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Starting with the proposed sweeping elimination of upper division GE to the challenges in maintaining GE against systemic pressures to reduce units in degree programs, this year has been a very intensive one to be involved in the Chancellor’s General Education Advisory Committee. From this last meeting, the “CONTENT” related material covered in the meeting covered quantitative reasoning, oral communication, and the role of music skills training in GE. On quantitative reasoning we continued our discussion on the role of intermediate algebra and the STATWAY project (we will look at pilot data outcomes in the coming year). On Oral Communication, we discussed the Santa Barbara City College Oral Communication Pilot, and the continuing actions to revisit the CSU GE Guiding notes on oral communication and potential future pilots.

You have a second reading item in your package today regarding the desire of GEAC to have a task force respond to the evolution towards learning outcomes in the context of the somewhat differing guidance provided within Title 5, EO 1065, and the CSU GE Guiding notes.
We had a discussion on our continued successful partnerships with ITL and the COMPASS project in leveraging experiments to produce change and work towards increased student success.

We had an extensive discussion of MOOCs, GE and reciprocity. GEAC is looking to see if there is appetite for a system level role in assessing transfer of GE for those courses offered within the CSU that are offered with the intent of use at the non-local campus (i.e., playing on a level field with the CCCs vis-à-vis GE transfer). This would be very strong if such a role was requested by 23 campuses. There was a second concern that there might be a fiscal and FTES shift from largely smaller or less well funded campuses to larger and better funded campuses that have a greater ability to offer such non-MOOC large scale online offerings. Partially in response to this item, we also discussed the need to streamline and better define the process of testing out of courses based on achieved outcome competencies.

**NOTES**

1. **Review of Agenda**
2. **Review of Prior Notes (from March 2013)**
   a. Yee-Melichar attendance by phone
3. **CIAC email re: intermediate algebra**
   a. The memo approved at the March 2013 GEAC meeting was vetted by Math Council prior to distribution
4. **Update on Santa Barbara City College alternate GE**
   a. Memo from chancellor attached to hardcopy of agenda. This memo directly provides support for the GEAC approved pilot.
   b. Partial completion of the package has been addressed (this is implementation largely outside of GEAC except to ensure that it is properly addressed).
   c. There is a GEAC expectation for a once per year report
5. **Update on distance delivery of oral communication**
   a. Intention to revise guiding notes on oral communication. The core group will be the original oral communication sub-group + Dr. Cameron XXX from Santa Barbara City College.
   b. There was recommended to be a limit on the size of offerings in the pilot – this was later revised to be that the size of the courses be indicated in any rfp submission.
   c. Continuing approval versus new course offerings. Keep track of section by section, which are distance mediated.
d. Ongoing approval will depend on not exceeding pilot duration when approved for online offering.
e. Pilot submissions will be reviewed by 3 oral comm. Faculty. Faculty appointed by GEAC.
f. For pilot participation there will be require evidence to be provided during the pilot period. We will need outcome assessments to be shared with GEAC.
g. The GE Guiding notes for oral communication should not change for the purposes of the pilot projects. It was noted that we did not change the CSU GE Guiding Notes for the STATWAY project.
h. It was noted that the ASCSU White paper on online education (page 20) endorses holding online offerings to the same enrollment as in person.
i. There was a question of when should course size increases yield a full curricular review (vis-à-vis quality concerns). As an alternate, it was suggested that meeting student learning outcomes should be the key to quality control and initial assessment.
j. The ASCSU AA will be looking at QOLT = Quality Online Learning & Teaching. These pilots may converge with some other evaluation metrics discussed with QOLT.
k. It is anticipated that the product of the evolution of this pilot brings us to closer alignment in expectations between the CSU and CCC when courses used for transfer are the focus.

6. **ASCSU (Academic Affairs) Resolution 3119 Clarifying GE.**
a. The resolution formalizes the desire to deliberately address disconnects between the language in Title 5, EO 1065, and the CSU Guiding Notes. It explicitly addresses the evolution of GE requirements from lists of needed content towards achievement of Learning Outcomes.

7. **Institute for Teaching and Learning**
a. Summer institute (July 9-11, 2013)
   i. Implementation re: “Building a better baccalaureate” theme. Online, backwards design, service learning, flipped classrooms, assessment all offered in 2h workshops (w/ hands-on actions). Each session will be offered twice. Working dinner on Critical thinking (GE transfer: John Tarjan, Ken
O'Donnell, Industry [headhunter]).

ii. Panel will discuss skills and content of lower division GE. What should degree level proficiency in critical thinking look like?

b. Have program level assessments approached the point where such assessments could yield advice for revisions of CSU GE content and guidance? (A: maybe? e.g., continuing evolution of assessment at Channel Islands)

8. **CCC request for Music Theory reconsideration (CSU GE area C1)**
   a. The requirement from the area includes both subjective and objective responses (appreciation vs. technical training).
   b. The underlying message is to tie in content to great works of human imagination and spirit.
   c. If we look at music should we look at art as well?
   d. There is a strong cultural component required.
   e. The course evaluation notes seem counter to the outcomes-based movement.
   f. We will empanel a review group to recommend (for or against) any possible change: potentially two CSU music representatives, two CCC music representatives, one CSU non-music C1 representative, two non-C1 CSU representatives to revisit CSU guiding notes re: music theory. Likely outcomes are:
      i. We can change notes from current language to be less discouraging of skills based courses (i.e., weaken “not ordinarily count”) (evidence-based)
      ii. Do nothing

9. **MOOCs, GE, and reciprocity as defined by EO 1065**
   a. What is reciprocity?
      i. Unit elective credit from a four-year institution (esp. another CSU) will be accepted as, at a minimum, elective credit.
      ii. Units from another CSU will generally be accepted for GE credit within the same area of GE at a CSU (or CCC).
      iii. Units as used towards requirements of the major program will be a decision of the program on the receiving campus. It is not a matter for system-level concern.
b. There was a discussion of the potential ‘downstream’ consequences of a MOOC failure experience on the campus that the student is actually matriculated at. That is, the commitment to non-matriculated students may not be as strong, or the evaluation of content as inherently important, when the student is not matriculated at the offering campus. A related concern focuses on the negative impact of recruitment to the major at the local campus for the student if their introductory exposure to a field is from a course targeted without responsiveness to local campus values and culture.

c. Eric Forbes memo. This memo asked CSUs to indicate how they intended to use and acknowledge units achieved via Cal State Online and/or SJSU+ (Udacity partnership) on their local campus.

d. In response to other questions, it was noted that online courses (or SJSU+ courses) are not transcripted differently that any other course offered by the institution.

e. It was noted that the ASCSU should establish desirable online content requirements.

f. Regarding access to online education, at the current time it would be fair to summarize that we are looking to see where CSU offerings are competitive and where we find our niche. There should be a focus on the achievement of outcomes regardless of modality.

g. There is a concern about the transfer of FTES from large and better-funded campuses from smaller and less well funded campuses. Should there be a reimbursement of some portion to the matriculated campus? This FTES transfer issues underscores the financial implications for use of large-scale online courses. The movement towards large-scale courses seems to be to make or save money rather than a focus on meeting student outcomes. There appear to be very little focus in quality. How are best practices in requiring written work with feedback to be met as class size increases?

h. There are concerns about the privatization of public education.

i. The concept of “testing out” is well understood. We need
to rely on SLOs. “Were they met?” is the critical question for both pass-along and for program requirements.

j. Title 5 section 55204 of CCC language requires regular instructor contact with online education. Section 53200 defines regular effective content. The CSU has no equivalency in Title 5.

k. AA should recommend criteria for online courses (cf., CCC title 5). There is widespread concern re: processes followed on the campus and what differential requirements online courses ought to address.

l. We need to publicize where and when online courses are offered. This information can be difficult to find.

m. Support for a CSU system level role in curriculum would be very strong if 23 local senates asked for it. The ASCSU might want to test the will of individual senates to establish direction as to whether GE courses predominantly offered “for transfer” should be evaluated against statewide standards.

10. **GIVE STUDENTS A COMPASS**
   a. Grants from Gilbert and Jonston foundations to support narrative/argument/directions document and actions.
   b. Miami conference on student success report
   c. AAC&U agenda-setting conference
   d. Role of themes as lending cohesion to GE. Upcoming conference at CSU:Northridge.
   e. October 11th is next COMPASS meeting (strengthening student success w/ CCC RP group).

11. **STATWAY**
   a. Intermediate algebra as prerequisite and/or included.
   b. Joanne Benschop has links to CCC pilots that include varying levels of intermediate algebra into STATWAY.
   c. Encouragement of possible expansion of the pilots.
   d. Data presentation at first meeting of 2013/14 GEAC.