Minutes

Attendees: Eniko Csomay (Chair), Nancy Counts Gerber (Vice Chair), Mark Green, Gregory Wood, Gary Laver, Rick Ford, Elaine Newman, LaTonya Parker, Kate McCarthy, Jose Lozano, Michelle Plug, Dixie Samaniego, Caron Inouye (CSUCO)

Standing guests: Beth Steffel (ASCSU Chair), Mark Van Selst (ASCSU), Quajuana Chapman (CSUCO), Marci Sanchez (CSUCO), Bob Quinn (CCCCO), Raul Arambula (CCCCO),

Invited guests: History Council members – Bridget Ford/Lisa Tran

Action items are in bold

1. Call to order and roll call (11:02)
2. Chair’s welcome and introductory comments  
   a. Agenda updates: Chair Csomay had some changes to the agenda.
3. Overview and approval of Agenda - Agenda approved with some revisions by the Chair to speaker/item order
4. Future meetings  
   a. May 16 (modality = virtual)
5. Approval of January Minutes (Dropbox March/Minutes folder)  
   a. Minutes from January meeting approved with an edit to the report of the CSU AO.
6. Announcements - none
7. Segment reports of items relevant to GE  
   a. CCC System Office (Lowe)  
      i. AB 928 (Berman, 2021) – Cal-GETC  
         The legislation requires the creation of an Associate Degree for Transfer Intersegmental Implementation Committee and establish a singular lower division general education pathway (Cal-GETC).  
         • Task Force  
           o CCCs requirements  
      ii. Study Groups to address the 2023 legislated recommendations:  
         • GOALS: “Identifying annual goals for increasing transfer rates in California and closing racial equity gaps in transfer outcomes to be adopted by the state.”  
         • STEM: “Proposing a new unit threshold for STEM degree pathways that meet the requirements for admission to the California State University and the University of California.”  
         • REENGAGEMENT: “Reengaging ADT earners who do not transfer or apply for transfer into a four-year postsecondary educational institution.”
iii. **AB 928 (Berman, 2021) – ADT Auto-enroll**
- **Requires** the placement of students who declare a goal of transfer on their mandatory education plans on the ADT pathway if the student has not opted out, as specified, and if such a pathway exists for their intended major.
  - By August 1, 2024
  - Where ADTs for major pathways exist…shall place students on the ADT pathway if students declare a goal of transfer on their mandatory ed plans
  - Opt-outs: Students who are UC or Independent bound, or no ADT path exists for major, pursuing associate degree, or a BDP student
  - CCC Guidance in this area forthcoming

iv. **AB 1111: Common Course Numbering**
- **Requires** the California Community Colleges, by July 1, 2024, to adopt a common course numbering system for all general education requirement courses and transfer pathway courses, and require each community college campus.
  - A student-facing common course numbering (CCN) system across the California Community Colleges (CCC) on or before July 1, 2024, for GE and transfer pathway courses.
  - [Landscape Scan Report Now Available](#) to inform the implementation
  - Task Force Meeting #4 is April 27 and will continue to meet through 2023 with the objective to provide an implementation recommendation to the Chancellor’s Office. These are hybrid public meetings, all interested in this project are encouraged to attend.
  - A project [webpage](#) is available.

v. **Ethnic Studies Core Competencies**
- **Community** College system is in the process developing Ethnic Studies Core Competencies.
  - ASCCC is going to use a modified MCW process to vet the CCC core competencies.
  - CSU and UC have agreed to accept each other’s core competencies.
  - Advising colleges that if they use the CCC version they are for local requirements but if they want their ES course to transfer, they should use the CSU/UC competencies.
  (Ideally we would like all competencies to align but there is no agreement on that yet.)
vi. **AB 1705:**

- **Requires** a community college district or community college to maximize the probability that students will enter and complete transfer-level coursework in English and mathematics within a one-year timeframe of their initial attempt in the discipline, and for a student with a declared academic goal, that the transfer-level coursework satisfies the English and mathematics coursework requirements of the intended certificate or associate degree, or a requirement for transfer within the intended major, within a one-year timeframe of their initial attempt in the discipline.
  - Need for 4-year partners to align with their prerequisite requirements to support CCCs in implementing.
  - CPL: Hearing some CSU campuses are not allowing GE credit for veteran Joint Service Transcript (based in American Council of Education descriptors (ACE: [https://www.acenet.edu/Pages/default.aspx](https://www.acenet.edu/Pages/default.aspx)). CCCCO will gather additional details and report back.

vii. **Local priority admissions policies** and implications for CVC. CCCCO will gather additional details and report back.

- **Questions/Discussion following report:** The CCCCO update contains topics that relate to General Education and the CSU system. For each topic is a brief description and detail of subtopics that will be discussed.
  - Clarify what “re-engaging” with ADT students means: reaching out to students who have earned their ADTs but have not successfully transferred to a 4-year institution (i.e., didn’t apply or didn’t enroll) to find out why and to serve as resource for help.
  - Specify what “unlikely to succeed” means in context of AB 1705: no standards/definitions established and indicators are nuanced, but CCC is working on identifying strong predictive measures; refer to guidance (link provided in chat).
  - Re. JST (Joint Services Transcript) and some transfers who are veterans having difficulties getting GE credit at certain CSUs. CCC-CO is trying to get more info on which CSU campuses and what the problems are with issuing GE credit—may have to do with interpretation of revised Credit for Prior Learning policy.

b. **CCC Academic Senate (May as proxy for Parker)**

i. See the [report](https://example.com) from President May of ASCCC.

Discussion:

- CCC is looking at their own Title 5 CCC GE and aligning the Associate Degree GE requirements with Cal-GETC and addressing
questions re. what will happen to other GE patterns—goal is to be student-centered

- AS plenary is Apr. 20-22 and will be discussing many topics incl. academic freedom, culturally responsive curriculum, etc.
- **Transfer Alignment Project** has intersegmental participation and will be looking at Transfer Model Curricula and ADTs as they align to UC transfer pathways and involving discipline faculty for robust discussion of what students need within the major
- **Tracking** what happens to students after they transfer—do they stay in the ADT major (ADT guarantees transfer into a similar/same major in the CSU), use their AA degree instead to change their major, use ADT to fulfill GE; finding ways to make ADTs more valuable to the CSU.
- **Cal-GETC issues**—need to make sure CCCs have courses for smooth transfer.
- **Intersegmental Curriculum Workgroup**? has several subgroups focused on specific areas (e.g., STEM), which will have recommendations by the end of 2023.

c. **CCC AO (Plug)**—Questions/Discussion following report:
   i. CCC urging CSU to make lifelong learning a LD graduation requirement. Although it was discussed in ICAS as a possible UD requirement, this was not decided.

d. **CSU AO (Lozano)**
   i. Nothing much to report except ongoing conversations among AO’s re. AB 1111 and Cal-GETC, and keeping track of GE catalog rights (challenging and almost always requires manual intervention).

e. **CSU CO (Inouye/Chapman)**
   i. IAVC *Massa* has stepped into the position of Interim Associate Vice Chancellor of Academic and Faculty Programs and will serve in this position for the next year. Dr. Massa comes to the CO from Cal Poly Pomona, where she was Associate Vice President for Academic Programs, Accreditation Liaison Officer, and Professor of Psychology. Recruitment for the permanent position will launch in fall 2023. AVC Massa will join us in GEAC at 1 PM today.
   ii. Cambridge **International**. After the Jan. GEAC meeting, and after their “nudging” of some GEAC reps, the CO made it clear that:
      - **GEAC** has NO plans to discuss CI further this year;
      - CI may have an invitation to a 2023-4 GEAC meeting;
      - CI is encouraged to use the already authorized ACE National Guide (which includes 5 CI courses) when working with individual CSU campuses.
      - CI responded that:
         o Additional ACE recommended CI subjects have been/will be added to the National Guide
• Feedback they’re getting from individual campuses is that they want system-wide clarification/guidance on awarding credit
• Request: A request was made by Chair Csomay not to invite Cambridge International for the September meeting (maybe for November) and that they report on one specific question: Why are they not going through ACE with the courses they would like to propose?

**GE Review, IGETC and CIAC**

• Re. question on current process of review for IGETC: all segments have to agree, and for Cal-GETC, much work still needs to be done to determine how this will operate if there aren’t unified sets of core competencies, e.g., for Area F. The CCC-CO provided their perspective that
  o 4-year segments must unify core competencies as much as possible
  o Retaining a CSU breadth separate from Cal-GETC is against the spirit of AB 928
  o We need clarity on the message for CCC students
• Discussion re. guiding notes for GE course review and how they can be different from CSU specific review of GE
• Re. changes from IGETC that will be reflected in Cal-GETC guiding notes, most notably: oral communication, critical thinking, quantitative reasoning, written communication, and ethnic studies (ES in particular will need unified definitions for CSU and UC—currently, a course that meets either segment’s core competencies is approvable); additionally, the reduction in humanities/arts and social sciences prompts need to relook at how these courses are defined.

f. **CSSA (Samaniego)—Questions/Discussion following report:**
   CSSA just hosted its 28th annual CHESS (CA Higher Education Student Summit) and March plenary the first weekend of March at Sac State. We hosted over 200 CSU students and they were empowered to become change agents in advocating for an accessible, affordable, and quality system of public higher education for all Californians. CSSA is looking forward to having our April plenary on April 1st and 2nd on Zoom.
   i. Discussion:
      ii. Were there any topics intensively discussed? In March, legislative and systemwide student affairs focused on sending recommendations on student loan debt relief, menstrual equity, policy on student participation in governance to ensure student voice is included in conversations, mental health policy (what students really want from campus mental health services).
   iii. What is the student perspective/position on LDGE pathway and UDGE?
      Students aren’t typically included in discussions of academics and GE pathways. Focus should always be centered on student needs. Navigating GE should be made as easy and accessible as possible for students. Consider perspective of a 17-18 yo first-year student reluctant to reach out to an academic advisor for help but prefer to rely on online accessible resources to guide them.

 g. **CSU Academic Senate (Steffel)**
At our February meeting, ICAS (the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates) approved Cal-GETC, the singular lower division general education pattern for transfer into both the CSU and UC thus fulfilling our obligation as required by AB 928. ICAS has formed a special committee to develop the standards for Cal-GETC and will be having our first meeting in April. ICAS met with members of the legislature (including Assemblymember Marc Berman, author of AB 928) and the governor's office at the end of February to discuss our priorities of academic freedom and transfer including our progress on developing and implementing Cal-GETC as part of AB-928.

Discussion:

i. ICAS has approved Cal-GETC, special committee will be meeting first week in April

ii. Met with Mark Berman (author of bill), he was happy with the process

h. GE Review, IGETC and CIAC (PPT slides)

Re. question on current process of review for IGETC: all segments have to agree, and for Cal-GETC, much work still needs to be done to determine how this will operate if there aren’t unified sets of core competencies, e.g., for Area F. The CCC-CO provided their perspective that

i. 4-year segments must unify core competencies as much as possible

ii. Retaining a CSU breadth separate from Cal-GETC is against the spirit of AB 928

iii. We need clarity on the message for CCC students

Discussion re. guiding notes for GE course review and how they can be different from CSU specific review of GE

Re. changes from IGETC that will be reflected in Cal-GETC guiding notes, most notably: oral communication, critical thinking, quantitative reasoning, written communication, and ethnic studies (ES in particular will need unified definitions for CSU and UC—currently, a course that meets either segment’s core competencies is approvable); additionally, the reduction in humanities/arts and social sciences prompts need to relook at how these courses are defined.

8. JEDI Liaison Report (time certain 11:50 AM) — cancelled due to illness/written summary provided:

a. Discussed various campus impacts of the "enrollment cliff," which has particular implications from and for systemically marginalized students and faculty.

i. Particular enrollment drop-offs of students from systemically marginalized backgrounds

   • How does this crisis overlap with existing issues of Black and Native student enrollment issues
     o How do impending budget cuts related to the budget crisis disproportionately impact the availability of courses and other resources for students from systemically marginalized backgrounds?
     o How do impending budget cuts related to the budget crisis disproportionately impact the employment of lecturer
faculty, who are disproportionately from systemically marginalized backgrounds in comparison to TT faculty.
  o No resolution action at this time, continued discussion and monitoring.

ii. Support for the expansion of TT counselor lines
    • No resolution action at this time, continued discussion and monitoring.

iii. AB 2081 - Priority Registration for Caregivers
    • Continued discussion on resolution to urge expansion of “caregiver” category beyond students who are primary caregivers to minor children. It could be expanded to include students who are primary caregivers to elderly and/or disable family members, etc.
    • No resolution action at this time, but likely will introduce in Fall.

iv. Broader discussion of the systemic marginalization of ASCSU senators from systemically marginalized background (through silencing and removal).
    • Need to introduce and read aloud the interruption statement at beginning of all committee and plenary meetings
    • Need to systematically review the participation and interaction of ASCSU senators in meetings through analysis of meeting transcripts and video recordings.
    • Possible creation of a BIPOC caucus
    • No resolution action at this time, continued discussion and monitoring.

9. ***BREAK FOR LUNCH***

10. Report/Presentation form CSU History Council (Bridget Ford/Lisa Tran), time certain 1:00 PM
    a. Written summaries provided to committee—History Council brief
    b. Questions presented to History Council
       i. What is different about our (CSU) AI courses (e.g., in History) from what is offered in the high school curriculum (e.g., through their History courses)? What additional knowledge, or skills, do students gain through our courses?
       ii. What would be the ramifications of requiring each campus to develop upper division (UD) American Institution Requirement (AIR) courses to support transfer students who did not complete them in the lower division?
       iii. In relation to #2, would it be worth mandating the existence of an upper division GE double count option for those majors that otherwise would not meet (and would not have to meet) AI requirements per CSU policy (see policy below)?
       v. Questions/Discussion:
       vi. Clarification provided to history council (prompts 2 and 3 misunderstood, use of “required” caused confusion): Goal is not to move AI to the UD but to encourage AI as an UD requirement for transfers who haven’t fulfilled AI in
the LD (backstory: authors of SB 1440 didn’t realize AI was NOT in GE); if AI is required as an “overlay” option with GE, then it remains as a grad requirement that doesn’t get waived for high unit majors.

vii. The council was thanked for their thorough and thoughtful responses to the questions asked of them.

viii. One member of the history council was called out for unprofessional outreach to the student representative, contacting the student on their personal student email account rather than their work CSSA account and calling for a one-one meeting during the student’s finals week. The Chair of GEAC should be the first line of contact.

ix. The student surveys/quantitative analyses of student outcomes have not extended beyond CSU history courses (e.g., political science), so it’s unclear how repetitive the curriculum of non-history AI courses is with that of high school.

x. More b/g provided on the charge of GEAC as an advisory committee to the CSU-CO. Although there’s no mandate only recommendations on implementation, just the discussion is causing speculation/rumor and perceived threat. Suggestion for clearer communication on the goals/charge of GEAC to stakeholders.

xi. Discussion about the variety of ways in which AI is implemented at each campus (e.g., 3- or 6-unit requirement, double-counted with GE or not or which area of GE), with suggestion that GEAC should tackle this issue.

xii. Back to the motivation for questions 2/3 posed to the History Council. Because AI can be waived for high unit majors, we must acknowledge that some proportion of our transfer students in high unit majors may not be able to complete and will have it waived. So, should we require an overlay within UDGE that will fulfill the AI requirement?

xiii. CCC: students ARE encouraged to complete AI prior to transfer.

xiv. Issue of articulation and “inheritance” of GE attributes was discussed briefly

11. CO charge discussion (1:30) (Dropbox GEAC Main folder)
   a. American Institution
      i. Reflections on HC presentation
      iii. Issues with UD AIR (Inouye)
   b. Upper Division GE (Massa)
      i. Inquires about progress GEAC has made in recommendations for UDGE
      ii. Points out that regardless of what happens to LDGE, any changes have to be brought to the BOT, and if there is motivation to change UDGE, then now is the time to do it.
      iii. Emphasizes that student success should certainly be at center of discussion re. UDGE. Asks if UDGE should stay as is? Should all 9 units go back to campuses, or 3 units, 6 units, perhaps to implement capstone course(s), first-year success course(s)?
iv. Argument for retaining CSU breadth: Once Cal-GETC implemented, CSU breadth may provide an easy pathway for transfer due to its more permissive grading requirements for those students unable to complete Cal-GETC and transfer in with < 30 units.

v. Chico, Sonoma would be upset if Cal-GETC becomes singular LDGE pathway.

vi. UDGE not perceived by GEAC as a “problem that needs to be fixed.”

vii. Massa encourages ideas on how to change UDGE if change is warranted/justified.

12. Follow-up
   a. AP credit
      i. Math – Pre-calculus was approved by Math Council (on January 27, 2023) and APEP resolution is coming about “The Math Council recommends that campuses accept the AP Precalculus exam for the appropriate campus precalculus course(s) and for GE area B4 credit, awarding a minimum of 3 units for a score of 3 or higher.” Vote is needed.
      ii. African American Studies – AP African American Studies still under discussion by Ethnic Studies Council. GEAC discussion and recommendation will be decided at May meeting. “Can/would they count as Area C or D if not eligible for Area F. OR no system-wide GE credit” (Discussion lead by Associate Dean, Inouye) Vote is needed when ready.

13. Information item: Cal-GETC and Life-long Learning – unsolicited feedback from CCs and feedback on where things stand re: Cal-GETC (2:50)

14. Guiding notes Updates
   a. Request by GEAC to provide summary of what was presented, including specific areas that GEAC should focus on, including AI, in the Guiding Notes; Quajuana will point out the areas for GEAC to focus on, primarily the subject areas for GE and the tables that we have ability to make stronger (which include subject area expectations).
   b. GEAC should engage History Council and ES Council re. US-1.
   c. B/G: GEAC had decided last year to play bigger role in providing feedback on this document, so this is why we’re being asked to do so this year.
   d. Suggestion to make distinction between aligning language in guiding notes with Cal-GETC language—need to be clear about the distinctions so as not to cause knee-jerk negative reactions.
   e. Argument against aligning CSU GE breadth with Cal-GETC is the difference in admission requirements between UC and CSU, and CSU GE breadth would offer an avenue to those transfer students who don’t meet those minima for Cal-GETC (brought up again in this context).
   f. Will catalog rights change for, e.g., UC students transferring in to CCC or CSU? Try to be as accommodating as we can for transfer students, but this scenario is a small
subset of transfers. Catalog rights will be addressed and included in changes to Title 5.

15. New Business – none

16. Adjournment (3:40)

**Invited guests:**
Lisa Tran  
History Council  
lisatran@fullerton.edu

Bridget Ford  
History Council  
bridget.ford@csueastbay.edu

Laura Massa  
Interim Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic and Faculty Programs  
lmassa@calstate.edu

**Standing guests:**
Steffel, Beth  
ASCSU, Chair  
bsteffel@calstate.edu

Mark Van Selst  
ASCSU, Secretary, Former GEAC Chair  
mark.vanselst@sjsu.edu

Dana Nakano  
ASCSU, JEDI liaison  
dnakano@csustan.edu

Chapman, Quajuana  
CSU CO, Assistant Director, General Education and Intersegmental Partnerships  
quchapman@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