
Chancellor's General Education Advisory Committee

Tuesday, September 6, 2022

11:00 am – 4:00 pm

Zoom Meeting

Minutes

Attendees: Eniko Csomay (Chair), Nancy Counts Gerber (Vice Chair), Mark Green, Gregory Wood, Sarah Nielsen, David Barsky, Gary Laver, Simon Rodan, Rick Ford, Elaine Newman, Michelle Plug, LaTonya Parker, Kate McCarthy, Jose Lozano, Brent Foster

Standing guests: Beth Steffel (ASCSU Chair), Caron Inouye (CO), Qujuana Chapman (CO), Bob Quinn (CCCCO), Raul Arambula (CCCCO), Mark Van Selst (ASCSU Secretary, former GEAC Chair)

Invited guests: none

Action items are in bold

The meeting began at 11:03 am

1. Call to order and roll call
2. Chair's welcome and introductory comments
 - a. Focus, purpose, intent of committee.
 - b. Orientation to and navigation of GEAC's Dropbox documents in 22-23 GEAC → appropriate subfolders, by, e.g., meeting date, agenda, relevant documents to review prior or at the meeting
3. **Revised agenda including mode for next meeting (hybrid or zoom), membership changes, and Letter from World Languages Council unanimously approved** (final, approved and corrected agenda is in Dropbox)
4. Future meetings (all will be zoom accessible)
 - a. Discussion of desire for hybrid option (Ford, Newman). However, it was noted (Steffel) that the Plenary must be remote due to the current, unexpected CSUCO closure (due to high numbers of COVID cases); meetings may have to be remote due to these circumstances.
 - i. September 6 (modality = zoom)
 - ii. November 1 (modality = hybrid/zoom)
 - iii. January 17 (modality = TBD)
 - iv. March 14 (modality = TBD)
 - v. May 16 (modality = TBD)
 - b. **Decision (with no objections) was made to change the Nov. 1 meeting to hybrid/zoom format (depending on the then-current circumstances).**

5. May Minutes
 - a. Editorial correction needed (item 9a) was noted
6. **Minutes approved (with 4 abstentions by new members on GEAC)**
7. **2021-22 GEAC annual report approved with minor editorial corrections**
8. Segment reports of items relevant to GE
 - a. CCC System Office (Arambula)
 - i. not much going on yet re AB 928 but will report fully next time
 - b. CCC Academic Senate (Parker)
 - i. <http://createsend.com/t/y-D6790827D8CAC7C92540EF23F30FEDED>.
Conducting a survey about Cal-GETC (see report).
 - ii. Questions
 - AB 1705 has implications for GE A2 and B4—how they will implement in CCCs
 - Concern from AO from approvals for courses that fulfill GE areas under IGETC vs. CSU GE and how it will work for Cal-GETC; concerns re articulation of courses across CCC's with shared CID numbers, particularly when one course may fulfill UC requirements but another with same CIC does not (complex issue); links were shared in chat; Van Selst helped to define ADT, IGETC, Cal-GETC, TMC, etc.
 - iii. Relevant links shared in chat:
 - [Bill Text - AB-1705 Seymour-Campbell Student Success Act of 2012: matriculation: assessment.](#)
 - [Bill Text - AB-1111 Postsecondary education: common course numbering system.](#)
 - [C-ID](#)
 - [final Summary of ICAS actions on AB 928 June 152022.pdf \(icas-ca.org\)](#)
 - c. CCC AO report (Plug)
 - i. AB 928 and the implementation of CALGETC continues to be a concern for articulation officers.
 - ii. CCC Articulation Officers and CCC faculty hope that Lifelong Learning can be considered for a graduation requirement at the UC.
 - iii. AB 1111, the common course numbering system and the implementation and implications for community colleges and transfer.
 - iv. The phase out memo of the new versions of the ADT degrees has been a topic of discussion.

LUNCH (12:10)

- d. CSU AO report (Lozano)
 - i. CSU AOs are busy updating ASSIST course-to-course departmental

agreements and by-major agreements.

- ii. AB 1111 (common course numbering): overall concern to ensure course content is consistent across all CCCs and that CSUs accept for articulation the CCC course across every CSU. Articulation by way of C-ID currently is voluntary for CSUs. Acceptance of ADT is not voluntary, but rather, articulation by way of C-ID. C-ID has had some issues.
- iii. CPL (credit for prior learning) (formerly EO 1036) duplicate credit. CSU are to honor whatever CCC transcribes, but when veteran students attend several CCCs, for example, it will be difficult to track.
- iv. Questions for Lozano
 - How common is multiple CPL credit given for the same work? Not clear.
 - Even though the CID is the same, it isn't the same course. But if it has a common course number it has to be accepted even if not exactly identical.
 - Transfer not addressed yet, it's just the CCC. But that could come.
 - Can't we enter whatever is truly important (central) then shouldn't it go into the CID? The CID is a minimum, but others might want to add on to that. Need to separate articulation for GE not the major.
 - One size fits all is flexible, but removes the distinctiveness of programs. Hard to be distinctive when everything has to be the same. Are we responding to edge cases? Are 99% not a problem?
 - Who determined the content has to be the same rather than just course numbering?
 - CCC students are confused. They think the common course numbering impacts transfer but it's just the CCC for now.
 - It is a real concern when courses at campus X are not available... how to determine if a course at campus Y will be acceptable. It is how to make this equivalency (or lack of equivalency) as transparent as possible. The legislature won't start with transfer because it intrudes on autonomy... it is easier to start with "just" the CCC to avoid CSU pushback (while being fully aware that the move will impact the CSU)...
 - The CSU is assuming that the CID descriptor matches the curriculum.
- e. CSU Office of the Chancellor (Foster)
 - i. New faces in new places: We are currently wrapping up a search to replace Karen Simpson-Alisca; Leo Van Cleve has announced he will retire at the end of November which means that there will soon be a new ASCSU CO liaison; Caron Inouye has joined as the Associate Dean of Academic Programs, Curriculum and Assessment at the CO; Rob Collins

is our new Ethnic Studies Faculty Coordinator and will be working on a number of things related to the ES articulation process to include an ES rubric to be shared with the CCCs.

- ii. We are nearly complete with a new Articulation and Transfer website to be mainly utilized by AOs at the CCC.
- iii. AB 1111 group is meeting this month. Needs a faculty representative. Alison will talk to AA.
- iv. Guiding Notes are nearly finalized, with only minor edits being currently addressed, and should be published in a couple of weeks.
- v. Extended the deadline for GE articulation until the end of September.
- vi. The GEAC charge has now been signed and is in the dropbox.
- vii. All but one CCC now has at least one ES course.
- viii. Quajuana Chapman provided GE Articulation cycle overview.
- ix. Questions for Foster
 - Area F - Only one CCC that lacks a single ETHS course.
 - Simon reported on feedback from the Council of Ethnic Studies: 1) would the CO be open to considering faculty nominated as area F reviewers? Response: Council will be reported to by Rob. There will be a call for ETHS faculty; 2) Concern that some courses being approved are not being taught by ETHS faculty. Response: Not a part of the GE review. Will work with Rob to be sure review process meets the intent of AB 1460.
- f. CSU Students (CSSA) (Castillo)
 - i. No report submitted
- g. CSU Academic Senate (Steffel)
 - i. Cal-GETC adoption for the CSU (Unified transfer pathway into the CSU and UCs called for in AB 928)
 - ii. ICAS (Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates) leaders of each academic senate segment unanimously approved in Spring 2022
 - iii. AB 928 Implementation Committee, had 1:1 with the facilitation team (SOVA)
 - Three meetings set for this AY, October, January, April
 - iv. Questions for Steffel
 - What is the group's role? Will the ICAS recommendations be changed? Sending it out to the systemwide Senates for approval, but there is not much opportunity for change. Because the three systems must agree, there is not much chance. If we restart, the decision gets taken out of the hands of the faculty and made by admins.
 - ICAS made a proposal. They are sending it out for review. They have to finalize that by May. If we get too specific, too many

courses will not qualify. UC added oral comm and continues to have Language Other Than English (LOTE) as a graduation requirement (assuming that transfer students already come with that). What are we going to have to give up? There might be some edge cases, but mostly finalized.

- We don't know what's happening with Area E, but it won't be a Lower Division GE requirement.
- Applies only to transfer students not all students? (Simon). To what extent do the FTF and transfer patterns need to be aligned? Does CSU GE need to match Cal-GETC?
- The goal in the package was to be very simple... no overlays; easy to understand. Beyond the simple set of 11 courses + 1 unit lab package we need to determine what definitions/criteria we need to include now and which are ok to leave for later negotiation.
- What formal outreach has occurred about the ICAS proposal? Did ICAS do that? No, each segment is doing their own consultation. CSU hasn't decided yet. CCC and UC have.
- Why would you require different standards for FTF and transfer? This could cause legislators to intervene.
- Aren't there already two standards? No Area E from CCCs.
- Simon prefers different flavors rather than standards for FTF vs transfers.
- An argument could be made that a freshman experience would make the FTF different than transfer. We might not need to follow the CalGETC package for FTF.
- Could have a student who can enter the CSU but not the UC. They might have higher standards. If a student follows a specific pathway they can get in both places. If they don't, we can still accept it.

9. Discussion of committee scope and charge

- a. Preface to 2021-22 GEAC annual report
- b. Chancellor's (2022-23) GEAC charge (in Dropbox)
- c. Comments/questions on items in charge
 - i. Exceptionally strong charge.
 - ii. Take the opportunity to rethink UD-GE.
 - iii. Unit constraints on upper division coursework (ADTs say 60(now66)+60), Upper Division GE 'removes' 9 of those units if not used by the major... thus there is tension between "what does it mean to be a CSU graduate (commonality is only UDGE and Campus Requirements)?" and unit

limits. Some campuses make these an FTE pump and others have been creative and hallmarks of the institution.

- iv. UC says you do not need American Institution (AI) if you graduated from high school in California. American Institutions is a CSU graduation requirement typically met in CSU GE but now area D is reduced to 6 (from 9 units) so "eats up" all of area D to do AI.
- v. UC does not have the 120 unit restriction as we do.
- vi. Example: Engineering at SJSU dropped from 2 semesters physics to 1 semester to meet 120 units. It is hard to argue that this is an equivalent quality degree. Might be able to persuade the CSU to raise above 120. Partial GE certification won't be a thing in the future?
- vii. ADTs can now be 66 units not 60. So add 60 UD and you have 126? Might do this by exception.
- viii. Old ADTs for high unit majors waived some GE requirements already so there might not actually be an increase in units.

10. Review of recommendations for future consideration from 2021-22 GEAC Annual Report

- a. The committee broke up into groups to discuss the recommendations in the final report.

11. Priorities identified for action

- a. There was no consensus on the priorities but Mark pointed out that as we are a committee convened and charged by the CO we need to be sure to address the items in the charge.
- b. CSU Guiding notes: Brings CSU breadth and IGETC together. Not policy but must adhere to policy. Not many faculty are aware of the resource. Could help with GE submissions. New version coming out soon – within the next two weeks.
- c. Credit by exam/Credit for Prior Learning: we update this effectively in January every year the idea being that when the COLLEGE BOARD (who does CLEP and AP exams) updates their content it is typically accompanied by a concurrence resolution through the ASCSU (because it is curriculum). Only about 10% of campuses have updated their policies (see links below). Will Cal-GETC allow credit by exam? UC doesn't accept credit by exam to meet IGETC.
- d. No oral comm listserv. How can we facilitate communication with disciplinary groups that don't have an obvious organizing body?
- e. Eniko proposed spending 1-1/2 to 2 hours at future meetings to discuss one of the priorities plus additional items that get added.

<https://calstate.policystat.com/policy/9817841/latest>

<https://www.calstate.edu/apply/transfer/Pages/External-Exam-Credit.aspx>

12. New business

- a. Letter from World Languages Council

- i. Not anything for us right now but will be part of wide-ranging discussions on GE issues.
- ii. Need to hear from faculty who are supportive of the proposal as well as those opposed. Sometimes we typically only hear from those opposed.
- iii. The letter does not suggest an alternative. There is a possibility of a more flexible alternative solution (take 4 of 5 of the following...) but that structure was deemed to violate the "singular GE pattern" asked for in AB928 when considering proposals to recommend to ICAS.

13. Adjournment (4:05 pm)

ECS/NCG 9/16/22