

---

**Chancellor's General Education Advisory Committee**

Tuesday, May 11, 2021

11:00 am – 4:00 pm

Zoom Meeting

---

**Minutes**

**Attendees:** Mark Van Selst (chair), Eniko Csomay (vice), Kevin Baaske, David Barsky, Julie Glass, Gary Laver, Susan Schlievert, Stephen Stambough, Michelle Bean, Regina Eisenbach, Jenni Robinson, Raul Arambula, Melissa Lavitt

**Visitors:** Robert Collins (ASCSU Chair), Quajuana Chapman (CSO), Aisha N. Lowe (CCCCO, Vice Chancellor), Stacey Bosick (Sonoma State), Tiffany Tran for Leonor Aguilera (CCC/Irene Valley)

The meeting began at 11:06 am

1. Chair's welcome and introductory comments
  - a. Tiffany Tran filling in for Leonor Aguilera for this meeting
2. Agenda was approved
  - a. Inspired by the discussions on articulation, an additional item was added under New business (Requirements for GE articulation) during the meeting
3. March minutes were approved unanimously
4. Segment Reports of items relevant to GE
  - a. CCC System (including Articulation Officer report)
    - i. There was a CCC Title 5 change that eliminated the previous restrictions on when pass/no pass changes were permissible. It used to be that students could change to pass/no pass during the first 30% of the term only but now it is left open to the whole semester (but can be constrained by the local CCC district)

**Discussion:**

- Credit/no credit language will be eliminated to change it to pass/no pass.
- Q: If students can take pass/no pass for Golden four, and not a letter grade even though that has been the general practice, would they be able to transfer in with no grades for those courses?
  - A: A pass and no pass is defined as a C or better, so yes.
- Q: Can students come in with basically no GPA?
  - Faculty voiced concerns and said that for the major, they would like to take the students with letter grades.

- b. CCC Academic Senate (Michelle) [edited down to items of GEAC interest - MVS]
- i. CCCAS report was shared by Michelle (see Dropbox)

Legislation

[https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill\\_id=201720180A](https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180A)  
**B1805** *AB-1805 Community colleges: Student Equity and Achievement Program. This bill would provide that, as a condition for receiving funding pursuant to the Student Equity and Achievement Program, a community college would be required to do all of the following: inform students of their rights to access transfer-level coursework and academic credit ESL coursework, and of the multiple measures placement policies developed by the community college, as provided; annually report to the Office of the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges the community college's placement policies and placement results; publicly post its placement results; and implement these provisions by a specified date. The bill would state the intent of the Legislature that the chancellor's office make the collected placement policies and placement data publicly available, except for personally identifiable information, by posting the data on its Internet Web site or making it publicly available upon request. Data available to everyone in the summer/early Fall e.g. student success rate for English, ESL etc. including longitudinal data*

- a CCC system dashboard is being set up to distribute this information
- ii. Guided Pathways Task Force (tangentially related to GE re: possible GE impacts): The funding for this effort has ended and ASCCC are integrating this work into their standing committees (see Dropbox)
- iii. Work towards the possibility of an Ethnic Studies Transfer Model Curriculum
- Tangentially related to GE in that the descriptor might be a signal that the courses may be tailored, in part, to meet the CSU GE Area F requirement.
  - Although GEAC is not designed for this particular role of CCC/CSU communications on curricular development, it is understandable given the CCC and CSU expertise in curriculum (Faculty, Articulation Officers, and CO Staff) and thus some time was spent on this item with implicit referrals for follow up to the ASCSU.
- iv. CCC system is within the 45-day comment period for the Title 5 change that proposes language for a CCC-required Ethnic Studies requirement.
- c. CCC Articulation Officers (Tiffany)
- i. Articulation report was shared by Tiffany (see Dropbox). Further discussion centered around course-to-course articulation;
- Discussion of articulation concerns in part led to item 10: new business – requirements for GE articulation
- ii. Request from the AOs regarding catalog rights

- The relevance to GE is highlighted by the need to determine which students must follow the new CSU GE requirements.
  - System offices need to provide better clarification on the Title 5 language defining catalog rights (language seems outdated and default rules seem to be any credit bearing course in an academic year rather than the official definition). **A request was made that a Q&A session, task force, or a group session be held to clarify these questions regarding catalog rights.**
- d. CSU Office of the Chancellor, Senate, Students
- i. Credit for Prior Learning summit
    - Goals: To wrap up edits on the policy that is already in good shape; edit language to allow for student appeals re: CPL determinations
  - ii. GE evaluation processes re:submissions for Ethnic Studies certification
    - The work is still in process but wrapping up.
    - There will be ES Office hours (5/12) to clarify confusion about what counts and what doesn't count as ES (see examples below).
    - The process does not check for, or use, course-to-course articulation as a decision mechanism.
    - The process assumes the requirement to stand up to legislative scrutiny and thus focuses on the 3-5 competencies being clearly present and congruent with the design of the course.
    - Clarifications, such as cross-listing, are on the list to clarify; Originating department was checked as the prefix must be ES and whether the course provides the disciplinary lens and the GE – these were the main principles.
    - Less than half of ES were approved for GE for system-wide articulation – much of this likely reflects the unusually short curricular cycle prompted by the legislation.
  - iii. Technical appeal process is reviewed and is combined with the ES course reviews and resubmissions.
    - Resubmission window for the courses denied for GE will be June 1-10.
    - Retroactive application of ES evaluations from the 2021-2022 cycle to the 2020-2021 cycle has previously been discussed by GEAC.
  - iv. Catalog rights
    - Peoplesoft processing is being updated to follow CSUs catalog rights (40401). These do not pertain to high school dual-enrollment.
    - Some of the need for this is to avoid the wholesale reversion to prior catalog rights if the de facto standard of assuming catalog year of admission were to remain. The consequence is that incoming transfer students will generally retain their earlier, pre-ES, catalog requirements.
- e. Academic Senate CSU

- i. The Academic Senate CSU Academic Affairs Committee has met with CSU ES Council members multiple times. Dialogue is continuing and progressing.
  - ii. The Academic Senate CSU has endorsed the guidelines and principles for B4 by the CSU Math council (GEAC has seen these recommendations at it March meeting w.r.t. IGETC standards revisions); and has an outstanding request that clearer guidance be incorporated in the Guiding notes and CSU GE policy.
  - iii. The Academic Senate CSU shares the segmental concerns regarding the many issues regarding AB 928 – concerns for common pathway
  - iv. ASCSU Chair Collins reports ICAS is also concerned about new legislation on common course numbering, the possible restrictions on curricular development stemming from a variety of legislative proposals – in particular the possibility of creating a non-academic body to oversee the segments of California higher education.
- f. California State Student Association
- i. No report
    - CSU will need to make a redoubled effort in future years to ensure greater student participation.

<b>noon – 1 pm Lunch</b>
--------------------------

5. IGETC Standards (update)
- a. They had three meetings. The outcome of the final meeting made all the recommendations which were also brought to this body to review at the March meeting (see Dropbox / March); All changes were approved at ICAS for their first reading with no further modifications proposed; The agenda item for the June meeting includes a final reading and approval.  
Updated IGETC doc: [https://drive.google.com/drive/u/0/folders/1FLI6V2k\\_wwwP-veQhWTOZA4Z9vsE9rod](https://drive.google.com/drive/u/0/folders/1FLI6V2k_wwwP-veQhWTOZA4Z9vsE9rod)  
Summary document: [https://docs.google.com/document/d/1YXUqjt1ae08e-X8d8FbP-Ce\\_UkmBINqs/edit](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1YXUqjt1ae08e-X8d8FbP-Ce_UkmBINqs/edit)
  - b. Concerns about the unified GE (AB 928) and its timeline: It cannot be approved if it doesn't have Ethnic Studies (legislative intrusion) and also, still waiting for the UC colleagues but they may not finish before December.
6. Sonoma State GE Exemption request
- a. A3 exception (waiver) to accommodate Electrical Engineering while not going over 120.
  - b. Rationale: Equity concern for transfer and first-time freshmen.

Discussion:

- Has this been passed by the campus GE committee? Yes

- Is there a commitment to assessment? Does the GE committee have access to the assessment document that programs pull together? Yes.
- Recommendation to CO: It would be good to ask for the documents re assessment, etc., up front so it is included in the package.
  - Recommendation of GEAC is for the submission process to require the proposal include: 1) a clear statement or plan for Assessment; 2) that the campus GE committee weighed in and inclusion of concerns if not recommended; 3) provost recommendation/certification of the submission;
- Currently, after taking ES 210 *Digital Circuits and Logic*, the student meets the A3 requirement
- Golden four – Upper Division GE requires Golden four: How will that be met?
  - EO 1100 states "*Students enrolling in upper-division GE courses shall have completed required lower-division GE courses in written communication, oral communication, critical thinking, and mathematics/quantitative reasoning.* "
  - At least one CSU campus requires Golden Four plus all LD in that particular area in which UD is being sought.
- If or when a Sonoma State student switches out of the BS Electrical Engineering program, when will they have been deemed to have met the A3 requirement?
- When does a BS Electrical Engineering student become eligible for Upper Division GE coursework (which requires completion of the Golden Four lower division GE requirements: Oral Communication, Written Communication, Critical Thinking, and Quantitative Reasoning)?
- Remaining deep concerns about the impact of adherence to the 120-unit limit and/or restrictive unit counts on the integrity of CSU GE goals and outcomes;
- Unease at the move (predicated by the above) for increased inclusion of GE requirements into major program coursework;
- Appreciation for, and the need to formalize, the requirement for campus GE processes to weigh in on such waiver requests;
- Support for the campus to retain the A3 designation for ES 210 (*Digital Circuits & Logic*)

***MOTION/ACTION:** That GEAC will accept (i.e., recommend to the Chancellor) the request from CSU Sonoma that the BS ELECTRIC ENGINEERING program will meet A3 outcomes by the conclusion of the program and thus the "waiver" of the A3 requirement for incoming transfer be authorized for admission to this program. GEAC advises the Chancellor to recommend retaining A3 for ES210 (partly to ensure students transferring out of the program have A3 met as appropriate).*

***VOTE:** 5 (yay)-1(nay)-2(abstention) [recommend approval of request]*

## 7. GEAC Annual Report

- a. Minutes
- b. Recommendations
- c. Referrals

- d. Response to annual charge
  - e. Recommendations for future
  - f. Systematic evaluation of GE as a program
  - g. Recommendation:
    - i. GE exemption requests
      - Give better guidance in general, and more specific deliverables re: requests to CSU campuses re: what we are looking for.
      - Be explicit that the GE exemption is exemption for Golden four requirements at admission with expectation that CSU GE requirements are met for every student in every program.
    - ii. Re: course-to-course articulations for major coursework and how that differs from GE articulation.
    - iii. We work together – formal role, advice on GE, and practical role, communication of concerns and future directions of curricular actions are different because it is where CCC/CSU AOs faculty and system staff meet
    - iv. AB 928
      - CCC/CSU faculty and system offices are deeply concerned with the likely fall out if AB928 were to become law
        - CCC is concerned about losing A3 courses if CSU moves CSU GE towards IGETC.
        - Massive costs re: 1440 transfer with any change to CSU GE patterns.
8. “Exemption” request (What does it entail? What are the campus options and what does CSU CO authorization mean for the campus?)

#### Discussion

- Suggestions for greater clarity (better guidance for campuses)
- Current version of the exemption is different from earlier understandings (which was “you do not need to do this”); Now it is only for transfer students
- Waiving away an entire area is problematic; UD is supposed to be building on areas that students have already seen. Favor UD as long as the LD is in place.
- GE should be fewer units for these programs --- all requests are exclusive of the Golden four; Is it just that it is a Golden four course or is it any modification to any GE?
- “Sci-GETC” pattern does not need a waiver since it does not delay Golden four – only one course in C and D till after transfer.
- Summary: We are not in favor, as a group, of wholesale exemptions; Annual report can express GEAC’s positive stance on the new interpretation of GE Exemption, which is an exemption at transfer re: Golden four, but it needs better clarity on checklist/approach a campus to take

- What guidance from GEAC for campus process? What are the limits to campus authority and/or clarify and/or recommend best practices? (positive vs. negative approaches)
- Double counting
  - i. Campuses could put a limit on how many GE courses would be required for the major
  - ii. Major courses and campus-wide required courses that are approved for GE credit shall also fulfill (double count for) the GE requirement
  - iii. CSU campuses may permit up to 6 semester units or 8 quarter units taken to meet the United States History, Constitution and American Ideals Requirement (Title 5, Section 40404) to satisfy GE requirements.

9. CSU GE review

- a. Appeal process update
  - i. CSU office hours tomorrow (5/12) where the criteria for resubmissions will be described again; resubmission was not allowed in the same academic year before but now it is; June 1-10 is the resubmission period; technical resubmissions (e.g. forgot a textbook, etc.) that do not require disciplinary expertise is also at the same time as Area F (ES) resubmissions; Area F has to have core competencies and how they are met through disciplinary content.
- b. Aisha thanked everyone to be partnering on these.
- c. How fast could it be done? Not known yet but asap
- d. Gray area
  - i. What happens if it is unclear if a course meets the outcomes? Faculty review takes place when ambiguous.
  - ii. What process determines who the faculty member is who is consulted for such GE reviews? There are faculty in the CO and there are special consultants; there is not a formal call for names, nor a formalized process to appoint people to review. There is a strong inter-rater reliability between (across) the AO reviewers.

10. New business

- a. Requirements for GE articulation –to be included in the annual report – an item to flag for the future – particularly CC to CSU

Meeting adjourned at 3:15 pm

MVS/ECS 05/12/21