Notes

Members Present: John Tarjan (Bakersfield), Barbara Swerkes (Northridge), Cindy Parish (AO-SBCCD), Jim Wheeler (Maritime Academy), Chris Hanson (CSUCO), Darlene Yee-Melichar (SFSU), Jim Postma (Chico), Hiro Okahana (CSSA—LB), Jeff Spano (CCCCO), Maria Viera (Long Beach), Catherine Nelson (Sonoma), Ted Anagnoson (LA), Tapie Rohm (San Bernardino)

Visitors: Judy Osman (CSUCO)

1. Potential Alignment of IGETC/GE-Breadth
   a. The joint task force has not yet been appointed. John Tarjan is our system’s representative.
   b. Potential areas of contention/problems
      i. While UC staff has stated that 60% of CCC transfers come to their university with IGETC certification, it is unknown if this is an accurate figure.
      ii. The UC transfers many fewer students than the CSU (approximately 9 vs. 50 thousand annually).
      iii. Many more CSU students transfer with some type of GE-B certification, although the figures are not reported and therefore are not available.
      iv. Not all UC campus colleges accept IGETC.
      v. More courses can be used for GE Breadth than IGETC.
      vi. EO 595 works for both transfer and native students—the UC system does not have a system-common GE structure.
      vii. The CSU allows double-counting for GE-B Area D and American Institutions courses. Students under the IGETC pattern cannot double count courses for IGETC and American Institutions. While American Institutions is a state requirement, UC believes students meet this requirement through high school coursework.
      viii. The CSU does not mandate a grade minimum for GE-B certification—IGETC requires a minimum grade of “C” (not “C-“) in each course.
      ix. The CCC does not see a problem with parallel systems (from CIAC comments). Counselors and students understand the differences and nuances of both systems.
      x. CSU GE-Breadth allows more course options for CCC students. IGETC course lists are more restrictive. All IGETC courses are accepted for Area-Breadth but not vice-versa.
      xi. If we tried to have one pattern, there is no assurance that UC would be more generous in its definition of IGETC qualifications.
      xii. IGETC is less flexible and can end up being harmful to students who are not certified.
GE-Breadth is preferred because it better serves students. Very few students come to the CSU IGETC-certified. It was reported that an unofficial survey found that fewer than 100 students systemwide used it to transfer to the CSU in a given year.

c. Potential changes needed for alignment
   i. UC changes
      1. allow partial certification
      2. allow American institutions to be used in the GE pattern
      3. require oral communication
   ii. CSU changes
      1. require the a-g foreign language requirement for GE (not unit-based)
      2. move Area E to upper-division
      3. make A3 composition intensive
      4. require minimum grade of C in each course
   iii. Any change would have implications for units needed for graduation, course selection, etc.

d. Perhaps by working on this on our own we may keep political forces at bay that would mandate alignment.

e. There will be costs associated with any change.

2. GE Credit for AP (Hanson)
   a. The guidelines that we approved last meeting will be implemented beginning in Fall 2007.
      i. We will accept the science courses with lab for 4 units (UC will only accept for 3 units pending review)
   b. An Executive Order is being drafted on the number of AP units that can be used for transfer credit. It will be vetted by the committee.
   c. Phasing out Music Theory AP
      i. It is currently being accepted. We recommended that this be removed from the approved list.
      ii. We need to be clear on the timing.
      iii. We need to be clear in our communications about how GE music theory courses taught at CCC will be handled.
      iv. Transfer students who pass the AP Music Theory exam with a grade of 3, 4, or 5 by spring 2009 will be able to use the units earned from the exam for CCC GE-B certification. Students who pass the AP Music Theory exam after spring 2009 will earn transfer units for the exam, but the CCC cannot use the units earned for GE certification. **Note: This proposed policy was clarified and approved subsequent to the meeting.**
      v. We need to communicate this to the CCCs and to CSU campuses to allow them to consider aligning their local policies to the system transfer policy.

3. Update/Discussion of Access to Excellence Document
   a. Many of these ideas came out of the discussions we had of potential revisions to EO 595.
b. This letter went out to the Access to Excellent steering committee, campus senate chairs, provosts and deans of academic planning.
c. It was meant to stimulate discussion but carries no committee endorsement.

4. Potential Revisions to EO 595
   a. The suggestions dealt with a greater focus on learning outcomes rather than course content.
   b. A lengthy discussion revolved around the inclusion of financial literacy.
   c. The new language (with the exception of the treatment of foreign language competency at the a-g level) would not mandate new courses but would rather offer guidance for the development of courses. It is anticipated that courses would not be reviewed against these guidelines.
   d. The item is carried over to our next meeting.
   e. CSSA will be formally consulted on any potential Executive Order.
   f. Perhaps the treatment of competency in a language other than English could be handled by a change or new Title 5 language.
      i. It would be nice to have uniformity across campuses in all requirements.
         Some campuses already have a language requirement.
      ii. We might benefit from input from CCC faculty and students.
   g. We should probably separate the Title 5 proposal from the other language changes at our next meeting. Chris and Jim Wheeler will draft some proposed language changes.

5. Language of Instruction for GE Courses
   a. Current Ed Code (30) and CCC legal opinion offer sufficient guidance to deal with inquiries regarding language of instruction for GE courses. Basically, all GE courses need to be offered in English. (Foreign language and foreign language literature courses are gray areas).

6. The committee heard a review of Education Code, Title 5, and Executive Orders and how they are amended.

7. Guidelines for Review of GE
   a. Chris Hanson gave an overview for the document developed to guide reviewers of CCC GE course submissions.
   b. It may be advisable to include others who are currently involved in course reviews and/or who have significant experience in course reviews.

8. The next meeting will be held on February 8th April 12th. Lunch will be served at noon with the meeting to follow.