NOTES

Wednesday November 6, 2012
11:00 AM to 4:00 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

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

CSU Campuses
Bakersfield  Fresno  Monterey Bay  San Francisco
Channel Islands  Fullerton  Northridge  San José
Chico  Humboldt  Pomona  San Luis Obispo
Dominguez Hills  Long Beach  Sacramento  San Marcos
East Bay  Los Angeles  San Bernardino  Sonoma

Stanislaus

http://www.calstate.edu/app/geac/
GEAC Notes from Wednesday November 6, 2012

Order of Business

1. Call to Order, Welcome and Introductions, Approval of Agenda
   A. Notes from September 12, 2012 meeting were reviewed

2. Report on Inquiries from SEPT meeting.
   A. Critical Thinking: continued discussion re: better definitions and outcomes. Surface issue of definitions of Critical Thinking in Title 5, Guiding Notes, and LEAP rubrics differ in expectations. Carry-forward to future meetings as a continuing discussion item.
   B. Oral communication proposals: Recommendations for consideration
      i. GEAC could authorize a pilot (5-6 sites) to test online delivery of online communication.
         a. Public presentation at different sources? What venue?
         b. EO 1065 allowed acting 1
      ii. What is GOAL: educated adult, solid well-thought out presentation. Is there appetite for an rfp? What is the criteria for success? These are the “open forum” thoughts:
         a. Components: Must be high-tech
         b. Restriction on redoing presentations for at least some of the evaluation
         c. Restriction to experienced instructors
         d. Research study perspective / sampling awareness / multivariate analyses (gender, age, ESL, etc.)
         e. Michelle Pilatti and Michelle Bruno (SB1440 comm lead)
         f. Comm Studies experts should craft the rfp.... Central role
         g. Live audience should be an element for at least some.
         h. Some might be REQUIRED to NOT be in person...
      iii. Oral comm. Re: WICHE aligning GE across states ... other states do allow Oral Comm to be online. Restrict the rfp to develop to meet learning outcomes, leave implementation open.

3. C-ID use with GE?
   A. Could C-ID course descriptors work for automatic approval of GE Breadth. i.e., “automatic” GE review. We could test with a Narrow set of test courses if there is appetite for this proposal.
B. There are issues with C-ID reviews already. This could exacerbate problems. Alternatively, could GE review CCC/CSU/UC courses to determine C-ID (but lack of expertise goes both ways).

C. The C-ID descriptor would need to be more robust vis-à-vis GE. C-ID review is “new” ... submission, approval, and denials.

D. Could there be denial based on SLOs vs content?

E. Maybe C-ID is too “new” of a process. What would the training of reviewers for C-ID + GE look like? (are the processes too new to try this?). There is great variability across reviewers. The C-ID review process is different from CSU GE review. It appears that there is some appetite to consider concurrent submission processes.

F. FDRG should meet and establish norming to use of reviewer notes in potential revision of “base” C-ID descriptor to encourage incorporation of GE where it makes sense.

G. Would a combined pilot of submitting GE alongside but separately from C-ID needs FDRG consultation? Yes, it would be improved if the C-ID descriptors were built to include statewide GE requirements.
   i. Local vs. statewide GE requirements emerge as a concern as does the fact that currently articulated courses may represent different GE areas across the state (local autonomy).
   ii. GE serves a different purpose that the major.
   iii. What problem are we trying to solve?
   iv. There is a question about what data set would inform further discussion.

H. DECISION TO NOT PURSUE (NO ACTION).

4. Defining the 2.0 minimum GPA prior to transfer (does it mean C or better in every GE course?)

A. There is a Board of Trustees (1996) requirement for C or better in every course. Additionally, Title 5 requires satisfactory work on golden four. We state a requirement for 2.0 or better for CSU GE (overall average).

B. Admission handbook says 2.0 in every course. Campus practice has been to go with CSU GE average of >2.0 –

C. Achievement of C in every course has been achieved by virtue of impaction.

D. Admission requirement vs. graduation requirement on the campus.

E. Intention: Let us build on what our best practices are... stick with averaging 2.0 in CSU GE.

F. Codify 2.0 or better in golden four into title 5

G. Side note: Remove LDTP from title 5.
H. Comprehensive plan. 2.0 @ all transferable credit (Admissions) + all CSU GE (including local performance) would need 2.0 for native students.
   i. ACTION 1: Mark and Eric will create an outline of a potential goals state for 2.0 in CSU GE Will occur.
   ii. ACTION 2: Joint submission or C-ID and GE processing GEAC supports this

5. Report on Interstate Passport (WICHE)
   <http://www.calstate.edu/app/GEAC/documents/20121106/4-WICHE.pdf>
   A. Overview of project and context of other state to state transfer initiatives
      i. Statistics into quantitative literacy and acceptability of draft outcomes
      ii. Acceptability of draft outcomes for written communication
      iii. Acceptability of draft outcomes for oral communication
   B. CA students can use GE to transfer out of state without problem.
      i. We are not looking for out of state students to transfer in.
      ii. The issue of moving to outcome-based articulation is somewhat independent of CA history of articulated coursework.
      iii. As presented at Colorado, until we can agree on criteria and standards, the passport might not make sense.

   A. Strong research-based presentation/update on assessment efforts re: STATWAY success (Bernadine, Chuck, Fong, Karon, Kipple)
      i. gives 3 units of undergraduate credit
      ii. Algebra concepts and principles: Algebra is in development but the amount of algebra is only that in service to statistics (relatively minimal)
      iii. The statway model is open to adding added algebra to meet university requirements.
         a. This seems ideal for the CSU in that we get both Intermediate algebra and quantitative literacy (both at a level we expect).
         b. We need to look at Mathematical outcomes (e.g., knowledge of exponentials).
         c. The end of course exam includes exponential models.
      iv. We need to answer:
a. What happens to long-term success post-statway? Are students moving through more efficiently? How are they doing in upper division methods/statistics/quantitative coursework?
b. What is the commitment to intermediate algebra as required for the CSU? REQUEST: determine what algebra is included in what we are defining as STATWAY and ensure meets our needs?

7. Programmatic assessment of GE on the campuses - Kate was not present thus no action; item held over.

8. Outcomes-based articulation (inquiry from Excelsior College)  
   A. seems unusual to allow styles of articulation that are not permissible from the CCC system
   B. There was a question about how many students would be served.
   C. The decision was to not act on the request.

9. Golden Four and Cal State Online  
   A. Cal State Online is different from “normal” campus offerings since the offerings are explicitly targeted to transfer.

10. Los Medanos College "Path 2 Stats"  
   A. The course articulation is being taught out with lack of prerequisites allowed for those students who would otherwise be disadvantaged. No new students to be allowed since the course actually needs to enforce that intermediate algebra prerequisite to qualify.

11. Give Students a Compass  
   A. March conference  
   B. Inquiries re additional networking sites

12. Open Forum  
   A. No time thus no new items other than those included as revised within these notes.