

**Chancellor's General Education Advisory Committee**  
**CSU Chancellor's Office, Munitz Room**  
**Tuesday, May 8, 2007**  
**10:00am-1:00pm**

**Notes**

**Members Present:** John Tarjan (Bakersfield), Barbara Swerkes (Northridge), Jim Wheeler (Maritime Academy), Darlene Yee-Melichar (SFSU), Jim Postma (Chico), Hiro Okahana (CSSA—LB), Jeff Spano (CCCCO), Tapie Rohm (San Bernardino), Maria Viera (Long Beach), Catherine Nelson (Sonoma),  
**Visitors:** Kurt Hessinger (CSUCO), Judy Osman (CSUCO consultant), Mark Van Selst (San José)

1. Members and guest were welcomed at 10:15.
2. Further discussion of the pros and cons of alignment to inform the ICAS task force.
  - a. A small percentage of students transfer to the CSU under IGETC. Yet students are often counseled to take IGETC courses yet end up transferring under Area-Breadth.
  - b. There are a number of courses approved for Area-Breadth that are not approved for IGETC.
  - c. Community college faculty and others have expressed concerns about moving away from Area-Breadth.
  - d. Perhaps we should focus on the extent to which the package helps students to accomplish their educational objectives.
  - e. Reducing confusion would be a good thing. However, it is unclear that the current dual system really does confuse things.
  - f. Changing GE would have the impact of altering LDTP agreements and potentially harming relationships with our CCC partners.
  - g. Moving toward Area-Breadth would be a good thing.
  - h. The committee's advice is to not pursue further alignment between GE-Breadth and IGETC.
3. Potential revisions to EO 595
  - a. In some cases, we spend a lot of time in committees discussing issues with no ultimate disposition of the issues. How should we proceed on this effort?
  - b. Perhaps we should solicit the input from undergraduate studies officers.
  - c. It is difficult to solicit feedback from a system this large and complicated. Who should be solicited? Who represents the "campus?"

- d. Articulation officers would be a valuable resource.
- e. Jim Wheeler will take on the responsibility for collating comments and versions of the document before us. He will be assisted by Catherine Nelson and Chris Hanson.
- f. We should probably solicit more feedback from different constituencies prior to sending something forward to Academic Affairs Committee.
- g. We could either develop a new advisory committee on EO 595 including campus participants or develop a draft further and send it to those groups for review. Perhaps we could invite representatives from the groups to visit a GEAC meeting to try to hammer out a final version.
- h. Perhaps we could use electronic resources to facilitate this process.
- i. Bringing the GE chairs together for a meeting would be a nice idea. Perhaps this could be a one day symposium where we share best practices in addition to working on EO 595. Chris Hanson will explore the possibility for CO support for such a meeting. AVC Roth has indicated that she would be willing to support the meeting.
- j. Perhaps the directors of assessment should be included.
- k. The committee has approved the distribution of draft proposed changes to the following groups:
  - i. Associate VPs/Deans of Undergraduate Studies
  - ii. Articulation Officers
  - iii. Assessment Directors
  - iv. Chairs of campus GE committees
  - v. Campus executive committees or other committees they would deem appropriate (e.g. education policies committee).
- l. After getting advice from these groups, we will draft a penultimate version of the proposed EO 595 changes would be distributed to the participants at the meeting for final feedback.
- m. The cover letter to campuses soliciting feedback on the draft changes will:
  - i. Go out in the fall,
  - ii. Enumerate the other groups from whom feedback is solicited,
  - iii. Be targeted to all 5 groups,
  - iv. Be signed by the chair of GEAC and chair ASCSU and sent through appropriate channels.
- n. The subcommittee will incorporate feedback from this group and the campuses to date and develop a draft be distributed at the fall GE Chairs' meeting. They will also draft a summary of the proposed changes to be incorporated into the cover letter.

- o. The biggest impact from the proposed changes would likely be in the area of foreign language (requirement of the equivalent of 2 years HS foreign language study for graduation).
  - p. The ideas in section V. can be interpreted as suggestions for areas of coverage rather than as specific requirements.
  - q. Feedback was given to the subcommittee to guide the further development of the proposed changes.
  - r. Perhaps we could invite some CCC faculty to attend. There was no consensus on this suggestion.
4. Update on U.S. History criteria review.
- a. The survey of chairs is ongoing.
  - b. The political science chairs indicated a preference for maintaining the status quo (EO 405-specified criteria).
5. Treatment of critical thinking in GE review.
- a. EO 595 definition of critical thinking—is it appropriate? The implications of the language were discussed. The committee also discussed various perspectives on critical thinking and logical reasoning.
  - b. Should we allow the use of literature criticism courses in A3? While some literary criticism courses have been accepted in the past, many CCCs do not consider this appropriate, and one is pressing this issue. Current APP staff have not found that literary criticism courses fit the EO 595 definition of critical thinking as primarily training in logic. Should we look to expand the definition of critical thinking?
  - c. Most CCCs have interpreted the criteria to emphasize logic and fact-based reasoning rather than literary criticism or analysis.
  - d. The definition of critical thinking is a subject of debate in the academy.
  - e. Some philosophers feel that critical thinking and composition should be taught separately.
  - f. There was support for maintaining the current definition of critical thinking and for applying that definition to course review, in keeping with present practice. This topic will be revisited next fall.
6. Sub-areas within social and behavioral science in GE-Breadth and IGETC.
- a. Interdisciplinary courses without strong discipline exposure and topical courses probably belong more at the upper-division.

- b. The committee expressed a desire to retain the 10 discipline-based sub areas within Area D.

7. IGETC Notes Revision and UC Approval of IGETC AP Chart

- a. Dean Hanson gave background on both the draft IGETC notes and use of AP courses for GE certification.

8. Issues to carry over to next year

- a. Full-year scheduling at the first meeting. Perhaps we can set meetings for the year. Meetings can always be cancelled.
- b. Critical thinking in Area Breadth.
- c. EO 595 language
  - i. Potential changes document
  - ii. Letter to campus constituencies
  - iii. GE chair meeting
- d. History chair update—U.S. history review guidelines.