

PRESENT

David Hood, Barry Pasternak, Susan Gubernat, Terri Eden (video), Mark Wheeler (audio), Rob Collins, Jeff Spano, Catherine Nelson, Kathy Kaiser, Mark Van Selst, Mary Ann Creadon, Ken O'Donnell, Elizabeth Adams, Steven Filling, Bill Eadie, Michael Adams, John Stanskas

GEAC Summary to ASCSU for meeting of Jan 20, 2015

There was a request from the CCC senate for advice regarding the constitution of what is entailed by Upper Division GE. After an extensive discussion that ranged well beyond the impacts on GE, we established a sub-group (Mark, Ken, Catherine, Rob) to collate the upper division GE expectations based on title 5, executive order, and CSU guiding notes content as well as a synthesis of campus approaches. The executive order explicitly expects transferability of upper division GE although this expectation is not heavily embraced given differences in upper division GE expectations across campuses.

We were informed that at the few private institutions that participate in CSU GE, those private institutions also have the ability to certify lower division CSU GE completion.

There is the conclusion of the CSU COMPASS project "New Paradigms and Pathways in General Education" conference, Feb 12-14, 2015. We have ongoing participation in the AAC&U Faculty Collaboratives project and the WICHE Passport project in defining what interstate expectations largely around GE objectives might look like.

At a recent meeting of the Board on Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS), the UC system has allowed STATWAY to count towards IGETC Completion. At present we are still holding to the STATWAY pilot pending further evidence from the CSU and our CCC colleagues.

Finally, in the arts, technique-focused courses have historically been excluded from CSU GE breadth. Where the outcomes and course structure might meet GE objectives we have loosened these restrictions.

-Mark Van Selst, Chair.

Review minutes from November meeting. If we see an action item on there that is not on today's agenda, say so and we'll add it to the agenda.

From Nov. notes: Dental Hygiene—not GEAC, so no action needed.

Ken explains status of C grade, and reminds us that executive order specifies C grade for Golden Four. Mark will distribute by the end of today the new language.

Susan has clarified that a Credit will translate as a C under the new Golden Four rule.

Item 3: Upper division GE at CCCs offering baccalaureates. John reminds us that CCCs did not favor this, but legislature passed anyway. About half the districts put forward a proposal. Nine pilots going forward to Board of Governors.

Kathy: Equine science at Feather River interesting; others all to the south?

John hasn't seen all proposals. Law says as many as 15, and 9 going forward. UC didn't care.

Steven: Tim wrote Brice and said we had no problems with Dental Hygiene and Mortuary Science. Others won't go forward until after faculty have a chance to comment.

Ken: don't forget a separate matter. Bac degrees also contain some upper division GE, that could be good thematic GE packages we could use as models.

John: faculty decide what degrees are, and last CCC senate told Chancellor that they want to be in charge of this, and want to work with CSU and UC to decide what counts as a degree.

Ken: but CSU does have a problem defining GE and could use collaboration and help from CCC as they work on this.

Susan: CSUs still checking on duplication, so what kind of press release can come out? We will not do a review in 24 hours.

Catherine: heard on radio that degrees were going before the Board of Gobs today as first reading item. She tried to do some review, and needs more time.

JEFF LOOKS ONLINE AND SEES THAT IT'S ACTUALLY AN ACTION ITEM!!

Elizabeth: how did it get whittled down to 9 from 17? We don't even know that reasoning.

Susan: our review was supposed to start during December break.

Barry: hard to say what should be u.d. GE when we're not consistent ourselves about this.

Kathy: has CCC made sure accreditation is followed in proposals?

John: CCC senate wants to make sure u.d. GE has integrity.

Bill: he saw these proposals and did a one-day review. Some wanted to waive the ud GE requirement because integrated into degree. Also a question came up about how other departments at the CCC could accommodate ud GE requirement. Also, what about articulation and transferability? Range of ideas and plans for how to respond to all this.

John: disaggregate CO's office concerns from CCC faculty's concerns. Ten years ago came up with what an associate's degree is. Need a similar process for this degree that does not just use units earned. Really want faculty partners from CSU and UC to get at this definition of the degree.

Mark asks Terri: what is the 70 units? Terri says all lower division, but this will now change.

Terri: let's work together because if up div GE is going to be asked to transfer in, how are we going to do it? Course Match differs in what is accepted and what not. Need clarification on the areas and on levels.

Some years ago GEAC and AA looked at what constitutes up div GE and gave up.

David: liked Bill's questions—violate 60 unit cap? Apply only to programs? But does this mean you only have transferability in "good" cases, not "bad" cases.

Also, this is too complex to have this fixed by end of February.

Kathy: K-12 likely to get the bulk of state money. We will have very little to spend. Our online courses must be accepted all over the system. This bac transferability looks like it will be the same way. This is a political solution to the economic problems of higher ed.

Ken: higher ed funding, the goal of higher ed, all shifting. What happened with this quick pilot approval is more like bad manners, because there was just ambiguity about how to do reviews or implement. No breach of law, really. When CSU asked for doctorates because we were able to argue it was in the students' interests. Now we can't just say, that's our job. Our own security is not anything anyone else cares about. We have to ask if this is serving the students' interests. Who are we serving? Is it local?

What exec committee is tasked with is not reviewing programs, but in coming up with a process for review. Also, remember that UCs always said they didn't want to do those doc degrees. This is a different case from the CCCs just starting to offer these degrees from legislative mandate. Can CCCs, though, offer faculty expertise and resources that CSU already has?

Susan: we need to be concerned about the fact that 850 says nothing about place-bound rationales for degrees. And we should be concerned about mission creep? We will—let's be honest—be in competition for dollars. CCCs asking us for help on how to do well what we are already doing well.

Catherine: Ken, are you saying 850 opens the door to a fundamental shift in higher ed in the state? Yes, he says, but he's just saying that himself.

John: CCC and CSU work differently in some ways; you are more campus – autonomous. You are perhaps uncomfortable in going down the road of collaboration. What about students who want to go from CSU to CCC, and vice versa? What transfers? We still need to know that. CCCs are being stretched at both ends—make transferable courses happen, and now offer bacs. All of their missions getting blurry.

Jeff: appreciate remarks about being stretched. CO's office only doing what the legislative mandate says. Trying to make the best of it.

Mark: Senators on Senate only get together and see each other every 2 months. Unwise to constrict our discussion too much. We need to catch up every 2 months, and are just catching up now. For GE we recognize that CCC degrees will not contain our up div GE; this shows us that we need to get our own up div GE in order. We need to define it for ourselves, and this is an impetus for ourselves to act on this definition.

Barry: in the end will the CCC bac be cheaper? Master plan is dead; let's admit it and figure out how to offer degrees more cheaply. Why do we even have 3 different systems? Going to be hard to argue difference between upper and lower div GE when we can't figure it out ourselves among 23 campuses.

Mark: what if any action do we want to take?

Kathy: whatever we do needs to be reflective.

Mark: suggests we talk to ourselves and let CCCs into room while we talk. We really need to figure this out, because either we keep campus autonomy, or figure out what we think it is, either campus specific or as a system.

Barry: what are they on the campuses?

Susan: whatever they are on our campus, they do have a good bit of writing. Shouldn't we make sure this happens? And what about the interdisciplinary happenings in up div GE? What about what's already happening?

Rob: at SFSU up div GE is shaping what kind of student we want to graduate.

Terri: let's first take a look at Title V, etc. to see what rubrics we're operating under.

Kathy: we need to allow the diversity that the Compass project, for instance, has nurtured.

Elizabeth: we have an extra section, Area F. What about that?

David: what about doing a survey? Ken says fine—he's willing.

Mark: 1) do nothing quickly; 2) pull from GE guidance the guiding notes and the EO, etc. and cull out and digest it and come up with something. This could happen as another meeting in which we come to some conclusions. But we should worry about the distinctiveness of students, and the problem of mirroring the problem of engineering—a GE that looks like Engineering majors GE. How do we ensure breadth. Get a report back to GEAC in March. Should we be worried about deadlines?

Barry: what would our process be?

Catherine: What this group would do? Figure out a system wide commonality based on the current requirements, then figure out CSU-CSU transferability? Is this what we're doing?

Mark: CCC to CSU would be the same as CSU-CSU transferability.

Kathy: might some campuses be careful if they're breaking the rules in answering the survey?

Susan: how much do we look at other campuses programs? To John: are we moving fast enough for what you need? She would rather take time on this and get it right.

John: unclear what's being determined at Board of Govs today, but something will start, and he imagines it will be what constitutes upper division in the major, which may likely entail GE. But he would rather get good advice than quick advice, so move at your own pace.

Ken: what are cool things you're doing in GE that could help CCCs? What are you proud of and what are your best examples and practices? Robust writing component, lower section caps, integration with major are all good elements. None of that will bear on Title V, etc. This is another kind of advice that we should assemble for CCCs. His role as Title V cop and observance of reciprocity? He thinks it is not relevant. Good up div GE is what will get a stamp of approval. Stupid denials of acceptance will make CSU CO mad.

Steven: 1) don't agree that CCC transferability is same as CSU transferability; 2) don't do too much in this room; this belongs to the campuses; 3) doesn't agree that integration with major is what we should be after.

Kathy: agree that asking campuses what they do well is a good idea. Don't think we should look at unique and distinctive as a model for all GE.

Terri: as CCCs award degrees, if students are from an accredited institution elsewhere, we don't disallow non-GE courses. We're looking at a small number of students.

Barry: let's ask campus Senate chairs; they should know about GE.

David: we have to be careful not to penalize students for exploring in GE. But we also need to ask if this is going to be useful info for SenEx?

Steven: useful for what?

Mark: really doesn't go to SenEx, but should go to Senate.

Mark: what is our action now? Do we need a resolution? We need Senate buy-in, not GEAC buy-in.

Kathy: but we should only provide advice.

Mark: but this, if we decide what up div GE should look like, should go to Senate.

Mark and Catherine: we need both existing campus policies, and what are the practices on each campus for up div GE? This by March.

Ken: survey should begin with faculty somehow.

Mark: committee will be Mark, Ken, Catherine, and Rob.

Item 4: Private institutions participating in GE Breadth. Ken: we always thought it was: you send us your proposals to us and we review. But it also meant that students from privates were then certifying students for transferability. They always thought the students still needed to get certified through a CCC. But this has never been the case. They can be tracked just through the transcript, or by the school having filled out a form with a list of the courses that certify, or they can get codes into the transcript that shows the approved courses and the certifications.

Terri: would be good to get these courses as certified into Assist.

Mark: question about quality—we have asked CCCs to certify. But what about a private like Heald? How can we say no, or can we say no?

Ken: every once in a while we get requests from other privates, and he says no to them. Heald and FIDM are actually good articulators, good courses. But nobody else gets to be in.

Kathy: we need to be careful because state project included all four segments.

This is the place to start experiment of what constitutes a legitimate private that gets in.

John: not sure about policy for getting a degree from CCC after taking just one course. Does agree that every case should be looked at individually.

Ken: but remember that USC wants in, other great private non-profits want in. But we don't have the resources to do all of this articulation and certification.

Elizabeth: Adams State in Colorado offering online courses that athletes and others taking illegitimately or having others take the courses for them. Adams State offering courses that sound like the Golden Four. BYU also.

Terri: remember that these schools are accredited, so hard to deny the articulation. But the students aren't helped because they don't have the correct competencies.

Mark: not participating policy if not using public funds?

Ken: that's the reason for not putting them on Assist.

Item 5: information item on outlines for reviewing GE. Tough to get 3 reviewers, tough for next gen Assist as that rolls out, tough because so many courses that need reviewing (over 1000). This past year got even more—150% of normal—for review as both pre-professional and GE. Information is that the submissions for review are overwhelming. Should slow down as we get to STEM courses, but arts, humanities, and social sciences are a huge number. Last year

on first try of this way of reviewing had a face-to-face meeting in San Diego and advice emerged that eliminated the subcategories of Area D, so that was good. Jan. 30 social science, Feb. 6 is STEM, and some other categories in a final webinar on Feb. 13. Meetings last one hour.

Kathy: clarify: weeds out to get the norm for these courses. But how to get this done in one hour when so many courses?

Ken: point of webinar is to raise the idiosyncratic cases. Reviewers have already trained and normed; what they come with were the ones that they couldn't make fit in the norm.

Mark: originally College Board was going to come in and talk about AP Capstone, but they will now come in March with a time certain.

Debra David: Give Students a Compass report. Discusses what will happen at the Feb. 12 meeting. Ken and Debra will then complete a report after this meeting.

Ken: poster presentations will be important, because of compendium of presentations from all segments. AAC&U using CSU results in a national meeting.

Hoping that GE directors will be coming to meeting.

Mark: 2 nights cost of hotel, and \$95 registration.

Susan: but is every campus bringing a group?

Debra: maybe didn't market enough, but there are a lot of groups going from nearby campuses. CCCs on the listserv, also.

Will send the notice to Mark to get word out to us to get to campuses.

Faculty Fellows positions: AAC&U has funding to host a faculty collaboratives project about proficiency. What ideas are coming forward, and how do we figure out proficiency? Not to sell proficiency, though sponsored by Lumina Foundation. Less prescriptive, open-ended, to make sense of these initiatives. Five states, all LEAP, in first year and then five in second year. What works? The scholarship of teaching and learning is what this is about. Want to build on relationships coming from COMPASS, from 1440, from all constituencies. Five people across all systems.

Susan: funding to AAC&U through Lumina, right? Some concern about their wish to move into a proficiency model. Are there any strings attached? What is their interest?

Mark: goes back to the Bologna model of competency.

Debra: this opens up discussions about what we want the students to be able to do when they graduate. Also useful for up div GE, for example.

Ken: what Lumina might be doing is not accelerating proficiency model, but easing up on it, since they're now tagging it to LEAP, GEMs, etc. Only DQP is initiated by Lumina.

Barry: close deadline, Jan. 30.

Debra: all that is needed is a cv and a letter of interest.

Debra: also from Lumina, and Gates Foundation, we have been asked to participate in faculty conversations about what we expect students to do when they finish low div GE. Debra suggested that local senates should be involved with WICHE interstate. But we should only help shape by way of conversations, but not buy in to Passport.

Mark: we have more experience trying to figure out what works for GE transfer than other states and systems, and so to not be present doesn't make sense. Current passport is not something we should sign off on.

Steven: faculty have not been in the room in discussions he's been in, and he thinks we should not help shape, because that will eventually mean we will be asked to sign off because we were so involved.

Ken: Mark, what do you think about these initiatives so far?

Mark: quantitative reasoning has actually worked pretty well, and qualifying the proposals helps get our view across.

David: Lumina gave money to CSU and to WASC. Gates dropped out of college, doesn't believe in college. What bothers him about DQP is greatest supporter is National University.

Kathy: What are we supposed to do?

Debra: Partly information, and partly to get faculty to participate. Don't let National University determine this stuff.

Kathy: What about deadlines?

Mark: That's what I've been sending out notices about.

John: There are national trends, and California says no. If we don't participate, others will define what will become mandates.

Ken: lots of foundation money floating around. We could say no to it, but these foundations are also asking us to give quality degrees.

John: we should not fall behind national trends by not participating.

Kathy: financial aid is tied to this, though, also. Voices we trust should be at this table.

Susan: the problem is not that this is dirty money, it's that these people know what they want, they've criticized us and the way we educate people, and they have an agenda. Where are their resources really going? Do they want to give resources to us, or to themselves?

Steven: Lumina and Gates want to take us in a direction we don't want to go. We don't have to be at the table to influence things; our size influences things.

Debra: this is really a chance for us to get together and talk with each other about this. That's what's important.

Kathy: agrees we should be at the table, but be very careful about who we send.

Jeff: he was in early discussions, and was often very uncomfortable. We need to send strong people who are willing to speak up and represent California and the systems.

Mark: need to send people also who know their disciplines.

Ken: STATWAY. Carnegie submitted a curriculum for remediation to make Algebra possible to pass, basically. UC said no to it, which means it will count for our GE placement, but not for IGETC.

Susan: where does Math Council stand?

Ken: mostly opposed by Math Council. Real dropoff in degree production happens at CC level, because they get in but then don't pass math for degree.

Susan: some of her Social Science colleagues worry that it won't do the work they need for higher level statistics in their majors.

Ken: at system level trying to tag STATWAY students so they can see how they do in major. Would really like to know what students did it and who not.

Mark: one problem is many of the STATWAY students are not science majors.

John: goal is not degrees, but quantitative skills in the population. Those students will end up being excluded from being science majors.

Kathy: this was a national idea, not a California idea. Nobody expected math or science students to use this. Transfer Curriculum people coming in with lower division Stats, and now STATWAY students coming in. In districts Common Core already changing math. More students may be able to do the algebra that's required in a few years.

Barry: a difference between algebra and statistics. STATWAY doesn't give a basic knowledge of math.

Terri: what does this memo mean for GEAC?

Ken: nothing for GEAC to do, but nice that others are standing up to STATWAY, and make sure we follow up with success of students.

Mark: would like to see more on data before we change from pilot to a done thing. 20 student cohort is not enough, and we still don't have enough data.

Music Theory—Ken: a real flashpoint for meeting both GE and major. Music majors need a lot of theory, more than can take place in a 3-unit course. C-ID descriptor does not have our Area C outcomes. But some courses have come forward which are GE because they show how to thread in both global and cultural knowledge with hands on theory and notation theory. So these will be held up as models for successful GE courses.

Mark: this reminds him of Engineering GE courses. On the face of it, he doesn't believe that they do the GE integration. Would like to see a syllabus that shows the integration.

Kathy: Music, though, walks through human culture. She would like to see a course outline more than a syllabus.

Susan: looks like a technical course peppered with culture and history here and there.

Terri: must see a course outline, as Kathy says. Concerns: told CCCs to go and do this, make these outlines and are now holding them to a different standard. Why don't we show these syllabi to our faculty?

Kathy: we're playing doubting Thomas when they're doing what we asked them to do, so we should be careful.

Mark: don't use them as models.

Ken: not inappropriate to say to CCCs: This is different than what we do. It has more hands on than we think of for GE. May be good, but what can you show us for the results of this kind of course? How did you meet your objectives? Our minds aren't closed, but can you show us how it works?

CSU Institute for Teaching and Learning, would like a status update. Emily Magruder an interim director. Search did not conclude with someone Chris Mallon wanted long-term, but this is ok. New AVP will want to get someone in.

Susan: Search netted too small a pool. Faculty worried that geographical limit of Long Beach was a problem. Is it possible to get around it somehow?

Ken: ITL Director position so important; we need to be flexible.

Steven: heard from campuses that highly qualified people did not want to move here.

Mark: invite Emily Magruder here for next time.

Terri: Stretch English courses, more units. Starting to find course outlines that have 7 units. Combines remedial course with regular A2 course, but remedial course should not count toward GE.

Elizabeth: at CSUN, first 3 units are elective, second 3 units are GE. First 3 units also satisfy 665 and help keep students in the CSU.

Kathy: Course Match and all full time CSU students can take those courses. Home campus controls prereqs, Chico was told. But now hearing that campus for online course could determine prereqs.

Mark: this could be an AA issue, since it's not just GE courses that would be affected.