

GEAC MEETING

Nov. 3, 2015

Call to order at 11 am.

Present: Members: Chair Bill Eadie, Vice-Chair Mary Ann Creadon, Barry Pasternak, Catherine Nelson, Susan Gubernat, Virginia May [for John Stanskas], Joseph Bielanski, Mark Wheeler, Terri Eden, Mark Van Selst, Ken O'Donnell, Elizabeth Adams, Sean Walker, Jeff Spano, Jason Colombini. Guests: Steven Filling, Christine Miller, Debra David, Denise Fleming

Approval of agenda for meeting of 11/3/15 and minutes of 9/1/15

- Agenda: Approved.
- Minutes of Sept. 1, 2015: Approved.

Introduction of members and guests

Liberal Learning Partnerships

- Debra David reported that the Compass Report has been receiving much positive publicity and response. They are working now on proficiency initiatives through the AAC&U sponsored Faculty Collaboratives Project. This project is a ten-state initiative with, here in California, 10 CSU and 4 CC members, who are working with different existing proficiency initiatives (e.g., the WICHE initiative, Lumina Foundation work, Degree Qualifications Profile) to develop proposals to increase proficiency at individual campuses.
- Debra announced that she will no longer be the Passport representative.
- Questions arose about the involvement of the CSU in WICHE in particular, and the extent to which our participation in these initiatives lends weight to the projects.
- Debra said that ours is not a buy-in effort, but only an educational and informational resource for WICHE and for us.
- Responses came from committee members who testified to the value of the involvement on their campus of some of these initiatives.

- Upon questioning, Debra said this hub of proficiency initiatives has funding right now through September 2016, but the intention is to keep the hub going and so figure out how to do that, and under whose aegis it will be maintained (e.g., AAC&U, or the Chancellor's Office, or under the ASCSU). Debra said she would prefer it was under the ASCSU because it is a faculty project.
- Chair Eadie said we will check up on this again and see where it is going and who will take over the hub.

Critical Thinking Standards in Interstate Passport

- Mark Van Selst discussed the critical thinking outcomes developed by Interstate Passport, saying that in California these outcomes don't exactly fit our critical thinking outcomes, though they do fit the AAC&U rubric. WICHE has not yet figured out how to know if, or communicate how, the student achieved the skills of the outcomes, and scalability is a problem.
- Ken O'Donnell said that many campuses are interested in how to determine that a student has achieved critical thinking skills, so the guidelines are useful.
- Barry Pasternak worried that campuses with engineering programs in particular, which have removed critical thinking courses from the GE requirements, and have second language learners, will have a particularly difficult time determining the success of these outcomes and the ability to communicate them.
- Susan Gubernat expressed a concern about scalability, and the tendency towards standardization and homogeneity that it encourages. Outcomes should be local and based on what a campus needs and has available to it. Even this document, not meant as policy, suggests the advisability of homogeneity of standards, and drills fairly far down to specifics.
- Catherine Nelson noted that this was the second discussion of this meeting about proficiency standards, and the implied sense that proficiency standards matter more than taking a course. K-12 shows the

- problem with this, where they have become accustomed to “teach to the test.”
- Ken O’Donnell agreed that K-12 damaged themselves with much of the business about testing, but that this document accounts for nuance and is not designed toward teaching to the test.

Statway, Math Council

- Ken O’Donnell explained the import of the memo from the Chancellor’s office extending the statistics pilots, whether through Statway or the California Acceleration Project. Now the question is how to keep algebra competence in the requirements, and what should be the floor. Forming the group to determine that was the ASCSU’s job; extending the pilot through the memo was his job.
- Terri Eden expressed some confusion about the “statistics pathways” identified in the CO document, and what would be the consequences for the C-ID courses that have been approved for Associate Degree for Transfer. Mark Van Selst agreed, saying that adding in CAP or Statway may break the legislative mandate against additional units. Ken O’Donnell noted that these pilots and courses are only for GE, not for a major, but advisors and students will have to look out for their major requirement units.
- Mary Ann Creadon and Catherine Nelson reported on the discussion of Statway at the Math Council meeting they attended in October, noting that some on the Council still expressed strong opposition to Statway and the diminishment of algebra it allows. Math Council members were encouraged to participate in the Task Force being organized by ASCSU.
- Steven Filling reported that because of some troubling responses from the Chancellor’s office about consultation in determining general education standards for quantitative reasoning, the ASCSU is first having a discussion with the CO about faculty governance of curriculum before the Task Force is instantiated.

- Ken O'Donnell suggested that the troubling language may have come from him as he tried to open the quantitative reasoning standards discussion to other constituents, although the CSU should have the final word on GE standards.
- Catherine Nelson and Susan Gubernat expressed concern about the CO response because it did not clearly indicate that CSU faculty are in a leadership position.
- Virginia May indicated serious concerns about CAP and Statway, suggesting that if the standards are being altered by the inclusion of these pathways, we should be open about that fact.

CSU Institute for Teaching and Learning

- Ken O'Donnell reported in place of Emily Magruder. He said her position is different from her predecessors because it is a long-term position that allows her to look at long-term issues such as assessment. They are now casting around for themes for their spring meeting.

Report on Pilots: SBCC, Online Oral Communication

- Ken O'Donnell reminded the group that a few years ago we allowed the testing out by faculty of online oral communication courses. Three CC faculty responded, and now there are four or five CC campuses doing such courses. It now looks as though we will accept, with standards, online oral communication courses.
- Susan Gubernat said that before approval is given, we should receive more advice from the discipline. Here is where a discipline council for Communication would be good, so they can talk to each other about this, and offer advice.
- Christine Miller worried that allowing more campuses to do these pilots implies approval before we have had full advice and consultation. She remembers GEAC specifically wanting this to be a very limited pilot.

- Discussion ensued that reminded people that what has been accepted is the possibility of more proposals.
- Virginia May asked how the pilot works so that when it is documented for transfer, the articulation officers know that it was an online course. Chair Eadie said he thought the online courses were not to be allowed for transfer, and Ken O'Donnell said that articulation officers were good about this fact, but don't always know, particularly if a course is taken out-of-state.
- Ken O'Donnell said that there will be an upcoming conference call about the pilots with representatives from GEAC, the discipline, and the participating faculty.
- The other oral communication pilot was part of a proposal by SBCC to modify the transfer curriculum by keeping a cohort together for two years and dispersing the oral communication requirements among other coursework for this cohort. A Communication faculty member would spot-visit those classes to see how the requirements were being met, and they would look at data for retention, also. The faculty member doing the visits was not happy with the caliber of speeches given, so Ken is going to take down that pilot from our web page.
- Susan Gubernat expressed concern about the dispersal of disciplinary content for GE, and our need to honor disciplinary expertise in GE areas.
- Jeff Spano commended GEAC for being willing to give this pilot a chance and allowing the SBCC faculty to come to their own conclusion about its efficacy.

Upper Division GE, Online Courses, and Transfer

- Sean Walker said that Senate Chairs are concerned about the transfer of upper division GE within the CSU. This will be more of a problem with the CC baccalaureate programs emerging. CourseMatch makes this problematic, also. Because upper division GE transfer is infrequent, there is little machinery for evaluation.

- Terri Eden said that articulation officers are involved with CourseMatch, however.
- Steven Filling said that lower division GE articulation has slowly migrated to upper division, and we should watch out for this.
- Catherine Nelson said that AA will prepare a resolution on this, urging campuses to develop policies for upper division GE transfer, with faculty in charge of developing these policies.
- Virginia May said that resolutions proposing what upper division GE is for CC will come up this week at CC Senate. Ideas include 6 units, including two courses remote from the major, and one idea suggested requiring written and/or oral communication requirements in the courses.
- Discussion ensued about a division between the CO, which wants to make transferability easy, and the Senate, which wants upper division GE be campus specific.
- Further discussion included remarks about online courses and transferability of CourseMatch, since those courses are considered the equivalent of in-residence courses. One could take all CourseMatch courses and fulfill upper division GE from another or other campuses.
- Elizabeth Adams suggested that online courses for lower division GE from other parts of the country are a bigger problem and need to be watched, because they are not rigorous courses in many cases.
- Catherine Nelson said that insuring the integrity of the articulation process is vital.
- Terri Eden said there is a need to identify the areas of upper division learning, and make clear what we want to take place in upper division GE.
- All expressed interest in what the CC Senate resolution about upper division GE would ultimately be.

Humanities and Skills Based Courses in Logic, First-Year Language

- Representatives from Mt. San Antonio College and Moorpark College participated via phone.
- Ken O'Donnell said that in the humanities we expect a certain kind of learning that is sense-making: taking disparate sources and pulling them together to discover and articulate meaning. Thus, we've said certain courses don't belong in humanities: logic never, and the first semester of foreign language generally, don't count for humanities GE. Bob Stewart from Mt. San Antonio objected to what they perceived as unfair treatment of ASL courses, and Matthew Morgan from Moorpark said the CSU is unclear about logic and its place in the humanities.
- Discussion ensued about the teaching of logic with pop culture examples, which contextualizes the logic, and whether, if a textbook were created that used such examples, the course could count for humanities.
- The question of whether or not the course could double count for Area A and for humanities came up, or if the course could count only in one area.
- Bob Stewart from Mt. San Antonio College was surprised that there was a decision to reverse the approved articulation of ASL, since it meets the criteria for GE humanities, as the course requires a sympathetic response evoked toward the culture. As the course is taught by him, it is an immersion experience (they don't talk during class, e.g.).
- Ken O'Donnell said that the specific request to our committee is whether or not we will accept the Moorpark logic course which uses a specific textbook that contextualizes the skills in pop culture examples, and if we will accept the Mt. San Antonio ASL course for GE humanities.

- Catherine Nelson suggested that the question for the committee is framed analogously to the Statway issue: is there enough humanities substance in these courses?
- Some members expressed hesitancy about their competence in reviewing a textbook, or their expertise about the humanities content in an ASL course.
- Ken O'Donnell said that perhaps we should strike a categorical denial of logic from the guiding notes, but say it is very difficult to give logic humanities content. As for ASL, contemporary language study suggests that all language is learned in context, so that some language courses might meet GE humanities content. His sense is that the preponderant opinion of the group is that we don't need to categorically deny approval for such courses. We should therefore come up with language that says that such proposals might be accepted.

Other Items, Open Forum

- Terri Eden said, looking at CLEP exams and ACE recommendations, there is a discrepancy in our coded memo for units allowed for the second level of language, particularly a discrepancy with regard to recent changes made by ACE. There is another discrepancy with units allowed for calculus. We should review such discrepancies.
- Ken O'Donnell said we could review these at a future meeting. Unit counts have always looked high, so if ACE is reducing units allowed, we can revisit this. We should ask language faculty what they think about this.
- Susan Gubernat asked about reviewing ambiguities in the guiding notes, and Ken O'Donnell said he would share revisions with the committee.

- Mark Van Selst asked if the campuses could be asked about the uniqueness of upper division GE on their campuses such that transferability does not work.
- Ken O'Donnell said he wasn't sure the CO will want to ask about what *doesn't* transfer, and Susan Gubernat asked if a campus would be punished if it asserted that its GE was unique and not amenable for articulation.
- Sean Walker suggested that perhaps we could frame a request to campuses positively, asking them "what is unique about your GE?" Then it would not be in danger of being subject to punishment.

The meeting was adjourned at 5 pm.