

DRAFT MINUTES

Chancellor's General Education Advisory Committee

Tuesday, September 15th 2020

11:00 am – 4:00 pm

Zoom Meeting

Minutes

Attendees: Mark Van Selst, Eniko Csomay, Kevin Baaske, David Barsky, Julie Glass, Gary Lever, Susan Schlievert, Stephen Stambough, Michelle Bean, Regina Eisenbach, Jenni Robinson, Graciela Moran, Leonor Aguilera, Raul Arambula, Melissa Lavitt

Visitors: Quajuana Chapman (CSUCO), Robert Collins (ASCSU Chair), Karen Simpson-Alisca (CSUCO)

The meeting began at 11:07 am

1. Introductions
 - a. Membership
 - b. Invited statements of background and interest in GE
2. The agenda was approved as posted.
3. The minutes of May, 4th 2020 were approved (continuing members).
4. Chair's welcome and introductory comments
 - a. Possible new meeting in October was proposed to discuss the criteria to be used by Community Colleges in relation to deadlines for the Ethnic Studies courses, and the timeline in order to have courses in the catalog.
 - b. NEW GEAC meeting focused on ethnic studies implementation for GE:
October 6, 11am to 1pm**
5. Acceptance of the 2019-20 Annual Report (GEAC) was postponed to after lunch.
 - a. Annual report was approved as posted.
6. Chancellor's Charge to the Committee
 - a. Ethnic studies
 - i. provide feedback, as requested by CSUCO staff, on the revisions to the executive order on CSU General Education Breadth as a result of the recently published Section 89032 of the Education Code.
 - b. Guiding notes
 - i. to provide annual review of the CSU GE Reviewers Guiding Notes
 - c. EO 1036 (System-wide Credit by Evaluation)
 - i. to provide feedback on the upcoming revisions to EO 1036 (Systemwide Credit by Evaluation) as it relates to general education.
7. Review of Items from the 2019-20 Annual Report
8. Segment Reports of items relevant to GE
 - a. CCC system office report (Raul Arambula)

- i. Credit for prior learning
 - 1. implementation
 - 2. guidance memo went out on how to implement Title 5; discussions are still there on how it would be transcribed.
 - a. This is going to be a complex and continuing issue re: pass-through articulation, etc.
 - ii. Competency based education
 - 1. Title 5 regulations - First meeting next week on questions such as what would be taught, what the faculty are expected to do; a couple of pilots were mentioned as well as issues with high stakes testing and equity.
 - iii. Both (i) and (ii) will be big issues for the next couple of years.
- b. CCC Articulation Officer Report (Leonor Aguilera)
- i. Report centered around Ethnic Studies discussions.
 - 1. To assist with course development guidance AOs / CCC is requesting information expeditiously. Specific items include:
 - a. location within the GE structure,
 - b. timelines for submissions,
 - c. availability of the learning outcomes/requirements the course will be asked to meet.

Discussion included concerns related to ADT implementation (not to go over 60 units) and Title 5 / EO / Guiding Notes language as well as possible impacts or parallels to American Institutions.

- 2. Title 5 language will change slightly because a brand new area of GE – area F – will exist. Lower division area D reduced to 6 units from 9; a new area (Area F) is created where the 3 units of the new requirement will be met.
 - 3. The impact on the review process is manifold
 - a. The new (or reformatted) courses need to be evaluated
 - b. Downstream there will likely be movement of courses from area D to other GE areas (C, E in particular)
 - c. For many students 6 units of area D is used for American Institutions.
 - 4. It was noted that the existence of AI as an overlay means much more flexibility in where the requirement can be met.
 - 5. AI is not GE but it is an overlay and so GEAC is sometimes asked to discuss AI.
 - 6. The interface ethnic studies/Area F and Associate Degrees for transfer were discussed but noted as touching heavily into areas outside of scope for GEAC.
- c. CCC Academic Senate (Michelle Bean) (in dropbox)

- i. In addition to other content in the distributed summary report the majority of the presentation focused on guided pathways and transfers
 - 1. Additional info is requested on Credit for Prior Learning and Competency-based Education; Questions were raised re: associated to system-level concerns claiming that if systemically approved for GE, it should be going through the GE approval processes rather than relying on campus-based one-off substitutions.
 - 2. Guided pathways -- aligning to the ADTs to giving options to the students (in order not to waste time and units). Guided Pathways still provide flexibility for student exploration.
 - 3. When a student comes in (at least locally) with an ADT, campuses assume you have met GE already and they do not look for it because that is what the ADT is about. There is a continuing concern that some campuses are awarding ADTs based on IGETC without meeting CSU requirements (which they should not be doing).

Action: “mis-awarding” of ADTs referred to APEP for further discussion.

- 4. Credit for prior learning via California Virtual Campus – Online Education Initiative (CVC-OEI) was discussed.
- ii. CCC efforts towards achieving greater diversification of the faculty
- iii. Link to e-publication on Black colleagues addressing curricular trauma and other relevant issues for our time (see dropbox for article)

d. CSU office of the Chancellor (Melissa Lavitt)

i. Ethnic Studies

Discussion:

- 1. The timeline concerns are noted
- 2. Concerns about impact on ADTs will continue to be play a role
- 3. There will be interplay between Title 5, a forthcoming EO, and the Guiding Notes (a specific question addressed where the learning outcomes will be defined – in an executive order, as a stand-alone separate entity, or in the guiding notes).
- 4. CSU CO is likely to adopt without editing the ES Council/ASCSU recommendation
- 5. On the content of the requirement it was noted that the learning outcomes distributed by the CSU council appears to closely follow (but is not identical to) the previously recommended ASCSU learning outcomes. The content questioned will be addressed in the SEPT 16 meeting of the Academic Affairs (ASCSU) committee and the ASCSU plenary on SEPT 17/18.

ii. Credit for Prior Learning

1. EO1036 groundwork for accepting credits outside of CSUs – including military credits. CSU gives credit for CPL already.

Discussion:

- iii. The new community college rules require that any learning that has been assessed must appear on the transcript as a course. Consequently, the CSU may not be awarding the credit but we are being asked to accept what is already there and has received credit previously. Existing executive orders address many of these issues but will need to be revisited. The systemic awarding of GE credit is an issue for GEAC.

Discussion:

1. WASC rethinking 3-unit frame – showing evidence whether the students learnt what they were supposed to. Changes based on revisions from federal government
2. Transcribed course as it relates to credit for prior learning, etc. Generic course number with course name (variable topics) cf., “generic” course numbers used for study-abroad credit that don’t have a local campus equivalent. These are not appropriate for CPL designation.
3. There are tracking issue related to pass-through articulation as a now-transcribed course could yield duplication of credit for the original basis of the to-be-transcribed course.

iv. Competency-based Education

1. Education programs do it already Statewide; idea is to show us what you know rather than you showing how much time you spent in the classroom (which may not lead to competency in the area)
 - a. Military language training aim to see whether functional enough as a speaker rather than a high stakes exam

e. California State Student Association

- i. Ethnic Studies will have its meeting the weekend of 9/19-20; more information to come on GEAC’s October 6th meeting

LUNCH 12 noon – 1 pm

9. GE course review

a. Overview + Q & A

- i. Articulation officers to walk us through what the process is for submitting courses and perhaps a way to appeal
 1. Questions were raised as to where the disciplinary expertise come in in the process
 2. Questions around the timeline was discussed. A request was communicated to review courses that already exist in CCCs to meet area F learning outcomes asap

- b. year 1 report on special appeals (incl. timeline)
 - i. CO was tasked to develop a re-review process for CC courses – the process already exists. Main problem is with the timeline as UC is involved and they have a different timeline; a resubmission process was developed however for courses that required no disciplinary expertise involvement (e.g., lab manual was missing, credit hours were incorrect). In these instances, the timeline worked very well.
10. GE Guiding Notes (in line with Title 5) (Guiding notes Melissa and UC but also GEAC)
- a. Revisions addressing formatting? Q & A
 - i. Possible format to ‘require/recommend’ / to re-organize, re-format to make it more accessible for reviewers.

Discussion:

- ii. Questions around what is required and what is recommended listed in the GN were discussed.
 - iii. Recommend/required will highlight what is required and not just recommended
 - iv. Campus GE criteria can add to CSU GE requirements — often useful on a campus but CSU campus may require elements not in the guiding notes.
 - v. Guiding notes are underspecified in some areas such as the definition or litmus test for inclusion in the social & behavioral science cluster as well as the learning outcomes / goals associated with the laboratory component of area B.
 - vi. CSU GE / IGETC alignment will need to be examined further given the changes to CSU GE;
 - vii. Fear of going into curriculum too far... that’s a faculty prerogative (and thus the usual referral to APEP re: credit by exam lists for ASCSU approval, etc.)
- b. Next Generation Science Standards (update?)/Math Standards
 - i. Math Council’s take: Providing examples articulating a vision what a QR course could be would help that but it is missing from the Guiding Notes
 - ii. Next Generation Science Standards – Is it integrated into the Guiding Notes?
 - c. Role (may foreshadow Ethnic Studies)

Action: Rethink what the task is and have a better formulated ‘ask’.

11. Testing/External credit awards
- a. SAT/ACT lawsuits highlight importance of disability accommodations. COVID modification.
12. Ethnic Studies requirement (impact re: GE and the role of GEAC)
- a. Area F

- b. CSU implementation timeline (CCC submission, EO language, Guiding Notes, Review of submissions)

Discussion:

- i. Effect of ES and area D on Area C
- ii. Potential of Area F containing either lower or upper division
 - 1. Concerns re: associate degrees for transfer
- iii. Effect of 3-unit reduction in area D on pressure for American Institutions to supplant other area D coursework and/or pressure for area F also meet AI requirements.
- iv. A discussion about the possible cross-listing of area F courses was mentioned (per Senate Chair's meeting last week) but this would seem to produce a de facto veto on content that is antithetical to GE and normal curricular processes. Determined to be outside the scope of GEAC.
- v. Considered possible intersections between existing campus diversity requirements and area F. Determined to be outside the scope of GEAC.
- vi. Learning outcomes may be available soon

13. Other items (time dependent)

- a. Referral re: teaching of ESL vis-à-vis GE review and approval
 - i. Look at the review process and the format of the course
 - ii. The courses are not ESL courses – they may be, for example, in GE area critical thinking but targeted to the ESL population; they are regular courses but with teaching methods matching the needs of the ESL population
- b. How are freshmen being oriented to GE given COVID/online experience?
- c. Updates on Quantitative Reasoning (advising) [cf., Just Equations Sept 17]
 - i. Advising is extremely important; relationship between advising/orientation and ability

14. We adjourned at 3:30 pm.

EC/MVS SEPT 17, 2020