



Chancellor’s General Education Advisory Committee

Tuesday, January 23, 2018
Anacapa Room, CSU Chancellor’s Office
11:00-3:00

MINUTES

(taken by P. Selvester: pselvester@csuchico.edu)

Attendance:

- Kevin Baaske
- Bill Eadie (Virtual)
- Jackie Escajeda
- Denise Fleming (Virtual)
- Laura Hope
- Christine Mallon
- Virginia May
- Maggie MacGlothin
- Christine Miller
- Alice Perez
- Barry Pasternack
- Kris Roney
- Paula M. Selvester
- Tiffany Tran
- Jodie Ullman
- Mark Van Selst
- Alison Wrynn
- Sandra Perez (Guest Speaker)
- Janet Rizzoli (Guest Speaker)
- Pam Kerouac (Guest Speaker)
- Chrystal Vernon (Guest Speaker)

1. Announcements

Came to order at 11:12 am. V. May announced there was now a California Community College Math and Quantitative Reasoning Task Force (CCC MQRTF) formed by the ASCCC in partnership with the California Mathematics Council of Community Colleges (CMC³). The task force consists of faculty representatives from math, statistics, chemistry, and early childhood education. They will come up with short- and long- term recommendations. They may consider bringing in people from the outside for the long-term recommendations.

GEAC Membership

GEAC Membership Chair

ASCSU Senator, Los Angeles

Kevin Baaske, Chair

ASCSU Senator, Los Angeles

ASCSU Senator, Humboldt

Mary Ann Creadon, Secretary

ASCSU Senator, Humboldt

ASCSU Senator, San Diego

Bill Eadie

ASCSU Senator, San Diego

ASCSU Senator, East Bay

Denise Fleming

ASCSU Senator, East Bay

ASCSU Senator, East Bay

Susan Gubernat

ASCSU Senator, East Bay

ASCSU Senator, Fullerton

Barry Pasternack

ASCSU Senator, Fullerton

ASCSU Senator, Chico

Paula Selvester

ASCSU Senator, Chico

ASCSU Senator, San Jose

Mark Van Selst

ASCSU Senator, San Jose (Ex Officio)

ASCSU Senator, Chair Academic Affairs

Jodie Ullman (Ex Officio)

ASCSU Senator, Chair Academic Affairs

Committee, San Bernardino

California Community College Academic

Virginia May, representative, Sacramento City

California Community College Academic

Senate Representative, Sacramento City

CSU Campus Academic Affairs

Kris Roney, Administrator, Monterey Bay

CSU Campus Academic Affairs

Administrator, Monterey Bay

CSU Articulation Officer, Long Beach

Maggie McGlothin

CSU Articulation Officer, Long Beach

CCC Articulation Officer, Irvine Valley

Tiffany Tran

CCC Articulation Officer, Irvine Valley

Executive Vice Chancellor, CCC Chancellor's

Laura Hope

Executive Vice Chancellor, CCC Chancellor's

Office

Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, CCC

Alice Perez, Director's Office

Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, CCC

Chancellor's Office

Dean, Intersegmental Programs and Credit

Jackie Escajeda, CCC Chancellor's Office

Dean, Intersegmental Programs and Credit

Curriculum, CCC Chancellor's Office

Christine Mallon

Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic

Christine Mallon, Faculty Development

Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic

Programs and Faculty Development

State University Associate Dean

Alison Wrynn

State University Associate Dean

2. Approval of Minutes from October 31, 2017

Barry Pasternack approved and it was seconded by Van Selst.

3. Approval of Agenda

Ullman motioned to approved and May seconded. No additions were made to the agenda.

4. Chair's Report

Items of interest: Quottly Service

The chair had questions about the Quottly Service and wanted the committee to have more information. Jodie forwarded the email.

See Jodie (Hanley email) The question was should we discuss the evaluation of the CSU's Cross-Campus Online Education Program. The email that the chair received was sent to member for their information. From the email sent by Gerry Hanley:

Cal State Online has partnered with a provider to conduct a pilot project that will deliver a student-friendly, course discovery and enrollment service. The pilot project will provide CSU students FREE access to the [Quottly Service](#) via a custom link on [calstateonline.net](#) and campus advisors can use this service to complement their existing student services. Using Quottly, CSU students can discover convenient, affordable and efficient pathways to satisfy CSU general education course requirements from the over 70,000 online course offerings from both the CSU and California Community Colleges.

5. Continuing Business

A. Chancellor's Office Update (Alison Wrynn, State University Associate Dean, Academic Programs)

Christine Mallon Report:

C Mallon welcomed everyone back and reported that the CO would like to see that we make sure our discussions remain issue based and not personal as we may move to web-based discussions.

Basske asked for an update on EO 1100. No one has been given an exception but some campuses (9) have requested more time and were given extensions of a year. Most of the cases included a misunderstanding of what was required. When information was given to clarify, a number changed their requests. The 9 campuses who have requested extensions are:

Sonoma

San Luis Obispo

San Marcos

Monterey Bay

Stanislaus

San Francisco

San Bernardino

Northridge

Fullerton

C Mallon will send links to the QA and other documents etc. to the GEAC listserv.

Alison Wrynn

Math 110 discussion: The call of the full FDRGs will be requested second or third week of February –the decisions by these groups will be reported hopefully by March.

Campuses will be able to make a decision once the process is complete. There will be discussions with the CC and decisions will be made regarding the changes that may need to take place for the TMCs. The first conversation will take place with CSU first and then will go to the Community Colleges.

IGETC review: There is a new product in place for reviewing courses. The new company has another product and the code has delayed the work for a couple of weeks. There are approximately the same amount of course. Jan 17, 2018 reviewer training was complete Feb. 8, 2018 will be the Assist Training. There is not a lot of requests for non-traditional courses for QR. Next year there will probably be more newly designed non-traditional QR courses submitted. Ideally mid-March review will be complete.

A. There was a meeting with written communication group. Minor and Blanchard came to speak with the group. There were discussions about what kinds of professional development were needed, placement. Early start has to do with QR and Written Communication but there were some questions about what else could be in Early Start –courses from other Areas (such as Area E) that could be included in summer Early Start. Although the campuses were asking about this, few if any interest has come from the campuses regarding this idea. For example, Ethnic Studies in Area E could build in QR or writing and send forward their interest but so far nothing has been sent. The memo dated Nov. 2, 2017 from Blanchard in answer to the inquiries about the possibility of alternative Early Start Program models was distributed. In the memo requests for proposals to be submitted and had a distribution list that included Senate Chairs, Provosts, etc. No campuses have submitted proposals to date.

Guiding Notes Discussion:

It was noted that the Guiding Notes need to be clear. For example, what does a B4 course look like? We need exemplars—syllabi with assignments and outcomes for example. The Guiding Notes at the very least should say regardless of what prerequisites exist, the course has to be college level math. The Guiding Notes should explicitly state what constitutes college level. EO 167 from 1973 talks about what is college-level math. There is an understanding that the CC uses EO 167 to determine what is college-level and if the CC designates a course as college-level, the CSU will accept it. CC representative said the Guiding notes are regularly used to evaluate courses coming from other states. The discussion was truncated because the committee had a time-certain. The discussion will be returned to at our next meeting.

B. Defense Language Institute courses

Time Certain: 1:00 PM with Sandra Perez (World Languages Council); Patrick O'Rourke (Director of Active Duty and Veteran's Affairs); and Janet Rizzoli (CSU Channel Islands Articulation Officer). Related documents **in September GEAC Drop Box**

The discussion rested mainly on concerns that culture and writing may not be being taught to the standard required.

The syllabi used by the DLI and was looked at by the World Languages Council that reviewed the Chinese and Spanish course. The cultural component was not clearly addressed (from the home culture perspective).

A good deal of discussion examined the question of culture and writing, what the meaning of Writing is (GE written communication vs. written communication as a component of language development). Although both were written in the student learning outcomes on the syllabi, there were still questions. The representative from the World Languages Council said that in her discussions with O'Rourke that this could be make explicit. Culture needs to be understood by the target language informants. ACE (American Council of Education) reviews the courses and approves them.

The ACE recommendations are used at CSU Long Beach. If they have 3 units of credit they get GE credit. If they have 1 unit of credit, it goes for electives.

It was moved and approved with one opposed that we vote to send to the CO approval of DLI courses for GE credit using ACE credit guidelines.

C. Advance Placement Exams for Computer Science

Time Certain: 2:00 PM with Pam Kerouac (College Board)-*AP Computer Science Principles* and *AP Performance Tasks*, both **in January GEAC Drop Box**

Chrystal Vernon joined us via Zoom as a content expert on the College Board. This was brought a little over a year ago to GEAC. This discussion is a request to accept the AP Computer Science exam for credit GE Quantitative Reasoning Area B4. In Computer Science Principles they have to create their own computer program and submit their code. They have to be able explain what the algorithms inside their program are working. They use agnostic programming language. They allow teachers to select (java, java script, python, scratch (?) etc. The scoring guidelines and notes have holes. They allow the reviewers to differentiate students across the levels 2, 3,4 5. The board representative described how the exam reviewers use the rubric to level students on the 1-5 scale. She described the reliability of the scorers' ability to differentiate and stay calibrated. Algebra one is recommended to be taken prior to the course although some students take it concurrently. CC representative was wondering how a student without algebra could take the course.

It was voted that the AP Computer Science would be recommended for B4.

D. Examination of CSU campus-based GE assessment practices

(1) Indicators of Education Effectiveness Indicators (IEEI) Reports (in October GEAC Drop Box)

Our attention was drawn to the reports in Drop Box.

(2) Dividing the IEEI Reports

A. Wrynn:

We have information from each campus. The IEEI reports vary in detail. Some reported a lot. Others reported very little. All of the reports that have been received are in the folder in Dropbox. GEAC chair suggested we divide them up and read them, and then share by email the summary remarks (this is interesting, clear, or not). WASC does require assessment and we might want to know what is occurring on campuses. The CO asked us to identify best practices. At March meeting we can discuss our views regarding what we read.

It was suggested that we see the GE Assessment plans. We should be able to see the outcomes from the GE Director or the Assessment coordinator to get the outcomes and the GE Assessment plan. Each campus has a different person who collects this information. The CC colleagues were asked if they has GE assessment plans that had outcomes and assessments for achievement of those outcomes.

(3) Review to spotlight “best practices” in GE Assessment

Charge from Chancellor White **in September Drop Box**

GEAC chair will ask CSU campus chairs from listserv for their assessment plans. Put them in a drop box and assign regular GEAC committee members. He will send this information to the CC colleagues so they can do the same at their campuses.

E. Review and recommendations regarding revisions to the Guiding Notes

(1) Guiding Notes in September GEAC Drop Box

It was determined that we were not ready to go point by point on the Guiding Notes.

(2) Discussion and input

The expectations will be that each member will have read them, determined areas that need editing, clarification, etc. Next time we meet there will be a special place on the agenda to do this. Should we have a different format? Shall they be rethought? Is the format appropriate, easy to use? Is there another way to do it? In preparation, have the EO hardcopy to look at so that all of the notes discussion does not deviate from the policy. EO 1061 is policy for American Institutions. It was suggested that we meet face-to-face to discuss the Guidelines.

6. New Business

Getting best advice regarding EO 1110. It would be best to begin with the Golden 4.

7. Next GEAC meeting

A. March 13: Zoom meeting?

It was requested that we send items for discussion to GEAC chair.

B. May 8: Chancellor's Office, Long Beach