Chancellor’s General Education Advisory Committee
Tuesday, August 31, 2021
11:00 am – 4:00 pm
Zoom Meeting

Minutes

Attendees: Mark Van Selst (Chair), Eniko Csomay (Vice), David Barsky, Nancy Counts Gerber, Julie Glass, Gary Laver, Simon Rodan, Stephen Stambough, Michelle Bean, Regina Eisenbach, Jenni Robinson, Michelle Plug, Raul Arambula, Melissa Lavitt

No Representative: CSSA

Visitors: Robert Collins (ASCSU Chair), Karen Simpson-Alisca (CO), Rick Ford (APEP), Brent Foster (CO)

The meeting began at 11:07 am

1. Call to order and roll call
   a. Introductions: broad goals and areas of particular interest
2. Chair’s welcome and introductory comments
   a. Dropbox
   b. Agenda updated to add International Baccalaureate (Math changes) to new items
3. Agenda was approved (unanimous)
4. Future meetings (all will be zoom accessible)
   a. GEAC is always hybrid accommodating both in person and remote access to the meeting unless noted otherwise
      i. Aug 31 (modality = Zoom)
      ii. November 2 (modality = TBD)
      iii. January 18 (modality = TBD)
      iv. March 15 (modality = TBD)
      v. May 17 (modality = TBD)
5. May Minutes were approved (no dissent)
6. 2020-21 GEAC annual report was approved (no dissent)
7. Segment reports of items relevant to GE (11:30)
   a. CCC System Office (Raul)
      i. Approved changes to the Title 5 GE section and now requiring Ethnic Studies as graduation requirement; no date has been set yet as of when the requirement will start but the anticipated start date is in two years.
ii. Common course numbering implementation (AB1111 if passed) is a concern for this coming year

b. CCC Academic Senate (Michelle)
   i. Goals for this year:
      1. Culturally responsive student services, support, and curriculum;
      2. Equity-driven practices
      3. Transfer in higher education -- Academic academy conference will focus on enhancing transfer in Higher Ed in CA (hybrid conference) -

c. CCC AO report (Michelle Plug)
   i. Ethnic studies – faculty are creating more Area F courses at the CCC
   ii. AB-928 is of particular concern regarding both transfer and articulation processes

d. CSU AO report (Jenni)
   i. Area F
   ii. Issue of catalog rights (admissions, articulation, transfer, etc.)
      1. PeopleSoft will hopefully help;
   iii. Number of similar matches for ADT degrees - how to deal with many that include accommodations for upper division of GEs
   iv. Credit for prior learning and its impact to GE and transfer
   v. CSU fully online shows increased adoption (potential workload issue re: transfer)

e. CSU Office of the Chancellor (Melissa)
   i. Ethnic Studies over the summer
      1. CCC Course Outlines of Record (CORs) are historically reviewed only once a year only (largely over the summer).
         a. A lot of courses were reviewed;
         b. Faculty expertise is used in the review process; ES is the only GE area where SLOs are expressed; high quality courses are expected; generally, 90% CCC outlines of record for GE are approved. For ES these numbers are lower, and, including the submissions where the reviewer recommendations diverged and later approved, roughly 25-35% of submissions were approved (with feedback for improvement/description of deficits - generally to explicitly address 3 of the 5 competencies).
         c. Discussions around allowing backdating of Area F submissions to help students; a second review option for submissions was available for the 2020 review cycle;
         d. Workshop will be conducted for CC articulation officers;
registration is encouraged; submission processes in general and not just Area F will be discussed (including Humanities or Social Sciences); the level and quality of the reviews sent to the CC will be shared later – SLOs are the guiding principles for Area F review.

Discussion:
1. Q: How does backdating work? A: Backdating is for the past year; if the student is GE certified we will not say no. If student comes in with ADT which contains GE certification, we will not say no.
2. Q: Backdating: what happens when the course just doesn’t hit the SLOs? A: The decision will be student-centric.
3. Q: Catalog rights – would anyone starting 2020 and later should have the Area F requirement. A: Someone with and ADT or even if they broke catalog years or they are not continuous they are ok; catalog rights is not the only criteria to determine whether someone has met the Area F requirement – it is a phased-in approach.

f. CSU Students (CSSA)
g. CSU Academic Senate (ASCSU)
i. SB928 (Berman)
ii. AA: too early to say what’s on the agenda yet but two things will be there: Area F and the Graduate Writing Assessment Requirement [GWAR] – depending on campus choice it can be a test, a course, or both.
iii. APEP: Area F; Standards for B4 courses; SB928 – math standards;
iv. ASCSU:
   1. AB 928 (927, 1111);
   2. Transfer – why transfer isn’t broken;
   3. How do we support one another in terms of ES implementation;
   4. Help the UC as they are looking into an ES requirement to recommend for IGETC.

8. LUNCH (12:00)
9. Discussion of committee scope and charge
   a. Preface to 2020-21 GEAC annual report
   b. Chancellor’s (2021-22) GEAC charge
10. Review of recommendations for future consideration from 2020-21 GEAC Annual Report
   a. GEAC was provided with an overview of what the committee’s charge and activities were last year with the intent to think about what our priorities may be this year.
11. Priorities identified for action (3:15)

Discussion:
1. CO’s vision for our charge for this year:
   a. we are waiting on SB928;
   b. AB1111 (common core numbering);
   c. clearer guidance on multiple criteria for GE eligibility.

2. EO 1100 bird’s eye view
   a. Go back to campuses and see how EO 1100 revised-revised worked or not and what problems arose in the implementation to see where modifications may be needed; look at the re-revised 1110 and look at track changes where there may be some nuances to work on.

3. GE
   a. Looking at GE as a program through for example programmatic themes
   b. GE courses grouped together as a minor, as a major, as a certificate
   c. Problem of FTE seems to rip up great ideas on how GE could be better organized
   d. Ways of marketing GE would be worth a discussion
   e. Looking at each campus’ front (landing) page on GE could be starting to point to collect data on how marketing is done on campuses. E.g., Chico’s GE program: [https://www.csuchico.edu/pres/em/2019/19-021.shtml](https://www.csuchico.edu/pres/em/2019/19-021.shtml)
   f. Suggestion:
      i. Committee comes up with language (or identifies strong models) that campuses can use that outline
         1. Why GE matters;
         2. How GE helps you major
      ii. Bring in testimonies from alumni who are successful outside of their major and where skills developed through the GE courses helped the success

12. New business
   a. International Baccalaureate (Math)

      There are changes in the IB exams – previous exams are no longer offered; there are changes. Math council should be aware of it. Sense of urgency is there. An action item will probably be best by next time. Question is whether this new exam (or which one) qualifies as GE. Subcommittee was formed that will come back with a recommendation next time.

      ACTION: subcommittee (Glass, Barsky, Van Selst, Robinson, Rodan) to:
      i. Identify issue for the math council
         1. “Do the HL version of each of the two new IB math sequences meet the requirements of CSU GE B4?”
      ii. Provide math council with appropriate B4 definitions and IB math sequence descriptions
iii. Subcommittee to make a recommendation to GEAC at our November meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 2:59 pm
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