four across the curriculum in “real” ways.

16. Adjourn