

Chancellor's General Education Advisory Committee
CSU Chancellor's Office, Munitz Room
Wednesday, September 13, 2006
1:00pm-4:10pm

Draft Notes

Members Present: John Tarjan (Bakersfield), Ted Anagnoson (LA), Barbara Swerkes (Northridge), Tapie Rohm (San Bernardino), Cindy Parish (AO-San Bernardino Valley College), Jim Wheeler (Maritime Academy), Chris Hanson (CSUCO), Darlene Yee-Melichar (SFSU), Stephanie Low (CCCCO), Jim Postma (Chico)
Visitors: Kurt Hessinger

1. Attendees introduced themselves.
2. Replacement of CSU Articulation Officer on GEAC—Chris Hanson has solicited suggestions for nominations.
3. John Tarjan and Chris Hanson reported on the history of AB 2168.
 - a. It passed out of Assembly Higher Education Committee, which is chaired by the author.
 - b. It would mandate a single GE package across systems.
 - c. It did not come out Senate Higher Education Committee when it came up for review. A major reason was the opposition of Senator Scott, chair of the committee.
4. System articulation of GE courses from privates, out of state schools.
 - a. This was a proposal from a transfer center director at Santa Monica College for a system of articulation/communication across the state. A database of this type would greatly facilitate transcript evaluation and advising.
 - b. We could charge a nominal fee for articulation if this information were contained in ASSIST.
 - c. Some CSU campuses are so burdened with current articulation that this may be unrealistic.
 - d. The CSU currently does articulation with privates for transfers but does not charge.
 - e. Question: Why is there a problem getting articulation done? Answer: There is understaffing and other competing priorities.
 - f. The main problem is delayed evaluations at CCs due to a backlog of these types of courses.
 - g. Q: How is ASSIST funded? A: Pass-through monies contained in the budgets of UC, CSU, and CCC.
 - h. Automated degree audit on CSU campuses (CMS) is drawing people away from other activities such as articulation.
 - i. This may be more of a community college issue than a CSU issue.
5. Continuing analysis of the campus surveys.
 - a. How should we proceed? We could make suggestions to AAC or directly to the chancellor.
 - b. It appears that we there were three areas of general agreement
 - i. Double-counting should be allowed.
 - ii. More composition should be required.
 - iii. We should not make major changes.

- c. In light of LDTP, do we want to make large changes?
 - d. Perhaps we need to issue some type of report to bring closure to the survey process.
 - e. EO 595 is 25 years old and needs to be reviewed and updated for relevancy to 21st century needs.
 - f. The ASCCC is has changed the math and English requirements to for the AA degree.
 - g. Perhaps we can do a summary and refer to AAC.
 - h. There are three things that we should consider
 - i. Foreign language requirement
 - ii. Enforcement of writing requirements (lower class sizes)
 - iii. Some additional guidelines for Area E (e.g., financial literacy)
 - i. A fourth issue might be to align the IGETC and Area-Breadth requirements for critical thinking.
 - j. We need to be careful not to mix our recommendations with the data contained in our survey.
 - k. We should not be constrained in our recommendations by the results of the survey.
6. Tapie, Jim and Chris will work on a draft report which will be reviewed by the committee as a whole. Tapie will take the lead.
7. Potential revisions to EO 595.
- a. This does not meet the needs of 21st century students. Communications, for example, does not receive significant attention.
 - b. It is important to coordinate discussion and development of GE and LDTP.
 - c. We will discuss this further at our next meeting.
 - d. Tapie, Jim and Chris will look at the work already done on objectives.
8. Discussion of further alignment of GE-Breadth and IGETC.
- a. We should discuss potential alignment with the other systems.
 - b. Perhaps we should designate a representative(s) to discuss potential alignment.
 - c. A tripartite discussion would be welcome.
 - d. The CCC is reviewing Title 5 as it relates to curriculum. We will be reviewing curriculum and requirements, including general education.
 - e. In light of LDTP, any changes to GE-Breadth would cause problems in LDTP implementation.
 - f. Any changes to GE would take several years to implement.
 - g. It would be possible to align GE if both the CSU and UC “gave” on 3 issues each. (CSU—placement of Area E, writing-intensive critical thinking, foreign language) (UC—partial certification, American institutions, oral communication).
 - h. Changes to GE may not significantly disrupt the transfer of CCC students to the CSU.
 - i. Senator Yee will bring up this issue tomorrow at agenda setting for ASCSU. Any initiation of intersegmental discussion would need to be initiated by ICAS.
9. SciGETC implementation.
- a. The senate has already approved flexibility. It is up to this committee to recommend a way to implement this flexibility.
 - b. We should probably focus on GE-Breadth rather than IGETC given the number of students following this pattern.

- c. The LDTP patterns would have to be reconfigured to reflect the changes in lower division GE patterns.
 - d. John Tarjan will draft a proposal reflecting the ideas discussed in committee and distribute it. Jim Postma will discuss the implementation details.
 - e. We would likely need to communicate with the review coordinators to solicit proposals for inclusion. John Tarjan will draft a call for inclusion.
10. Our next meeting has been tentatively scheduled for November 7th at 12:00 noon.