Notes

Members Present: John Tarjan (Bakersfield), Barbara Swerkes (Northridge), Cindy Parish (AO-SBCCD), Jim Wheeler (Maritime Academy), Darlene Yee-Melichar (SFSU), Jim Postma (Chico), Greg Granderson (Santa Rosa JC), Hiro Okahana (CSSA—LB), Jeff Spano (CCCCO), Tapie Rohm (San Bernardino), Cynthia Turner (AO—Dominguez Hills), Maria Viera (Long Beach), Catherine Nelson (Sonoma), Romey Sabalius (San José), Cynthia Turner (Dominguez)

Visitors: Margaret Blue (Dominguez), Gail Evans (San José), Chris Sugiyama (Cerritos C)

1. Members and visitors were welcomed and the meeting began at 12:38

2. Announcements
   a. Dean Hanson had a death in the family and will not be attending the meeting. She forwarded commentary and background information on the items pertaining to Academic Program Planning.
   b. Ted Lucas has jury duty and cannot attend.

3. Comments from Deans Gail Evans (SJSU) and Margaret Blue (Dominguez) (representatives of the Associate Academic Vice Presidents)
   a. Gail Evans: We recently completed a revision of our campus GE program. We favor the current GE structure contained in EO 595
      i. Flexibility
      ii. The number of units
      iii. The structure
      iv. Also: we are emphasizing critical thinking across the curriculum. We also have a sequence in Area D that fulfills the American Institutions courses.
   b. Margaret Blue
      i. It has been some time since the structure of our GE program has been revisited.
      ii. Assessment is a big issue for us. Transfer complicates the process. This may change slightly as we admit more freshmen.
4. Update on Course Review Guidelines
   a. CCC Transfer Director and Articulation Officers Proposal for IGETC Review Guidelines
      i. It would be nice to have more CSU participation in this process.
      ii. Very few CSU students use IGETC.
      iii. The committee voted to allow reviewers to decide whether to allow history courses apply to either Area 4f or Area 3b but not both.
   b. Guidelines for Review of GE-Breadth
      i. The committee voted to allow reviewers to decide whether to allow history courses apply to either Area C2 or Area D6 but not both.
         1. Some transfers who change from UC to CSU may face hardship.
         2. Different history courses may follow different methodologies.
      ii. Some CCCs may have history courses previously approved for both C2 and D6. As future CCCs submit courses, there is the potentiality that similar courses from CCCs could be approved in different areas. This will create confusion for students, counselors, and other staff who advise students. The issue of Humanities versus Social Science could be discussed jointly between the CSU and UC.
   c. The use of OSCAR was reviewed. These guidelines are especially timely given the use of on-line review today. They are also helpful for submitters.
   d. Ted Anagnoson described the staff review/screening process for Area-Breadth. This is probably appropriate given the desire to maximize the use of faculty review time.

5. Update on the American Institutions review
   a. U.S. State and Local Government (Anagnoson)
      i. Chairs were asked to respond to the guidelines used for review of these courses. The chairs felt that the existing guidelines are appropriate.
   b. U.S. History
      i. It was decided to go forward with a review of course criteria by history chairs. Hank Reichmann (East Bay) has been appointed to replace the current individual coordinating the review.

a. Meeting Summary
   i. The group is composed of 2 faculty members and one central staff person from each system.
   ii. There was a general discussion of IGETC and whether it is effective as it could be.
   iii. There are some colleges within UC that do not accept IGETC.
   iv. Having different versions for UC and CSU students poses relatively few problems.
   v. There may be problems in supporting different GE transfer packages.
   vi. There was a proposal for a unified GE package.

b. Proposal (attachment)
   i. It seems to be closer to IGETC rather than Area-Breadth.
   ii. There was a question about process.
   iii. Where did this proposal come from?
   iv. Curricular Issues
      1. Critical thinking and composition would be diminished by combining the course.
      2. Area E would be eliminated.
      3. Units would be added.
      4. The articulation officers believe that IGETC and Area-Breadth work well.
      5. It is better to take Area E before transfer.
   v. Implementation Issues
      1. There may be legislative intrusion mandating a common program in the future.
      2. Something like this would likely result in different transfer and native student GE curricula. There would likely be pressure to unify.
      3. It is likely that if a common program were mandated, we would likely be forced to adopt the UC curriculum. It is likely that something will be mandated. This means compromise with the UC.
      4. Foreign language would pose a hardship. But, is it appropriate to have a lower standard for transfer students than incoming freshmen?
   vi. Proposal—To form a subcommittee of GEAC that would look at the pros and cons of pursuing a common curriculum. The subcommittee could look at
      1. the numbers of transfers between systems.
      2. the amount of commonality across systems.
3. what are the implications for various programs.
4. what would likely happen legislatively.
5. the treatment of history courses.

vii. The committee voted to form the subcommittee. It is composed. John Tarjan, Barbara Swerkes, Tapie Rohm, Jim Wheeler. Tapie will chair the subcommittee.

viii. It is awkward to be looking at revisions to EO 595 (GE-Area Breadth) at the same time we are looking at potential alignment of GE. Perhaps we should look at revising GE-Breadth and then look at potential alignment.

ix. An increasing number of students are in professional programs. GE should not be diminished as a part of the degree.

7. Reexamining GE Breadth—The following documents were reviewed.
   a. E-mail Concerning Critical Thinking and Composition from CSULA
   b. Northridge, SLO Responses to the Access to Excellence Letter
   c. Supplemental Review Criteria
   d. Results of the Campus Survey/Potential Revisions to Area-Breadth
   e. Potential Revisions to EO 595 (Wheeler)

8. Input Regarding IGETC—deferred to next meeting when the issue could be clarified further.

9. Upper-division coursework used in certification—the committee voted to proceed with a survey.

10. The next meeting of GEAC will be May 8th from 10:00 to 1:00. The main agenda items:

    a. Report from the subcommittee on GE alignment (Rohm).
    b. Potential revisions of EO 595 (Wheeler).