

## General Education Advisory Committee

Minutes

September 13, 2016

11-4 Anacapa Room, CSU Office of the Chancellor

**Present:** Mary Ann Creadon (chair), Mark Van Selst (vice), Bill Eadie, Steven Filling, Denise Fleming, Michelle Hawley, Ceci Herman [videoconference], Chris Mallon, Virginia May, Ken O'Donnell [videoconference], Barry Pasternack, Paula Selvester, Tiffany Tran, Jodie Ullman

**Absent:** Jackie Escajeda, Susan Gubernat, Pam Walker

**Guests:** Kate Stevenson, Catherine Nelson, Chris Miller, Emily Magruder, Pamela Kerouac

1. Approval of Agenda
  - a. Approved as amended
2. Review of Prior Minutes
  - a. Incorporated review into next item
3. Committee Charge and Review of Annual Report
  - a. No discussion
4. CSU Institute for Teaching and Learning
  - a. ITL summer institute (July 12-14, 2016)
  - b. Faculty Forum (Oct)
  - c. 19<sup>th</sup> annual teaching and learning symposia (Oct 21-22, 2016 at SJSU)
5. Advanced Placement Tests (Pam Kerouac)
  - a. AP Capstone
    - i. Memo (2015) has credit awarded, no GE area
  - b. AP Research
    - i. Memo (2015) currently has no recommendation, we need more information to see what the course entails.
  - c. AP computer science principles
6. CSU CO actions and updates
  - a. Coded memo on GE (August 2016)
    - i. The intention was to develop an overview of GE as implemented on each campus and to provide a system-level overview of GE.
      1. Campus compliance to system policies
        - a. Historically there is not a system-policy monitor, the intent is to have campuses self-evaluate
      2. Differences across campuses (unique campus requirements) and other features might be represented on an (ideally singular) table of requirements (i.e., an internal summary document)
    - ii. The coded memorandum itself is a summary of GE policies
  - b. Transfer concerns have emerged as a concern for the legislature
    - i. e.g., ACR 158 (March 29, 2016) on transfer and GE

7. The problem of CSU Golden Four credit requiring a C (vs C-) Grading.
  - a. Reporting out on Sept 13, 2016 meeting (*Ullman, Van Selst, Creadon, Mallon*)
  - b. Identified primary issues
    - i. Difference in perspective between C vs C- (and on what a C vs C- means on campuses where those grades “count” for GE credit vs. those where they do not).
    - ii. CSU CO memo (no ASCSU consultation) moved the minima from a C to a C- despite campus policies to the contrary.
  - c. Possible proposal being considered.
    - i. Disallow C- grading in Golden four
      1. Technology difficulties, does not address transfer expectations
      2. Does ensure a “system” standard (C vs C- whatever those terms/grades mean)
    - ii. **Modified course-to-course articulation (explicit adoption rather than area by area which is the current EO1100 content).**
      1. Would only ‘count’ for GE if counted at the institution where the course was taken (a campus *could* chose to accept a lessor value if they accept C- on their own campus).
      2. No grade of less that a C- could count for GE credit
      3. A grade of “Credit” could count for Golden Four
    - iii. **Defining what a “C” versus a “C-“ really means. Defining what these terms mean (grading is contextual).**
    - iv. **GEAC (re)-endorse C minima for Golden Four.**
    - v. Summary: the priority items are to produce separate ASCSU resolutions on (ii) and (iv) as suggested first reading items for the September plenary.
8. Quantitative Reasoning Task Force Report (*Stevenson, Filling, Fleming, Van Selst*)
  - a. Equity is achieved through balancing opportunity and access
  - b. The consensus statement that is the task force report recommends several interconnected support experiences around mathematics and quantitative reasoning across a students’ educational pathway – this takes us away from having a single course provide the possible entirety of a students quantitative reasoning experience. The issue of “streaming” (‘ruts’ in mathematical learning pathways) versus flexible options.
  - c. One of the critical questions was what is required for foundational reasoning at entry to the CSU (2c, p14) “Demonstrated proficiency and fluency in the combined skills found in the California State Standards for K–8, Algebra 1, and Integrated Math 1;
    - i. Practiced the skills in the K-12 California State Standards for Mathematics in a variety of contexts that broaden, deepen or extend K-8, Algebra 1 and Integrated Math 1 skills;
    - ii. Developed the eight Common Core mathematical practices, which

- are the abilities
- iii. Make sense of problems and persevere in solving them Reason abstractly and quantitatively
- iv. Construct viable arguments and critique the reasoning of others
- v. Model with mathematics
- vi. Use appropriate tools strategically
- vii. Attend to precision
- viii. Look for and make use of structure
- ix. Look for and express regularity in repeated reasoning.
- d. The four core recommendations are:
  - i. *Recommendation I*: Formulate an updated quantitative reasoning definition based on CSU best practices and reflecting national standards.
  - ii. *Recommendation II*: Revise CSU quantitative reasoning requirements and adopt equitable, feasible requirements that articulate with the other segments.
  - iii. *Recommendation III*: Ensure equitable access and opportunity to all CSU students.
  - iv. *Recommendation IV*: Create a CSU “Center for Advancement of Instruction in Quantitative Reasoning”
- e. GE actions to follow are:
  - i. Revise GE expectations statement on QR on Executive Order and GE Guiding notes in line with QRTF report (presuming implementation).
  - ii. Capstone expectations re: QR (UD GE?)
  - iii. What is the interface with SB1440 and within the CSU for those majors that require intermediate algebra (or other QR competencies)? [extends beyond GE but will have an impact on default preparation for major programs that GE will want to ensure are disaggregated from the GE preparation]
  - iv. “That GEAC appreciates and acknowledge the work of the Quantitative Reasoning Task Force – in particular its recommendations concerning modernizing and updating Quantitative Reasoning expectations for the CSU, especially as they are likely to impact General Education” (approved unanimously)

9. Other

- a. C-ID statistics
  - i. Changing prerequisite from intermediate algebra to “that prep required by GE”
- b. Discuss the impact of QRTF Task-Force on Statway / CAPP outcome expectations. Possible future dissemination of QRTF report to pilot project sponsors and participants.
- c. Upper Division GE
  - i. Capstone elements? (Oral Communication, Quantitative, writing, etc.) – in major? Thematic capstones?

ii. Definitions

1. It was noted that CCC degree development would find this useful.

10. ACTIONS:

- a. October symposia report
- b. AP information
- c. GE survey (aug memo)
- d. C/C- resolution feedback
- e. Quantitative Reasoning Task Force -related actions
  - i. EO 1100 / CSU GE Guiding notes / etc. revision
- f. Upper Division General Education discussion
- g. Oral communication
  - i. Expectations for online oral communication (what to expect)
  - ii. What to look for in reviewing fully online oral communication
- h. C-ID statistics and SB1440 effects update