Draft Notes

Members Present: John Tarjan (Bakersfield), Barbara Swerkes (Northridge), Cindy Parish (AO-San Bernardino Valley College), Jim Wheeler (Maritime Academy), Chris Hanson (CSUCO), Darlene Yee-Melichar (SFSU), Jim Postma (Chico), Greg Granderson (Santa Rosa JC), Ted Lucas (AVP—Channel Islands), Hiro Okahana (CSSA—LB), Jeff Spano (CCCCO), Cynthia Turner (AO—Dominguez Hills), Maria Viera (Long Beach)

Visitors: Jerry Eisman (CSUCO), Season Eckardt (CSUCO), Judy Osman (CSUCO)

1. Welcome and Introductions
2. Announcements
   a. Further alignment of IGETC/GE-Breadth is on the December ICAS Agenda.
3. Approval of Agenda
   a. GE Credit for AP was added to the agenda.
   b. The agenda was approved as amended.
4. Handling of Notes/Minutes
   a. The posted notes prove useful for both committee members and others.
   b. We may want to move to more formal minutes rather than the less formal notes.
   c. It is important to capture what has happened for outside reference.
   d. There was no consensus regarding minutes rather than notes. We will revisit the issue in the future.
5. Service Learning and GE (Gerald Eisman and Season Eckardt)
   a. The CSU offers a myriad of service learning opportunities across campuses and majors.
   b. Service learning is a highly effective way to produce civic engagement learning outcomes
   c. Dr. Eisman reviewed some ideas regarding civic engagement garnered from the literature.
   d. The committee was asked to consider the incorporation of civic engagement into the GE program. Comments:
      i. Civic Engagement/Service Learning can be accommodated to varying degrees by discipline.
      ii. Does civic engagement need to be captured in GE?
      iii. We would need to support faculty if this became a more formal requirement across the system.
      iv. This would be hard to accomplish only through GE. Major courses are effective ways to have students civically engage.
   e. Hundreds of faculty across the system incorporate civic engagement into their courses.
   f. “Civic engagement” is the goal. Students should have the knowledge, capabilities and opportunities to serve.
g. Do our undergraduate programs adequately capture civic engagement? Service learning is the most effective but not only way to approach civic engagement.

h. Social justice is a concept addressed at many campuses.

i. WASC is addressing service learning in accreditation.

j. Professional accreditation standards encompass civic engagement.

k. Civic engagement/service learning perspectives with inform our efforts as we look at potential revisions to EO 595 and the structure of GE.

6. GE Credit for AP

a. The proposal being discussed would apply only to CCC transfers to the CSU with GE certification, not native students.

b. The CSU has granted credit for AP scores of 3 or above for many years pursuant to EO 365.

c. Until 1997, the CSU policy (EO 365) did not designate the number of units to be awarded by exam.

d. In 1997, guidelines were published for using credit earned from AP for GE-Breadth credit/certification.

e. The administration has been working on updating the guidelines.
   i. To also include IGETC certification.
   ii. To update the list to encompass new AP exams. There are now 37 AP tests.
   iii. The UC has already looked at the issue.
      1. Credit for science labs is being considered. While HS AP classes are supposed to include significant lab experiences, they often do not.
      2. Environmental science is being debated. Should it carry GE credit and in B1 or B2?
      3. Latin is being looked at to determine if there is a sufficient cultural component.

f. Tasks referred to the committee.
   i. Approve a policy for uniform credit or,
   ii. Assist in the development of advisement guidelines for community colleges that reflect the various CSU campus policies.
   iii. Address CLEP and International Baccalaureate and GE credit.

g. A new policy with uniform credit to be awarded per exam would have to be phased in (over 4 years) to allow for adjustments, changes to enrollment systems, communications with community colleges, etc.

h. AP courses are also used for placement.
   i. Varying amounts of credit awarded by CSU campus poses difficulty for community colleges advisement of transfer students.

j. Suggestions for perfecting the list of exams/credit and policy were offered. They dealt with # of units, aligning GE-Breadth and IGETC, and the inclusion of quarter units in the guidelines.

k. The science lab issue was debated. (If HS students pass the exam but do not have a significant lab experience, should they receive 4 units?)

l. Chris Hanson indicated that all GE history courses are now accepted for Area C2 (and Area D) under GE-Breadth if they have been approved for IGETC.

m. It was decided that credit earned from the AP music theory exam will not be eligible for GE certification. This exam is geared towards majors and does not take a broad approach to music appreciation.
n. The committee approved the modified guidelines for GE credit for AP exams.
   i. All science courses should carry 4 units and lab credit.
   ii. Environmental Science should be considered a life science (B2).
   iii. The units for Japanese were corrected.
   iv. Music theory was deleted.
   v. The evaluation of AP history for GE will be referred to a history faculty
group to be designated by the Executive Committee.
   vi. While the committee attempted to have one policy for use of credit
earned for AP exams for both IGETC and GE-Breadth, there will be a
limited number of anomalies.
7. John Tarjan discussed the impetus for the GE study. The ASCSU was requested by
the Chancellor to review GE. The CSSA president also made comments in support of
a review at a Board of Trustees meeting.
8. Continuing analysis of the campus surveys.
   a. Jim Wheeler shared a document which summarizes the results of the survey.
   b. Perhaps a group can be formed to develop a list of issues related to GE for
consideration on the campuses for consideration as the Beyond
Cornerstones/Strategic Planning initiative moves forward.
9. Potential revisions to EO 595.
   a. There was an extensive discussion of the purpose and value of GE.
   b. Perhaps we should encourage the assessment of graduating student skills,
attitudes and opinions about GE.
      i. WASC mandates assessment of learning outcomes.
      ii. Could the system develop a common GE assessment tool? CLA is
expensive and may not provide the information we want.
      iii. Perhaps we can “market” GE more effectively to our students to assure
them it is responsive to their needs.
10. Further alignment of GE-Breadth and IGETC.
    a. The Executive Committee was in favor of moving forward.
    b. It is anticipated that a work group will be tasked with moving forward.
    c. This will appear on the December agenda of ICAS.
    d. A work group may also look at SciGETC.
11. The committee decided to form a task force which will draft a document for
    consideration by during the system strategic planning effort.
    a. John Tarjan will take the lead in developing a draft for the group. It will contain
both the results of the campus survey and potential changes that were
suggested by the survey and broader possibilities for restructuring GE that can
be considered by the steering committee and campuses.
    b. Ted Lucas, Jim Wheeler, Darlene Yee and Chris Hanson will also be members
of the task force.
    c. Once the task force has a draft (2 weeks?), it will be distributed to the entire
committee for review/comment.
    d. Things are moving quickly in the strategic planning effort. The document
probably needs to be ready by early December.
12. SciGETC implementation.
    a. John Tarjan gave an overview of the genesis of “SciGETC”, including the
resolution passed by ASCSU calling for flexibility in the completion of GE after
transfer.
    b. The proposal contains provisions for “partial” certification in Areas C and D.
c. How would this affect LDTP since most of the patterns include completion of GE-Breadth?

d. Students in some high unit lower-division preparation majors tend to complete their GE yet in some cases not their major preparation prior to transfer.

e. Is this really needed? Could advising and new catalog copy combined with current policy relieve the need for this type of arrangement?

f. The committee decided that while the proposal may have some merit in concept, current arrangements/practices should be able to accommodate student needs.

g. The issue was removed from our agenda.

13. English Language Instruction in GE—Should instruction in GE courses outside of Areas A1 and A2 be required to be in English?

a. The merits and drawbacks of requiring English instruction were debated.
   i. Perhaps courses that can be used for both GE and major preparation should not be taught in languages other than English due to the need to reinforce English skills throughout the curriculum.
   ii. Area A3 (critical thinking) would seem to be one course for which English instruction is most appropriate.
   iii. There is a logistical problem with reviewing courses for inclusion on the GE-Breadth/IGETC list that are submitted in a foreign language.

b. There was a suggestion that we continue with the status quo—discourage instruction in languages other than English but not exclude it.

c. Committee Decisions
   i. All courses on the approved GE list will be taught in English.
   ii. Courses in foreign languages and literatures are excluded from this recommendation.
   iii. All course proposals should be submitted in English.
   iv. This issue will be referred to AAC for further counsel. The committee believed that it could benefit from more advice about the English-only instruction recommendation.

   d. **Note:** Jeff Spano forwarded the section from the Education Code which addresses language of instruction. It included at the end of the notes for reference.

14. Review/revision of the GE Course Review Guiding Notes—deferred until our next meeting.

15. Our next meeting is tentatively scheduled for January 16th at noon.
EDUCATION CODE SECTION 30-30.5

30. English shall be the basic language of instruction in all schools. The governing board of any school district, or community college district, and any private school may determine when and under what circumstances instruction may be given bilingually.

It is the policy of the state to insure the mastery of English by all pupils in the schools; provided that bilingual instruction may be offered in those situations when such instruction is educationally advantageous to the pupils. Bilingual instruction is authorized to the extent that it does not interfere with the systematic, sequential, and regular instruction of all pupils in the English language.

Pupils who are proficient in English and who, by successful completion of advanced courses in a foreign language or by other means, have become fluent in that language may be instructed in classes conducted in that foreign language.

30.5. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, bilingual education shall be defined as a system of instruction which builds upon the language skills of a pupil whose primary language is neither English nor derived from English. For purposes of this paragraph:

(1) "Primary language" is a language, other than English or a language derived from English, which is the language the pupil first learned.

(2) "Derived from English" means any dialect, idiom, or language derived from English. Both of the following shall be construed as being derived from English:

(A) Any dialect, idiom, or language that has linguistic roots connected to English.

(B) Any dialect, idiom, or language that has a syntax distinct from English, yet can be traced linguistically as derived from English.

(b) A school district shall not utilize, as part of a bilingual education program, state funds or resources for the purpose of recognition of, or instruction in, any dialect, idiom, or language derived from English, as defined in paragraph (1).