

---

## Chancellor's General Education Advisory Committee

Tuesday, November 2, 2021

11:00 am – 4:00 pm

Zoom Meeting

---

### Minutes

**Attendees:** Mark Van Selst (Chair), Eniko Csomay (Vice), David Barsky, Ignacio Castillo, Nancy Counts Gerber, Julie Glass, Gary Laver, Simon Rodan, Stephen Stambough, Michelle Bean, Regina Eisenbach, Jenni Robinson, Michelle Plug, Melissa Lavitt.

**Visitors:** Quajuana Chapman (CSU CO), Robert Collins (ASCSU Chair), Karen Simpson-Alisca (CSU CO), Rick Ford (CSU APEP), Brent Foster (CSU CO), Aisha Lowe (CCC).

The meeting began at 11:00 am

1. Call to order and roll call
2. Chair's welcome and introductory comments
  - a. Dropbox, Agenda updates
  - b. Potentially an abbreviated meeting
3. Agenda was unanimously approved.
4. Future meetings (all will be zoom accessible)
  - a. Chair Collins will send out a survey after plenary on Friday to see the will of the body on hybrid or in person meetings for the Spring. The ASCSU determination for their January meeting will likely predict the modality for GEAC as well. GEAC has always accommodated both in person and remote access to the meeting.
    - January 18 (modality = TBD)
    - March 15 (modality = TBD)
    - May 17 (modality = TBD)
5. September Minutes unanimously approved (Dropbox)
6. Segment reports of items relevant to GE
  - a. CCC System Office (Michelle Plug; Aisha) Topics of discussion in the CCC System Office:
    - Ethnic Studies, Title 5 and catalog rights. Those who are matriculating to the CSU must follow the CSU catalog rights (if they have "old" catalog rights, they do not need to take ES). ES added as a CCC degree requirement. There is an ES task-force to advise on district implementation (potentially in Fall 2023 – Summer 24);
    - AB 928 – single GE pattern and how it affects students;

- Common course numbering system – it may include GE as well; AB-1111 Postsecondary education: common course numbering system [https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill\\_id=202120220AB1111](https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=202120220AB1111) “The California Community Colleges shall adopt a common course numbering system” (notes: the legislation mentions general education requirements). See more on this below (d/iv).
- AB 705 – 2 years of experimentation over implementation – 2022 Spring will be full force; AB-705 Seymour-Campbell Student Success Act of 2012: matriculation: assessment. The bill would prohibit a community college district or college from requiring students to enroll in remedial English or mathematics coursework that lengthens their time to complete a degree unless placement research [https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill\\_id=201720180AB705](https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180AB705)

b. CCC Academic Senate (Michelle Bean)

- Report with links is in Dropbox
- Concerns of Area F implementation no date yet for ES for CC yet
- CCCAS continuing work on equity mindedness
- Plenary this week in Long Beach
- <https://www.dropbox.com/s/r58d193a3tsbknt/ASCCC%20Report%20November%202021.docx?dl=0onal>
- ASCCC Rostrum: [https://asccc.org/sites/default/files/asccc\\_rostrum\\_2021\\_Nov\\_2021.pdf](https://asccc.org/sites/default/files/asccc_rostrum_2021_Nov_2021.pdf) (in dropbox)
- Ethnic Studies resubmission questions remain (see CSU CO report)

c. CCC AO report (Michelle Plug) see above

d. CSU AO report (Jenni) Topics of discussion in CSU AO

- Ethnic Studies,
- Catalog rights - guidance from CO is clarifying some of the questions
- Swirling questions of AB928 and GE: CSU GE and IGETC for UC (generic version) differ in Critical thinking, foreign language, oral communication, etc.
  1. Q (Rick): AB 1111 (common course numbering system) –has the impact of common course numbering system been discussed in terms of how much it would cost to implement? AB 1111: [https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill\\_id=202120220AB1111](https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=202120220AB1111) AB-1111 Postsecondary education: common

course numbering system. 10 million was set aside for the community colleges to implement AB 1111 – hired a researcher to see how this is working in other states and implement it here as well.

e. CSU Office of the Chancellor (Melissa)

- ES continues to be a topic of discussion. Adding to the complexity is the dually enrolled student (those who are taking cc classes in high school already – presumably at this point they are not considered as a matriculated CCC student vis-à-vis catalog rights at this point) Maybe revise Title 5 to capture the nuances of student enrollment?
- CCCs were sometimes unable to create new ES courses prior to the submission deadlines; instead, there was an effort to submit existing courses, many of which are rejected; resubmission was happening this past summer and the CSU also backdated approvals for ES courses. There are now “office hours” held in small groups for CCCs who received denials for ES. These office hours are conducted by the CSU ES articulation content expert and provide more nuanced and targeted feedback (two scheduled this week alone); another resubmission opportunity will be provided for the summer
- 3 searches in the CO office related to GEAC content (Intra-segmental staff, GE staff, AVC Academic Programs)
- The future of GVAR is being discussed (testing was suspended due to COVID and also because it is high stake testing and as such can be seen as potentially antithetical to equity goals)
  - Comment: Students look to the promise of common course numbering system with expectations that it will reduce confusion. It will still be somewhat confusing for students because the expectation that all courses will transfer to all programs will not be met (some courses are not used for some programs).
  - Comment: There is always useful input from CIAC that helps GEAC do agenda setting (CIAC: California Intersegmental Articulation Council). CIAC exists to facilitate AO to AO communications re: articulation. The listserv is used by all of the AOs on a daily basis.
  - Comment: There are concerns when a single course attempts to meet multiple GE requirements. The IGETC for UC potential overlay with ES and Area 3 or 4 (CSU GE areas C or D) was highlighted as a particular concern, esp. given that, in GE, only ES lists defined student learning outcomes.

- f. CSU Students (CSSA) (Ignasio)
  - CSSA has finalized their 2021-22 policy agenda – <https://calstatestudents.org/cssa-2021-2022-policy-agenda/>
  - One priority – policy 3 – academic success and holistic education; is highly pertinent to GE policies and implementation.
  
- g. CSU Academic Senate (ASCSU)
  - From ASCSU Academic Affairs Committee (AA chair Simon Rodan): Discussions around AB 928; Distance education (Federal definition is problematic and restrictive; common core – labs – in-person or online lab); AA will be developing a white paper on the Future of Higher Ed in CA and the role of the different segments in that future;
  - From ASCSU Academic Preparation and Education Programs (GEAC member David Barsky, APEP Chair Rick Ford): Intl. baccalaureate; B4 guidelines; AB 928 – reviewing that -- changing of our IGETC. A separate step Ed Code Section 3, 66720 common pathway for GE for transfer; Ed Code 66720 link regarding the common core curriculum in GE for transfer:
    - [https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes\\_displayText.xhtml?lawCode=EDC&division=5.&title=3.&part=40.&chapter=9.2.&article=1](https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displayText.xhtml?lawCode=EDC&division=5.&title=3.&part=40.&chapter=9.2.&article=1)
    - 1. Comments (Chair Van Selst): There will be a CSU BoT Title 5 change for IGETC for the CSU Title re: Ethnic Studies (model will follow CSU GE model not proposed IGETC for UC language)
    - 2. Comment (Guest Collins): It is important to Separate Title 5 changes re: ES from future GE changes related to AB928. For ES the Core competencies proposed for IGETC for the UC map well to the CSU GE ES requirements. The UC still has to vote on the ES core competencies.

## 7. Chancellor's Charge to the Committee

- a. Between CCC, UC, and the CA legislative action, there were too many moving pieces to develop a clear and specific charge for the start of the academic year for GEAC; GEAC is to help inform these discussions as well as its' usual functions.
- b. There will be a role for GEAC in ultimately responding to AB 928 – as the new GE pattern is developed, many ADTs may need to be re-envisioned. The bigger picture beyond GE is that lower division (ADT) content and upper division prerequisites should be clearly tied to success in the major. Recent legislation seems clearly tied to new pressure to reduce the number of 120 unit exceptions for major programs (this is more of a curriculum issue for Academic Affairs);

legislative interest is clearly favoring consistency vs autonomy of degree programs. The system will be looked at to assess what requirements are facilitating or impeding transfer.

- Comment (Julie): How can we be different from saying we have to offer all the same things. It doesn't say that we can't offer something special to our own students because those coming in will not have it.
- Comment (Mark): The trade-off in limits to campus autonomy vs systemness is the underlying question
- Comment (Simon): Tightly controlled curriculum – in some areas (e.g., Engineering preparation and to meet strict accreditation standards) may be desirable but in other areas (e.g., Humanities) it may be different (mismatch of expertise and “desired” outcomes from a standardized curriculum) – what are the appropriate bounds for unique and/or specialized programming?

## 8. LUNCH

## 9. Discussion of AB 928 (Berman)

- a. Mark: GEAC is an implementation and not a policy committee; However, we do have an excellent venue for inter-segmental sharing and a strong interest in how the processes regarding AB 928 will impact GE.
- b. There are two parts to AB 928. One deeply impacts curricular authority and implementation around ADTs; and the other doubles down on this by specifying the development of a single transfer lower division package for CC, CSU, UCs by May 2023 [if developed through faculty input] (despite the complexity generated by UC constitutional autonomy). This bill, as others, is basically trying to get the UC to do something by forcing the CSU do something.
- c. The alignment of lower division GE for transfer is to be acceptable for the 3 segments; ICAS (senates) have until May 2023 and then ‘authorization’ (again, UC curricular autonomy questions) goes to the three system offices to set lower division GE transfer curriculum.
- d. The Implementation of the GE portion of AB 928 also will have two parts: one is for ICAS in defining the new GE pattern (no role for GEAC here other than informational), the other (partially for GEAC) is what happens after a package is developed and needs to be implemented. In terms of original development, GEAC might play a role in highlighting what transfer elements in GE are important to each segment.
- e. Adding requirements to ADTs to accommodate UC transfer preparation may be somewhat challenging.
- f. Vis-à-vis implementation and design of the GE package and the re-envisioning of the ADTs: What is acceptable depends on the words in the legislation and, as we

saw with AB1460, what was in the mind of the authors of the legislation.

- g. What will the ICAS process look like? (Mark)
- Comment (Rob): There is agenda setting for upcoming meetings happening now. A subgroup of ICAS have had four meetings already and agreed to meet more frequently than every other month to work towards something that will hopefully work for the three segments. Important considerations include:
    1. CSU transfer is good – GE is equity-minded and students can explore why they are in college via GE – all units agreed that it is important
    2. There are differences in CSU GE vs. IGETC for UC:
      - a. Lifelong learning (CSU GE only)
      - b. Oral communication (CSU GE only)
      - c. Elements of critical thinking (some elements not in IGETC)
      - d. The CSU commitment to American Institutions (albeit technically not GE).
      - e. (note: there are other differences such as the differences in acceptable GPAs below 2.0 [CSU only], Language other than English (IGETC for UC only), Ethnic Studies [IGETC for UC requires an overlay] - Mark)
    3. We don't want to lose the strength of these CSU requirements for our students
  - Comment (Mark): CSU GE vs. IGETC for UC differences are noted in the "IGETC CSU GE crosswalk" excel document in Dropbox,
  - Comment (Rob): By law, we have a unit reduction in our future relative to lower division GE requirements. The question is what will we lose? A feedback web-portal is being constructed to ask campuses and faculty for best practices/desirable elements with the GE transfer packages and practices are. This web-portal will inform the conversations that the ICAS groups have.
  - Comment (Mark): American Institutions (US1, US2, US3) is not a part of CSU GE. It is a CSU graduation requirement -- as chair Collins points out UC assumes this for CA high school graduates (but does require AI for non-CA high school graduates as per my understanding). If AI is not incorporated in the GE pathway nor in the ADT then AI needs to be considered for UD GE and/or elsewhere in the 60 CSU units post-transfer (or wavier).
  - Comment (Nancy): Given our prior discussion that it may be harder for programs to get 120 unit waivers in the future, what does this mean for AI

waivers?

1. An ADT program may become exempt from the AI requirement if the Chancellor grants an AI exemption.
- h. Simon: Are we striving for an absolute minimum to meet AB928 OR is this an opportunity to try to 'modernize' GE as the ASCU GE task force attempted to do?
- Mark: I'd like to see GE organized and scaffolded to accommodate a more developmental structure but the challenge with any change (esp. a reduction/replacement) is that some departments will lose FTES and/or hiring lines.
    1. Eniko: How do we eliminate that?
- i. Mark: The alignment of the CSU and IGETC patterns may compromise some of the work by the CCC segment in response to the CCC prerequisite requirements legislation (AB-705 Seymour-Campbell Student Success Act of 2012: matriculation: assessment) since IGETC for UC has more clearly defined prerequisites (esp. re: B4) than CSU GE.
- j. Julie: Can a campus offer a unique GE program and/or unique implementation of a GE pattern while also allowing the single pathway for transfer?
- Mark: part of AB928 is a "common GE transfer" bill. The bill does not restrict campuses from using other patterns or specific implementations internally (albeit should not limit transfer).
  - David: We need to think about what the degree means. The students earn the same degree;
  - Regina: What David is talking about has WSCUC implications- speaks to the Meaning, Quality, and Integrity of degrees

#### 10. International Baccalaureate

a. Subcommittee update on recommendations

IB exams yield certain number college credit. This has been changed now so the question is when and how and what types of credit will be awarded – sub-subgroup met with the Math council (see correspondence in dropbox).

**MATH COUNCIL ENDORSEMENT: Recommendations of the CSU Math Council regarding new International Baccalaureate courses.**

*Based on the model overview and hours spent in the courses, which are comparable to the previous HL exam, we recommend the following:*

- No credit be given for standard level (SL) courses, Mathematics: analysis and approaches SL or Mathematics: applications and interpretation SL.*
- 6 units of credit, 3 of which satisfy GE area B4, be given for a score of 4 or higher for high level (HL) courses, Mathematics: analysis and approaches HL or Mathematics: applications and interpretation HL.*

*-- Given more information, including sample assessments, we would be willing to reconsider the standard level courses*

GEAC has accepted these recommendations.

#### 11. Strength of presenting GE

- a. Recommendations for highlights/awards? The perennial difficulties for students in understanding GE are two-fold. First, they are just given a checklist and told “take one from each bin”. Second, they are not provided with any rationale for the existence of their GE requirement(s).
- Eniko: 3 different models to show students re: how to understand GE -- a checklist, a playlist, or pathways... (SDSU model)
  - Simon: best practices, how to identify... how many have done a self-study of their programs (I know SJSU did and Bakersfield just finished theirs [Mark was their external reviewer]). Can we share review outcomes from campus GE reviews?
    1. Regina: That’s an excellent idea, Simon. Our campus is beginning to “re-imagine” GE, so having a repository of other campus efforts/ideas would be so helpful!!
  - Eniko: demystify GE through multiple venues, e.g., GE café, town halls, targeted meetings to deans, etc. to get an idea of how to improve GE on our campus and talk about GE in the first place.

#### 12. Adjournment (2:15)

Invited guests:

None

Standing guests:

|                       |                   |  |
|-----------------------|-------------------|--|
| Chapman, Qujuana      | CSU CO            | <a href="mailto:qchapman@calstate.edu">qchapman@calstate.edu</a>               |
| Collins, Robert       | ASCSU, Chair      | <a href="mailto:rcollings@calstate.edu">rcollings@calstate.edu</a>             |
| Ford, Rick            | ASCSU, APEP       | <a href="mailto:rford@csuchico.edu">rford@csuchico.edu</a>                     |
| Foster, Brent         | CSU CO            | <a href="mailto:bfoster@calstate.edu">bfoster@calstate.edu</a>                 |
| Lowe, Aisha           | CCC system office | <a href="mailto:alowe@cccco.edu">alowe@cccco.edu</a>                           |
| Simpson-Alisca, Karen | CSU CO            | <a href="mailto:ksimpson-alisca@calstate.edu">ksimpson-alisca@calstate.edu</a> |

MVS/ECS 11/2/21