CSU | The California State University

Chancellor's General Education Advisory Committee

MINUTES

March 12, 2024
Time: 11:00 AM – 4:00 PM
Zoom – information on calendar and in email

1. Call to order and roll call (11:00)
   a. Called to order at 11.04 am
2. Chair's welcome and introductory comments (11:05)
   a. Covered the items to be addressed and areas of discussion.
3. Overview and approval of Agenda (11:10)
   a. Van Selst: Add a report from the ad hoc meeting ASCSU ASA on AB928
   b. M/S: Wood/Van Selst Approved
   c. Item added to the revised agenda.
4. Future meetings (all will be zoom accessible) (11:20)
   i. May 14 (modality = TBD) – plans to make this hybrid
5. Approval of Minutes (1/16/24) (Dropbox March minutes folder) (11:25)
   a. M/S Wood/Schlievert Approved with minor edit to item 8 on 'freed' units from 6 to 5 (p.4)
6. Segment reports of items relevant to GE (11:30)
   a. CCC System Office (Stanskas)
      i. See report. Working on AB928 and AB1111: getting ready for the implementation of this legislation especially the operational rather than the curricular

GEAC Membership

Eniko Csomay, Chair
ASCSU Senator
San Diego

Gregory Wood, Vice-Chair
ASCSU Senator
Channel Islands

Paul Carpenter, Secretary
ASCSU Senator
East Bay

Samuel Frame
ASCSU Senator
San Luis Obispo

Dana Nakano
ASCSU Senator
Stanislaus

Susan Schlievert
ASCSU Senator (AA chair)
Fresno

Simon Rodan
ASCSU Senator
San Jose

Mark Van Selst
ASCSU Senator
San Jose

LaTonya Parker
California Community College
Academic Senate Representative
Moreno Valley College

Bernadette Muscat
CSU Campus Academic Affairs
Administrator, Chico

Sarah Wood
CSU Articulation Officer
Sacramento

Genesis "Gali" Pompa
CSSA Representative

Michelle Plug
CCC Articulation Officer
Citrus College

John Stanskas (Ex-Officio)
CCC Chancellor's Office
Vice Chancellor, Educational
Services and Support over Academic
Affairs

Brent Foster (Ex-Officio)
CSU Chancellor's Office
Assistant Vice Chancellor and State
University Dean

details.

b. CCC Academic Senate (Parker)

See report. Upcoming resolutions.

c. CCC AO report (Plug)

   i. Conference (intersegmental) coming up April 3-5.

   ii. AB1705.

   iii. Preparing for AB928 and AB1111 implementation. Some questions for Cal-GETC patterns especially partial certification, grade standards.

d. CSU AO report (S. Wood)

   i. CSU AOs met in early February.

   ii. We were advised there would be a panel discussion at the Associate Degree for Transfer Intersegmental Implementation Committee Meeting on March 28th. Allison Wiles from CSU San Bernardino will be in attendance representing the CSU Articulation Officers.

   iii. The CSU CO provided an update on the January BOT meeting. Several CSU AOs had watched live, others had not seen it yet. Some CSU AOs expressed support of aligning to a single GE pattern, citing the difficulties students face in the transfer process.

   iv. The CSU CO also provided a quick update on AB 1111 – the CCCs had discussed the potential numbering system within their districts. We were encouraged to read the Common Course Number Task Force report when it was released in late February.

   v. The CSU CO also provided an update on the AB 928 Implementation Committee recommendations for TMCs, specifically with the STEM pathways. One of the recommendations was to offering a different unit threshold for STEM pathways, up to 6 additional units. One of the suggestions presented to us was deferring up to 6 units of lower-division GE. Those are units our campuses would have to accommodate within the remaining 60 units. We will be reviewing our STEM TMCs and providing feedback to the CSU CO later this spring. We will likely not be able to make recommendations until we have the final BOT decision on GE.

e. CSU Office of the Chancellor (Foster/Inouye)

   i. Thanked chair Csomay for her work.

   ii. GE Review update

- Current GE review cycle: Course proposals for 2024-2025 academic year.
- Approximately 3,881 proposals (CSU GE Breadth, AI, and IGETC).
- Approximately 235 Ethnic Studies courses (included in total).
- Dr. Rob Collins continues as the CSU Ethnic Studies Faculty Coordinator.
- CSU GE Area E decisions published first.
- [Process overview](#) (pp. 8-10 in Guiding Notes) and other GE resources.
- Currently moving to 2nd level phase and reconciliation

   iii. External Exams

- AP African American Studies still in pilot
- Updates to AP exam titles reflected in [CSU External Exam Policy](#)
- It is likely that we will retain two sets of external exam lists as we transition to Cal-GETC
- Transfer and Articulation website https://transferprograms.calstate.edu/

f. CSU Students (CSSA) (Pompa)

   i. No report.

g. CSU Academic Senate (ASCSU) (Steffel)

   i. Board of Trustees has an item before them at their meeting at the end of this month

   ii. Part of it is to incorporate the Cal-GETC changes, part is to change CSU GE

   iii. Neither students nor faculty are in favor of changes to CSU GE at this time. The faculty have been very clear about opposition to change without data on impacts. Students resoundingly rejected changes to CSU GE (18-3) at their plenary on March 9, 2024.

iv. Students spoke really passionately about the impact of Lifelong Learning and Self Development especially in their development as student leaders and persistence and success as students.

v. It's not decided until the board votes, so please do not treat it otherwise.

vi. Encourage all to do public comment at the CSU Board of Trustees meeting.

7. Other reports

a. JEDI Liaison report (Nakano)

i. No specific issues or resolutions from the JEDI agenda have direct relationship to the charge of GEAC.

ii. JEDI continues to have questions about the impact of proposed GE changes re: potential adoption of Cal-GETC as CSU GE Breadth on underrepresented and historically marginalized student populations. JEDI reiterates ASCSU's call for more detailed data on transfer students and the impact of Area E courses on student success and further requests that this data be broken down by race/ethnicity, gender, first generation status, Pell Grant recipients, and other relevant demographic categories as much as possible.

b. Cal-GETC Standards Committee Report (Csomay)

i. Version 2.0 by May on Cal-GETC.

ii. No major changes – may be still a question around accrediting agencies.

c. ASCSU Academic Affairs Committee Report (Schlievert)

i. Academic Affairs will meet on March 13, 2024. Items for discussion include:

- AS-3665-23/AA Faculty Choice in Selection of Course Materials--- Refining of proposed resolution based on feedback received
- Artificial Intelligence: Empowering CSU Faculty Colleagues
- GE: On Cal-GETC Alignment and Shared Governance
- AB656: CSU granting more doctoral programs

- Chair Steffel's liaison report
- Reports from AVC Laura Massey and AVC Leslie Kennedy

d. ASCSU ASA Report (Van Selst)

    i. Ad hoc group exploring issues around the implementation of AB928 proactively – alignment between Cal-GETC and CSU GE breadth.

    ii. 11 meetings to date.

    iii. Not sure of the status of these off-cycle (unofficial) meetings – a place to engage in conversation around the issues rather than an official group. This needs to be clearer as this isn't part of the formal process of shared governance,

8. LUNCH (12:00)

9. Discussion items: [Chancellor's GEAC 2023-24 charge](#) (Dropbox GEAC main folder) (1:00)

    a. Resources: GEAC charge 2023-24, item #1, paragraph #2

    "Following board action to update relevant sections of Title 5 related to Educational Program and Admission Requirements, faculty will be engaged in implementation of a variety of changes related to Cal-GETC. For example, all Transfer Model Curricula (TMC) will need to be updated, and faculty advisors will need updated materials and training. What resources would GEAC recommend that the Chancellor's Office provide to universities to support implementation of these changes? Please provide this response by April 15, 2024."

    <u>Invited guest:</u>

    b. Interim AVC Laura Massa (time certain: 1:00) to answer three questions.

        i. We have heard that considerable resources have been set aside for the implementation of Cal-GETC on the CSU side (per Nathan's comment on 2/9/24). We are interested in the Chancellor's Office's plans in this area, and so we would like you to respond to the following questions:

- What are those resources?
  - Two types of resources. One is to address the technical aspects – technical consultant.

Another is to support faculty work to change curriculum which could cover several things. Set aside $2M across the system (independent of costs of technical support). Seeking GEAC input on what this would be spent on. Unit changes (e.g., lab course); adjustments to curriculum die to GE changes. Campus to decide on what to do with 'freed' units. TMC reviews based on changes.

- How will the resources be allocated; that is, which areas of the work (itemized) get what kind of support including exact $ figures?
    - Allocation metrics could include total u/g enrollment; number of majors; an average of these.
- What processes were followed to allocate those funds?
    - Nothing allocated yet but the budget department at the CO is doing that job.

ii. Ensuing *discussion*:
- Advising via DARS. Need for training on advising. Updating all the degree systems for DAR. Cost for this?
- Campus uniqueness and support for individual campuses.
- Use of 'freed' units by campus and seeking funding (e.g., first-year experience)? Central or campus funded? Could be funded centrally.
- Balancing faculty workload with compensation and time (on versus off contract). What is part of the 'normal' balance of work versus the additional new work to implement the changes?
- Autonomy to campuses assuming BOT decides on

unified GE pathway.

- Allocation process: who will be involved? Who decides? Base funded based on base cost of programs. Amount based on a funding model that goes to each campus and campus has autonomy over spending in implementation needs.
- Prioritize what work needs to be done.
- Does GEAC need to wait until a decision has been made and policy drafted before concretizing its recommendations? Concerns over timing of request from CO for recommendations on support needed – based on legislation there is no time constraint on the policy. Challenging getting changes done before summer even if policy out quickly – legacy of EO 1100 and implementing in summer when off contract that created mistrust. Need time to make an informed decision based on the crafted policy.
- Establishing best practices around how to use the 'freed' units (lower division). How autonomous will campuses be with respect to using the 'freed' units?
- Adding additional graduation requirements with these units and still retaining the 60-unit guarantee for ADTs is the TMC doesn't include these requirements.
- Content – who decides GE content? Discipline?
- Moving with ADT to program/concentration of choice. 52.8% of Fall 23 class earned an ADT. Of those, 28.7% transferred in didn't do so on their guaranteed pathway (with the ADT they came in with) and 24.1% on their guaranteed pathway.

iii. Suggestions from Van Selst:

- GEAC recommendations: 1) encourage CSU CO to ask leg for permission to allow ICAS recommendation for

7

ADT to be at 66 lower division units (+60 CSU units — > degree)...   2) FYE ... best practices, questions for a campus to ask....   3) programming support for GE eval as a priority.... 4) how to revisit ADTs with UC as a fuller partner re: content (2nd version of an ADT? How to accommodate different expectations and not harm students). 5) within campus course realignment (oral comm, English comp, crit thinking [& composition]).... and also curricular revisions re: campus or program responses to changed unit counts.

iv. The following was mentioned at the GEAC meeting on 1/16/24:

- Charging campus CIOs with determining the costs for reprogramming PeopleSoft.
- Compensating faculty for their time to make the changes and covering necessary costs for material changes and training on the changes.
- Convening the FDRGs and supporting their work with either stipends or reassigned time to check alignment of the TMCs with Cal-GETC.
- [Cal-GETC Administrative Implementation Guidance](#)

c. General *Education waivers*: GEAC Charge 2023-24, item #2"Please provide recommendations for both a policy and process for a campus to request waivers of GE course requirements for specific undergraduate programs."

i. [Report by the special committee](#) – proposal to be discussed and to be voted on.

ii. Discussion:

- Overview:
  - Need golden four to be admitted: some programs waived this requirement for admission but waived as part of degree content. Exemption was that you didn't have to do it all (i.e., not requirement to show covered

8

content).

- o Linked document above outlines recommendations to address as AB928 is implemented. Outlines steps to request and get waiver approved. Sets a timeline for recertification. Need a reset? If content in the program shows where that content is covered and assessed. Certified through a campus process. Exemptions off the table.
- Comment:
  - o Exemption versus exception differentiation, and waivers.
  - o GEAC's role in approval of a waiver? In past GEAC has asked if vetted at campus level; elected not to take a position; historically weighed in based on whether waivers granted for similar programs. Should be more than a 'rubber-stamp'. GEAC was asked to be more robustly involved in the decision-making process for waivers. CO will create a checklist of what processes the campuses had gone through to review waivers.
  - o Are there any areas of GE that should be off limits? Distinction between admission (transfer) versus any GE area regardless.
- Decision:
  - o Refer to sub-committee to address comments that have been raised.
  - o Agreed:
    - That audit/catalog review would be useful and do not allow exemptions. (M/S Van Selst/Wood – approved).
    - Articulate a review/recertification

process on a regular basis by GEAC for new waivers via a CO checklist = that campus requests for programs to modify GE processes or requirements (admission and/or content) are to be evaluated by GEAC and a recommendation made for system approval or non-approval (M/S Van Selst/Wood – approved).

- At graduation, every element of GE must be met by every student and assessed (no content exemptions) – transfer waiver for admission (M/S Van Selst/Wood – approved).
  - Transfer admission waivers for golden four content are acceptable. Content exemptions are prohibited —> all CSU graduates will have all elements of GE for every program.
  - Current "Exceptions"

10. New business (3:45)
    a. Van Selst: should we have another meeting post the BOT decision on Title V changes?
    b. Doodle Poll will be sent out for availability for another meeting to finalize language for Charge 1/b above.
11. Adjournment (4:00)

Invited guests:

Interim AVC Laura Massa

Standing guests:

Steffel, Beth   ASCSU, Chair
                                 bsteffel@calstate.edu
Kevin Kaatz   Chair, CSU GE Council

kevin.kaatz@csueastbay.edu

Inouye, Caron	CSU CO, Associate Dean, Academic Programs, Curriculum and Assessment cinouye@calstate.edu
Chapman, Quajuana	CSU CO, Assistant Director, General Education and Intersegmental Partnerships qchapman@calstate.edu
Marci Sanchez	CSU CO, Assistant Director Undergraduate Transfer Programs msanchez@calstate.edu
Raul Arambula	CCCCO, Dean, Educational Services rarambula@cccco.edu
Bob Quinn	CCCCO, Specialist, Educational Services and Support Division bquinn@cccco.edu

PC/ECS March 12, 2024