Wednesday September 12, 2012  
11:05 AM to 4:05 PM  
Catalina Room, CSU Office of the Chancellor

Chair  
Mark Van Selst  Psychology  San José

Vice-Chair  
Kate Fawver  History  Dominguez Hills

CSU Academic Senate Representatives  
Buckley Barrett  Librarian  San Bernardino  
Bill Eadie  Journalism  San Diego  
Steven Filling  Accounting  Stanislaus  
Andreas Gebauer  Chemistry  Bakersfield  
David Hood  History  Long Beach  
Kathleen Kaiser  Sociology  Chico  
Patricia Kalayjian  Interdisciplinary Studies  Dominguez Hills  
Catherine Nelson  Political Science  Sonoma  
John Tarjan  Management/MIS  Bakersfield

Academic Senate CSU Academic Affairs Committee Chair Ex Officio  
Darlene Yee-Melichar (remote)  Gerontology  San Francisco (BY PHONE)

California Community College Academic Senate Representative  
David Morse  English  Long Beach City College  
(Replaced by:) Michelle Pilati  (For this meeting only)

CSU Campus Academic Affairs Administrator  
Gail Evans (remote)  San Francisco State University

CSU Articulation Officer  
Terri Eden (remote)  San José State University

CCC Articulation Officer  
Joanne Benschop  MiraCosta Community College

CSSA Student Representative  
Jonathon Bolin  CSU Long Beach

CCC Chancellor’s Office Representatives  
Jeff Spano  Dean, Student Services

CSU Chancellor’s Office Representatives  
Christine Mallon  Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Programs and Faculty Development  
Ken O’Donnell  Sr. Director, Student Engagement and Academic Initiatives & Partnerships

Note: All members (with substitution for David Morse) were present.
Order of Business

1. Call to Order, Welcome and Introductions, Approval of Agenda
   A. Notes from March 2012 meeting to be reviewed
   B. Agenda to be approved

2. Future Meetings (each is the day before the ASCSU Interim + Plenary)
   A. Meeting Schedule 2012-13
      i. (W) September 12, 2012
      ii. POSSIBLE: we will doodle for an Oct. GEAC phone/web conference
      iii. (T) November 6, 2012
      iv. (T) January 15, 2013
      v. (T) March 12, 2013
      vi. POSSIBLE: phone conference call (T) May 14 to address updates and follow-
           through. This date will be held as a likely 11-1 phone/web conference.
   B. All meetings are from 11:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. in the Catalina Room, CSU Office of
      the Chancellor.

3. Articulation Officers Report vis-à-vis GE
   A. EO 1065 do not list grade minima
      i. Admission policies (per 1988) recommended hold for upper division transfer
         to have 30 units of GE with C or better including golden four.
      ii. Denied admission for Golden Four.
      iii. Is a C or better required? (major preparation coursework needs C or better)
      iv. IGETC needs C or better
      v. CSU GE does not need C or better in each course
   B. Definition of C grade (C grades does or does not include C-)
   C. Title 5 says “fully eligible transfer student 60 units, 30 GE”
   D. GEAC recommends that, in policy, a “c” or better is 2.0 or average.
   E. At some points SB1440 appears to conflict with admissions requirements (including
      outside of GE)
   F. Ken O’Donnell will talk w/ Karen and Nathan from the Academic Affairs division of
      the CO and report back. This will also be addressed in the ASCSU Academic Affairs
      committee.

4. Intersegmental Reports vis-à-vis GE
   A. SB 1440 / “STAR” Act (as pertains to GE)
      i. The C-ID elements tie in with the SB 1440 possible transfer degrees.
   B. COMPASS Project
      i. COMPASS II (next steps to recommend action)
         a. Report to Hewlett Foundation distributed and introduced
b. Hiring and support for COMPASS
   1) Faculty Development Specialist (hired; Las Positas/CSU:EB)
   2) Outcomes Assessment (Terri Underwood)
   3) Ed.D. Fellows working on qualitative experience and on outcomes assessment
   4) Student Assistant

c. There will be a March 8th (maybe March 9th) meeting in Northern California

d. Outcomes from the steering committee meeting in August 2012 (San Jose) were discussed.

ii. A discussion on the desirability of a possible GEAC endorsement of thematic course sequences to meet multiple GE areas with fewer units? (i.e., a GEAC-encouraged CCC pilot for efficient and appropriate delivery of CSU GE outcomes)
   a. Proposal from COMPASS for November 2012 will be forthcoming.

iii. Is it desirable/useful/pragmatically effective to require “qualification” to teach GE courses (content could include awareness of overall GE programmatic outcomes, experience with high impact practices, etc.)
   a. Faculty Development opportunities
      1) Orientation to breadth of GE
   b. Not a lot of support for requirement over optional development.

C. Statway
i. Concerns were discussed re: evident minimal algebra exposure (depending on implementation)
ii. Concerns re: algebra as admissions requirement vis-à-vis quantitative reasoning
iii. Statway is a national experiment … GEAC would request national data
   a. Data on persistence
   b. Data following participation in statway on quantitative success in later courses
iv. Tie in with mandatory K-12 “common core” which include Algebra requirements

D. GE certification on transcripts (CSU, CCC) (see March 2012 notes)
   i. Quick discussion, no action at this time.

5. CCC System and Senate Report vis-à-vis GE
A. C-ID and GE qualification questions:
   i. Could C-ID have content relative to CSU GE?
      a. This question has occurred before
   ii. Ultimately, could C-ID descriptors include GE elements?
   iii. Could a C-ID descriptor come with “automatic” GE certification
   iv. The big change is many-to-one descriptor vs. one to one descriptor.
v. There are IGETC complications
vi. Ken O’Donnell will facilitate the a trial submission to see how reviewers might assess a C-ID descriptor as if it were an “outline of record” and report back responses and concerns.

6. CSU System and Senate Report vis-à-vis GE
   A. Status of recommended language changes re: C1 (see March 2012 notes) were shared
   B. An update on processing of courses submitted for GE equivalency was provided.
   C. Assessment Activities (per EO-1065 http://www.calstate.edu/oe/EO-1065.html ), (also see #9 below) included:
      i. The Summer ITL conference on GE assessment
      ii. Compass activities related to GE assessment (and renewed focus on evaluation)
   D. “online” oral communication courses (see March 2012 notes)
      i. Bill Eadie, Ken O’Donnell, and Kevin Baaske to be on a task force to report out on current evaluation of “online oral communication”
      ii. Request for different course numbers for online oral communication.
   E. A report to the September CSU Board of Trustees (from an ad hoc group drawn from the CSU presidents?) on actions in response to budget cuts that may include weakening 9-unit upper division GE requirement
      i. http://www.calstate.edu/bot/?source=homepage (see September 2012 Agenda)
         a. Will be posted shortly
      ii. This item was moved to #2 in the agenda where it was given a time certain from 11:15 to 12:15 and from 2:30 to 3:00.
      iii. At the present time the original “Remove Upper Division GE” proposal is likely to be replaced by a “Commitment to 120 units” proposal. Further details are to be worked out.
      iv. A letter from the Chair of GEAC on the processes used to generate the item and on concerns related to the weakening of degrees that could result as a result of the item.

7. Credit hour guidelines as adopted by the CSU following recommendations of GEAC and the ASCSU
   A. CSU Definition uses a single definition of a credit hour
   B. There are systemwide credit minima for use with external examinations
   C. The recommendations for language competency (and others) appear to yield more credit than the comparable courses within most of state-supported public education in California.
      i. Does the “extra” credit granted facilitate the success for these students?
      ii. Is it defensible?
      iii. This may differentially impact veterans.
      iv. The proposal could produce a difference between how we award units for military service and for other students.
8. **(re)Defining Critical Thinking**
   A. add John Tarjan to workgroup from March 2012.
   B. The associate vice-provosts for academic affairs (WASC benchmark for critical success) have a group looking at critical thinking.
   C. Ensure that the original group includes ITL membership (i.e., Wayne Tikannen)

9. **Programmatic assessment of GE**
   A. Three domains were touched on:
      i. Quantitative Reasoning across the (GE) curriculum
      ii. Writing across the (GE) curriculum
      iii. Critical thinking (see item #8)
   B. Programmatic Assessment
      i. What are campuses doing re: program review (EO 1065)?
         a. California is recognized as a national leader
      ii. External Review
   C. Are there best practices in GE review or lessons learned? Strengths and weaknesses of the package and of the assessment process.
   D. Are there evidence of the utility of upper division GE

10. **“SciGETC” as a variant of IGETC/CSU GE for use with SB 1440 transfer degrees. Two CSU IGETC patterns.**
    A. “Certified” as done with a variant of CSU GE (CSU IGETC version 2 pattern) for upper division transfer as science majors with two fewer lower GE courses completed.
    B. This would produce an “SB-1440 ish” degree (but not SB 1440), hopefully with negotiated SB-1440 like benefits.
    C. On the question of “What is the current status at ICAS? At CSU?” and “What needs to happen to make this occur?”
       i. It seems that the CSU needs to act to explicitly adopt the particular proposed sequence (note: there are prior resolutions on SCIGETC).

11. **Actions and Activities pertinent to the potential further alignment of IGETC and CSU GE Breadth**
    A. As background:
       i. Prior feedback on CSU GE based on CSU input can be found at: [http://www.calstate.edu/app/geac/](http://www.calstate.edu/app/geac/) (bottom of page “summary of campus GE survey”)
    B. Discussion of the proposal to streamline the three possible GE sequences (CSU GE + the CSU and UC IGETC packages) was fruitful. Per CCC feedback, it seems that the three patterns are a strength for the students and it provides a clearer path and indication of future possibilities than a single blended CSU GE / CSU IGETC package would.
12. Ensuring appropriate GE coverage for intra- and inter-segmental nursing programs (see March 2012 notes)
   A. No action.

13. Intersection of Cal State Online and “massive open online course” (MOOC) delivery vis-à-vis GE
   A. Does this change the nature of “campus-based” GE approval when the audience is no longer principally the students at that campus?
      i. Background on Corsera (open online courses, high technology adoption) and Udacity (modules for training) were presented as possible examples
   B. Outcomes assessment and quality control
   C. It was agreed that MOOCs did not fit GE requirements.

New Business

1. New items
   a. None other than those included as revised within these notes.