

GEAC MEETING
Jan. 19, 2016

Call to order at 11 am.

Present: *Members:* Chair Bill Eadie; Vice Chair Mary Ann Creadon; Barry Pasternack; Mark Van Selst; David Hood; Catherine Nelson; Susan Gubernat; Jeff Spano; Terri Eden; Mark Wheeler; Ken O'Donnell; John Stanskas *Guests:* Steven Filling; Emily Magruder; Denise Fleming; Eric Forbes; Christine Miller; Carolina Cardenas

Approval of agenda for meeting of 1/19/2016 and Review of Minutes of 11/3/2015

- Agenda approved
- Minutes approved with minor corrections

Liberal Learning Partnerships

- Ken O'Donnell reporting for Debra David, summarizing Debra's written report on Faculty Collaboratives. The object of the Collaboratives is to get us in touch with colleges in other states about what we want liberal learning to look like. Thus, they are tied to, for instance, AAC&U rubrics, with an effort to get more explicit about outcomes. There is a skeletal online site for reporting on work on this. We should look at Debra's written report while examining the sites.
- Emily Magruder added that the CSU is coming together with CC faculty to look at what liberal learning looks like in conjunction with threshold concepts.
- Ken suggested that maybe discipline councils can have a hand in this kind of initiative.
- Barry Pasternack said that discipline councils should be started by working with chairs.
- Bill offered that the CSU wants discipline councils to be formed. Susan Gubernat said that money has been the issue for English Council. She added that, in looking at the hub site for the Faculty Collaboratives, it has to be curated, so money is an issue there, too, for continuing these discussions and their outputs.

- Mark Van Selst said he did not envision discipline councils tied to liberal learning. Perhaps department chairs should be involved with discipline councils, but there are also other communities of interest for liberal learning.
- Mary Ann Creadon asked Emily who was at the meeting she went to, and Emily said it was the Fellows in Debra's report, and faculty from CSUs and CCs with many adjunct faculty.
- Ken said there has been a core of about 30 or 40 people who have gone to the meetings, and he thinks it's very useful, but doesn't know how to make it go further, or how to continue it. Will the hub website be the end of it?
- Bill said he came away from the 2nd meeting of this group wondering about equity—how to engage equally all learners.

Math Education and CSU GE Area B4

- Ken explained that he invited Eric Forbes to come for this item because GEAC has been talking about entry-level math and ELM and quantitative reasoning.
- Eric: preparation in math has been a concern with a question of how to transform senior year to help with math preparation. We are leaders in this kind of possible reform as a result of EAP. EAP is now piggybacked onto Smarter Balanced results and schools are using both of them to look at math preparation. If we couple the poor results of EAP with Smarter Balanced results and we talk about statistics as math preparation, and note the UC's suggestion that this must improve, we might conclude that perhaps there is a need for 4 years of math in high school. Eric and Carolina Cardenas think now is the time for us to think seriously about a 4 years recommendation.
- Caro said there is concern in K-12 about resources for such a change. It is important to keep in mind that there are other stakeholders.
- Ken said this is just an information item. As we look at quantitative reasoning in the baccalaureate and what we expect of a college graduate, we need to be careful about overstating that expectation. Possible solutions: see if there are other pathways to what we want; strengthen our calculus curriculum; look at the

12th year of high school. What about this free space? Something equivalent to ERWC, perhaps, might work as a model.

- Mark Van Selst said that while he is a fan of these possible approaches, our direction in the last 6 months has been the opposite, towards weakening standards. Won't we look like we're contradicting ourselves?
- Ken said that he worries about the same thing: do we want students to do calculus better, or just do CAP (California Acceleration Project)?
- Barry said the legislature would say stats because it's cheaper and students can graduate faster.
- John Stanskas asked if all students now take EAP. Caro and Eric said yes, now they all do.
- John said that simply pursuing a stats pathway doesn't capture all students, since it is designed for non-STEM majors. The American Math Council of two-year colleges said that if your goal is not calculus, it is possible not to take intermediate algebra. What is the floor of basic knowledge for math?
- Denise Fleming said that after considering the APEP meeting in September where a number of people started thinking about quantitative reasoning initiatives, we might do well to reframe the premises. First, the question is not 3 or 4 years, but what do students need and why? Second, what is the capacity in each of our systems, and how do we share the burden and where do the resources come from? We should not ask high school juniors: STEM or not STEM? That's too early. Math is extremely important and 4 years is necessary for both kinds of students. The question is: what do they need? If they have a junior year assessment, and we can determine what they need upon entrance, then senior year can be a place for them to get to where they need to be.
- John said there has been an effort to get CCs to go to the high school and cover just the gaps, but that now CCs can go and offer courses to high schools to get them ready in English and Math.
- Susan said that the 4th year maybe should not be calculus, but a 4th year is necessary. We need language to talk about math through the 4th year.
- John said that EAP assesses algebra and geometry, not calculus.

- Eric said that we had a recent dialogue about basic subjects and developing courses, and a concern was that the restrictions have not in fact been lifted, and we are still trying to get math and English taught by CCs in high school. Also, we do need a CSU-sponsored course like ERWC. What CSU wants is A-G 4th year math. One idea was Algebra 1.5 for 4th year.
- Barry said he does see value of knowing concepts of calculus. Shortage of high school counselors, so directing students to correct math may not be possible now. How about a financial planning directed course or curriculum?
- Mark said there is a danger here of tracking people out of possibilities and careers.
- Catherine Nelson posed a process question: is this something that will go through APEP as a resolution?
- Denise said this was the second conversation on this topic. We need to proceed very carefully if we craft a resolution.
- Mark said it seems as though it ought to be APEP because of admissions advisory, and it certainly should emerge from the ASCSU.
- Ken asked what the resolution would most need to clarify. If the resolution is mostly about admissions and readiness, then APEP seems right. If it is about what a college graduate needs to know, then it should be AA from GEAC.
- Bill said it probably will be a combination of APEP and AA.

CSU Institute for Teaching and Learning

- Report by Emily Magruder: The work of ITL now is around assessment. Jodie Ullman is doing some of this work by working on a guide for assessment. They are also looking at revising a now-defunct Assessment Council. If we have ideas for needs about assessment, she would like to hear about them. She went to the WASC Big Five conference about assessment. One session was devoted to quantitative reasoning as part of the Big Five. This looks like a venue for faculty development.
- Mark said regarding quantitative reasoning and course redesign, e.g., at San Jose State the Udacity course is still there in a form. How do we deal with this?

- Ken said that the conversations on WASC are about assessing a Big Five which are mostly GE related. GEAC should be in on these conversations. There will be a meeting on April 22. Left on its own, it will just be administrators and accreditors. GE faculty should be there. Also, there is an ongoing assessment conference at Fullerton—it has been going on for years. This year the April 22 WASC meeting is the same day as this Fullerton meeting. How do we coordinate and get these groups working with each other?
- Emily said she keeps hearing that there are many resources and groups interested in assessment.
- David Hood said that the ARC (Academic Research Conference) group has a meeting, also, that usually has CSU people attending it. The CC people might want to go, too. That meeting is on April 6, 7, 8.
- Barry said that more of our faculty should serve on accreditation teams.
- Emily said that one of her takeaways from the WASC workshop was that she was struck by how many faculty do have insight into how assessment can work for them and for their classes. ITL will do a Summer Institute and would like topic, format, and audience suggestions. One very informal possibility is for how learning works, or about inclusive pedagogy. This year's Teaching and Learning Symposium will be held at San Jose State in April. The deadline for proposals is January 29.

Annual review of CCC courses proposed for GE

- Ken said that the CCs every year submit course outlines for GE. This year there were 1600 submissions. We have 45 articulation officers to work on this. When their first reviewers get stuck, it goes to other senior reviewers, and then if still stuck, to discipline faculty. Right now, we're about a fifth done. Have done arts, and oral comm. Complicated to some extent by movement from Assist to Assist Nex Gen. Ken is keeping a list of questions that they might need more guidance on, and will bring those, probably in March, to GEAC.
- Terri Eden said they are still having trouble with Music Theory.
- Ken said that with C-ID there is more pressure to have the CCs come up with courses. They've also noticed that there is at least

one place where the policy and the Guiding Notes diverge. Ken said that in his experience it is often better to look at the spirit rather than the letter of 1100, though he's happy to have us look at how it is written.

Upper division GE in California Community Colleges

- John Stankas reported that the CC Academic Senate meets only twice a year, and the last meeting took up the issue of upper division GE. There were some competing resolutions, and there was vigorous debate, and they came up with resolutions about the baccalaureate degree, and about upper division GE. He summarized the resolutions: minimum 120 semester units; upper division requirement is for 24 units for the baccalaureate. For GE, at lower division for the baccalaureate degree they would follow IGETC. This was debated. Many pilot colleges thought they should be able to develop their own lower division patterns. They wanted locally determined patterns, not patterns within defined system requirements. This was defeated, though. Upper division GE will have 6 units remote from the degree area, and at least one course must be communication, computation, or writing.
- Terri asked why they required only 24 units of upper division. That is not even a whole academic year, or just barely.
- John said they were thinking about the lower division scope being broad in some programs, but more narrow in others. 24 is a minimum, but they wanted to allow for flexibility.
- Mark asked if the American Institutions requirement would be the same. John said that it is not in Title V.
- Catherine said that requirement came from the Board of Trustees and is not in Title V.
- Mark said he was feeling a tension in how this is and isn't a true 4-year degree. The 24-unit thing is an example of this. What is the depth of the degree expected? Another question he has is about money.
- John said the legislature gave 6 million to the CCs and said use this. The resolution says make sure this money goes to degree programs, and not just to the colleges. As for what goes into making a 4 year degree? For example, a BA in Chemistry from

Berkeley and from CSUF are both 17 units of upper division. So that lens might be ineffective for looking at this question.

- Mark said, however, that you can't graduate from CSUF without 40 upper division units.
- John said, however, that you need to think about what you need for the degree.
- Barry said if a CSU student wants to transfer to a CC, how will you need in order to make that work? John said that was why they tried to stick with the IGETC pattern.
- Catherine said she understands the point about constructing degrees differently, but when one of those students looks at graduate school, will the fewer upper division units hurt their grad school admissions?
- Christine Miller said she remembered early proposals in which some lower division existing course would just be re-numbered as upper division. So how many courses have really been conceived at the upper division level, and how many just re-numbered? What is the standard for upper division courses?
- John said they had this concern. In the curriculum process for CCs, course proposals all go to the Chancellor's office for mostly pro forma approval. In this case all the baccalaureate proposal courses must go through Senate and they will have to show how they are upper division. Also, some of what was initially in the proposals is being altered now, with new requirements. The CC Senate is determined to do this well, and make it have integrity.
- Susan—these are career tech degrees. These appear to be terminal degrees, and that may be part of the confusion and concern. As you develop upper division GE, will there be pressure from the legislature to accept whatever you come up with? When your students go beyond what they've done at the CC, will there come a point where the students we accept and even our curriculum will have to be something that we don't want?
- John said that UCLA already is discussing ways to create a path from certain of these degrees to a public health masters there. They worry also about mandates from the legislature, and they worry about transferability even within their own system.
- John said there is an investigation about who their accreditor should be.

- Terri Eden said she wanted to correct the number of CSUF upper division requirements being talked about. It has 40 upper division, including 34 in Chem. We will eventually be asked to review transfers of these students to our programs, and to our grad programs.
- John said, but most of our faculty are being told not to offer a content-upper division course that won't do any good for transfer anyway. We have always tried to look for what will work for transfer. This is different. While we did our homework in looking at this, we are not looking for transfer possibilities.
- Mark predicted that the largest user of these courses would be upper division transfer students and we will be pressed to accept them, because this always becomes a race to the bottom. If it can be done more cheaply, we will be forced to accept it. As for upper division GE, what kinds of things are being floated so that you get your cohort of bac students to encounter other well educated students outside of their degree?
- John said that it is true that when the pilot starts, they will have a cohort of students coming through together into upper division courses. They ensure diversity of thought by making the upper division GE course be remote from the major. The course can't be taught by discipline faculty in the major. So maybe not students, but faculty will be different.
- Chris said this was a way of passing off the cohort model for a rationalization as to why they might graduate a good citizen of the world.
- John said that with these pilots, there is no other way to get this diversity of thought.
- Mark asked if the 24 vs. 40 units question had come up.
- John said yes, it had, but the lens rather than the units, they decided, should be the issue—that this should be the question to ask about the requirement. Also, none of the pilot colleges are going to do the minimum.
- Chris asked if John knew what might come up at the next Senate meeting related to baccalaureate degrees or GE?
- John said they may see a push related to quantitative reasoning. The Statway people feel very empowered by the CSU memo about extending pilots, and may push something.

Quantitative Reasoning

- In Ken's absence, Steven reported instead on the potential structure of the quantitative reasoning task force, and its charge.

C-ID

- Mark Van Selst reported that it looks like there's been a lot of turnover in the review lately, with some forgetting that there must be concurrence of CSU and CC faculty on courses for approval and programs. Assist Nex Gen is being postponed for another year.
- Jeff Spano said that part of the delay is that it has to be rolled out in a calendar year that works for articulation. There was the usual plea for reviewers. Not much happened that had to do with GE.

Other items, open forum

- Susan said that at CSUEB as they change to semesters, they are working on GE assessment, and came up with new GE outcomes presented to the Senate. The GE subcommittee chair said, in spite of objections about the language of some of the outcomes, that they were following EO 1100. Susan looked at the 1100 language and, indeed, it is poor in places. She wonders if we should look at the unclear language of the EO. We can recommend revisions, but we don't have power.
- Mark said that also, if you look at outcomes for labs, e.g., there really aren't any. Historically, we say what we really mean in the Guiding Notes. We ought to coordinate the language and decide what the correct language is. John said he hoped we don't want the EO to list the outcomes. Just say what the areas are, and let the campuses devise outcomes.
- Susan said she didn't want more language, just more clear language.
- Mark asked how units for CLEP get updated?
- Terri said that Ken sent out a coded memo reducing the units. It came out in November after our meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 4 pm