

GEAC MEETING March 1, 2016

Call to order at 11 a.m.

Present: *Members:* Chair Bill Eadie; Vice Chair Mary Ann Creadon; Elizabeth Adams; Joseph Bielanski; Terri Eden; Susan Gubernat; David Hood; Catherine Nelson; Ken O'Donnell; Barry Pasternack; Jeff Spano; John Stankas; Mark Van Selst; *Guests:* Steven Filling; Denise Fleming; Debra David; Christine Miller; Anthony Ongyod

Approval of agenda for meeting of 3/1/16

- Bill Eadie introduced the recently revised agenda.
- Mark Van Selst asks to add upper division quantitative reasoning.
- Ken O'Donnell asks to amend quantitative reasoning item for Steven Filling to introduce it.
- Agenda approved.

Review and approval of minutes of 1/19/16

- Postponed minutes until after lunch because they were just posted.

Liberal Learning Partnerships

- Debra David reports: 12 people on all-project team meeting in New Orleans. California best represented. Faculty Collaboratives and Equity representatives attended. Rolled out hub website in its early form. Ken O'Donnell went, and so did Deborah Harrington, 3CSN Executive Director. Deborah Harrington promised support at least through next academic year. Emily Magruder agreed to direct the project next year, and has asked for a modest budget. Two Threshold projects coming up this spring. Statewide, there will be a culminating meeting of this phase this spring.
- Ken O'Donnell adds that the collaboration between CCC and CSU is good. Question is arising: what does student work look like in lower division GE? Prospectively, Collaboratives may be more about student learning.
- Debra agrees, says next year's work will focus on assignments that meet outcomes, and their assessment.
- Over the summer, team will work on proposals for future funding. Looking for an invested team for this project.

- Potential statewide minor that focuses on lower division GE. Meeting about this just took place. Binding theme: civic engagement, social justice. 18 campuses and 24 faculty were at the meeting. Working to design a lower division component so that it is transfer-friendly.
- Minor? How would it work? Bill Eadie asks.
- Minor based on GE work first surfaced at Chico with the GE pathways. They now have 10 pathways. CSUN got excited about this and added a twist: designed GE paths in partnership with Pierce College. Five of the paths can begin at Pierce College. Civic engagement and sustainability are possible paths, for instance. Follows Campus as a Living Lab initiative, and meeting of interested groups and subgroups came up with a statewide minor possibility. So a cooperative minor looks like it has legs.
- Catherine: trying to understand: this would be a statewide approved minor, but voluntary and designed to be campus-specific? How does one get the minor? How is it administered if not through a department?
- Elizabeth Adams says a college was willing to administer their minor at CSUN. The Sustainability minor there is run out of Liberal Studies, but they have their own course naming and numbering. Civic Engagement will work the same way.
- At Chico, Debra says, and elsewhere there are departments willing to host the minor (like Environmental Studies for Sustainability).
- Catherine says it would be a Sustainability minor for CSUN, etc., though, right?
- Elizabeth: also getting a partnership going with Glendale CC.
- Susan: from Elizabeth this sounds campus-oriented. But still a statewide minor. How does this work? Is there a curriculum that we will look at and adopt or not?
- Ken: no campus initiative will be trumped by the statewide minor. It's only statewide in the sense that a student who starts somewhere and moves to another campus that is participating in the minor does not have to repeat courses already taken.
- Susan: so this is a resource rather than a mandated issue?
- Yes.
- Mark: how to figure out a term, language to use, that would stay out of the way of the campus program, has been an issue.

- Jeff: how does this work with the ADTs (Associate Degrees for Transfer)?
- Debra: every ADT has GE in it, so the student could opt to use the statewide minor if they wanted.
- Jeff: so it would be a matter of choosing the minor more intentionally. Yes?
- Catherine: the curricular review should be the responsibility of the dual campuses, so then how does review take place?
- Mark: if you have selected to put your minor under the statewide umbrella, then you know your courses at the first campus will transfer for the minor.
- Catherine: where is the curricular review legitimacy attached? If you call it statewide, then something statewide has to give it legitimacy.
- Bill: my opinion is that the system will convene people and have them come up with resources to give to campuses and the campus decides if they want to use it.
- Catherine: my problem is “this is a statewide minor.”
- Ken: that label will probably drop.
- Catherine: must go through the curricular review process, and so really all that should be developed is a TEMPLATE, not an actual statewide minor.
- Catherine: One danger is the danger of a minor or upper division GE all provided by one college, which is not what GE is supposed to be.

Online pilots for Oral Communication

- Anthony Ongyod from Mira Costa College online with us; Ken introduces.
- Memo from 2013 opened up the possibility of online oral communication for GE. The memo demanded expressed outcomes and review. It also indicated the community colleges that were going to participate.
- Memo from SBCC faculty member was very full and thoughtful
- Anthony: pilot program amazing; he has learned a lot.
- Bill: CSU has banned fully online oral comm courses for transfer. The community colleges are annoyed with this, because they can't get their courses transferred.

- Pilot and Zoom meetings last week were about what works and doesn't work for these courses.
- Susan: SBCC calls the courses "mediated."
- Bill: not all courses are like this or use that term.
- Mediated lets people know that the course was online.
- Ken: Zoom meeting: challenges for how best to go about teaching these courses; also about whether outcomes can be achieved online. Answer to the question about outcomes was yes, but getting there meant some careful rules for students. They need to be checked out on the technology separately from the course. One can't afford to eat up class time with technical glitches. Second, the faculty need to be ready for this. Third, this can't be money-making. The courses must have limited caps.
- Anthony: Taught in Maryland fully online. Not at Mira Costa. Big thing from the meeting was concern about the large variance in how instructors conceived of "audience." Some said audience required five face-to-face people; others required online synchronous. Is it our job to make parameters for what constitutes an audience? Outcomes are being met, but there are concerns about the notion of audience. Just videotape and have people watch? If we force people to meet, we lose online virtues. How many speeches are or can be done online? How many are or should be synchronous? Asynchronous? Kerry Hutchinson at SBCC has all three, so they could use her for a test.
- Anthony: In Maryland, regulations have been changing, so it's a moving target. In the rural Midwest where these courses are taught, they have necessarily small audiences. In Maryland, all three were required in a semester course. Face-to-face, synchronous online, asynchronous.
- Mark: liked that we had strong expectations before this began.
- Susan: even last year we had reservations about audience. For one thing, we need a non-self-selected audience. Also, synchronous vs. asynchronous is very different. In real time vs. preparing it for a later, not-there audience.
- Bill: had a conversation with Anthony about using Zoom, which gives a gallery of faces so you can see them.
- Susan: Kerry encourages students to watch TED lectures. But watching face-to-face lectures and performing a face-to-face

lecture are two different things. Why are TED lectures live? There's a reason for that.

- Jeff: was an undergrad in Communication Studies. More convinced of value of these courses because of the need to be able to operate in an online environment (for instance, a how-to lecture—some work really well, others don't).
- Bill: it would be good for Kevin Baaske to be here because he was such a skeptic and now says he's ready to think about making it ok.
- Chris Miller: still skeptical. TED talk people must be accomplished public speakers. The skill building effort requires face-to-face contact. Need the fundamentals first, and then build other skills having to do with technology.
- Bill: at first Kerry said it doesn't work, but now thinks she's addressed her own issues.
- Catherine: what is our time-frame?
- Mark: pilot authorized through Fall '17.
- Catherine: if we decide that face-to-face is important, we will just say no to fully online.
- Ken: could use a clearer definition of hybrid and what must happen in the two environments.
- Mark: two years ago this group planned to go back and rewrite the GE outcome about live audience. This hasn't happened. Either a subgroup of AA or GEAC needs to build a better, expanded version of oral comm. This could include hybrid or technologically inclusive ideas. Could get a draft of this ready pretty quickly and shop it for half a year.
- Susan: Kerry's report does not address the different audience problem.
- Bill: she addressed it in the call, and you can get in touch with her to see about her hits and misses.
- David: interesting that the oral comm meeting was by Zoom. Also, we all have two-way communication with our students.
- Barry: campuses do have definitions of hybrid and could use those.

Update on annual review of CCC courses proposed for GE

- Ken: each year we get about 1000 unique courses for review, this year about 2000. First pass goes through about 40 articulation officers, and then if a problem, goes to disciplines for review and judgment. The predominant review this year has been social science. Talk is usually around the gray areas of the Guiding Notes. Sometimes the course has evolved beyond the GE conception but still looks to be GE, and sometimes it looks like its straddling more than one area.
- Humanities language review. A growing area of submissions. We seem to be uncertain ourselves about these courses.
- Friday, April 22 is a meeting of articulation officers—probably about 30 of them. Some of the conversations can be technical, but sometimes very substantive. Two-hour meeting in downtown LA.
- Good if someone from GEAC could go.
- How do we organize GE transfer curriculum? Some GE learning outcomes are not content-oriented, but fluency across different ways of knowing: technical skills, teamwork, etc.
- E.g., the conversation we just had about face-to-face oral communication. Students will be working with web cams in the future, so should we actually require an online component? We don't want articulation to poke its nose into pedagogy, but shared interests suggests we should be looking at what we are and aren't transferring.
- Terri: another thing that came up is computer literacy as a content we might be out of step with. Not in GE, but it is a lifelong learning skill.
- Mark: let's go back to oral comm. In the past we have tried to take a run at all of GE for revision. Difficult to be motivated to do that. If we restrict ourselves to oral comm, maybe we can come up with a model for revising the Guiding Notes in general.
- Barry: financial literacy really needs to be there.
- Catherine: concerned that we have a slow slide into competency based learning, and how to tease it out from content. How do we talk about skills outside of the context of the content in which that happens. The content means everything for meaning. The skill is never without a content.

- Mark Wheeler: concerned we're talking about skills that should not be in GE. Use a natural language, but not use Spanish or French, etc. Or financial literacy, or speaking in public. Not GE. Broad education in terms of content is what GE is about. These generic skills are not what GE is about.
- Mark Van Selst: but much of what you (Wheeler) say is embedded in GE. If habits of mind are important, then these skills lead to those habits of mind.
- Denise: do we look at quantitative reasoning, or critical thinking as the arrival place and these are among the ways to get there?
- John: I see GE as foundational knowledge of everyone who exits with a degree. What Ken listed and others—financial literacy, etc. are part of good pedagogy as you go along. In addition to content, there should be a requirement for modalities: technology, public speaking, financial literacy, etc.
- Mark Wheeler: Agree. Skills are important for an educated person. Worry is that building them into GE misses the point of GE.
- Denise: when looking at GE outcomes and IGETC, are you evaluating what's in place in revising outcomes? What will come at the end of the day?
- Ken: this committee produces recommended changes to policy (IGETC standards) for EO 1100 and Guiding Notes. But there are extra good things that don't fit in, at least not right now.
- Barry: using mathematical models for business decisions. This is hard to get through GE, because of the prejudice towards liberal arts.
- Susan: at East Bay we are going through these discussions as we move to semesters. Shift going on in initiatives to talk about best practices, looking at student work, etc. But there are many modes of instruction and ways to get at outcomes. At CSUEB, some want to go beyond outcomes to prescribing how to get there, to teach in a certain way. We need to look hard at EO 1100, at its language: are these outcomes really something that can be assessed; some of it cannot be assessed. Suggestions or policies for how to teach, and what best practices are, constrict the many good ways that GE teaching can happen. At what point do we move from practice to prescription? Do we control our own classrooms?

- Mary Ann: how can we actually begin the task of revising 1100 and the Guiding Notes?
- Mark: we were pursuing critical thinking last year; what happened?
- Ken: one subcommittee once proposed critical thinking revisions; another practice once was to project EO 1100 on the wall and go through it line by line. It's hard to do.
- Bill: talking about the values we have for GE is important.

Quantitative Reasoning

- Steven: First meeting of Task Force report. Includes CSU, UC, CCC, admins from all three segments, somebody representing lieutenant governor, representatives from business. So wider audience than usual. First meeting was mostly data transmission from various speakers. What education or skills are needed? What changes has Common Core wrought? Some discussion of Smarter Balanced and their drive to not only assess but determine what students need to get into college. Some people concentrated on the need for computer science by students. They seemed to mean a more structured, enforced way for learning to take place in q.r. So next meetings will be what do students need to be quantitatively literate.
- Mark: much of what was talked about we already have discussed. Entry vs. transfer requirements, and how this all fits into Common Core.
- Denise: given the breadth of interests, there was a larger context than usual for thinking about quantitative reasoning.
- Steven: K-12 people would like us to let them know what we think students should know. There was a discussion about why 4 years of math would be good.
- Catherine: there is legislation in the works to allow computer science to count for one of the three high school years of math.
- Denise: seemed like the lieutenant governor and corporate reps have had extensive discussions about getting computer science into the arena of high school. Way to get it in is through A-G

curriculum and since math seemed like a good fit, that's where they thought it should go.

- Steven: the lieutenant governor sent a letter to BOARS urging them to do this, but UC BOARS refused to agree.
- Ken: Common Core presentation with what they expect, and ICAS document for expectations, were eerily alike. Kate Stevenson thought the common ground between those two documents could be something that Math Council could accept.
- Susan: always liked the ICAS document for math. Heard about argument to get computer science into pre-K. Sociocultural push: underrepresented students not getting into high tech jobs, so supposedly this is how we should correct that. So there is a question of who is influencing the lieutenant governor and where this push for computer science is coming from.
- Barry: logic is typically a math course, not always a philosophy course. Also, if you look at young children now, you can see that they are playing with Ipads right now, so this kind of knowledge is coming.
- Steven: Industry people repeatedly protested that they didn't want to train people to program. People going to work at hospitals, banks, etc., and do things with software need computer literacy, also. So they were trying to look like they're trying to look beyond themselves.
- UC Articulation Conference. Ken, Mark, Steven, Chris, Barry and Bill went to this conference.
- Ken: generally positive since people who needed to talk to each other were in the same room. But unbalanced towards stats. Kate's presentation about disciplinary contextualized stats was very good.
- Mark: first speaker good at describing where intermediate algebra comes from. Going back to C-ID descriptor and separating the math from the psych descriptions would be good.
- Steven: At Task Force meeting it was clear that: when students get to college, this is what they should know. At the UC conference, seemed to be a tendency toward early distinctions in students for STEM and non-STEM. They tried to talk about why stats is better for teaching quantitative reasoning, but it was not convincing.

- Barry: all he learned was that two semesters of stats is better than one semester, but this would be true of algebra, also.
- Chris: just a political ploy by UC to show they are doing something about “the math problem.” There was no action plan, and there were way too many people there.
- Mark: a lot of work on proficiency assessment is being done. Self-placement in community colleges was discussed. Those who challenged their self-placement did well in the new class, but that does not tell us about self-placement.
- Denise: there were a lot of ungrounded generalizations, or generalizations made out of context by Pamela Burdman.
- Ken: her books are more careful and particular than her presentation at the meeting.
- Steven: next meeting is March 24 at CO. Supposed to be done by the end of the semester.
- Ken: Kate said some things are easy to change, some things we can have moderate success with, and for some things we need advice on what to highlight.
- Mark: how about an action item for our agenda about stats pilots? We did not bake into the original pilot how they were going to do intermediate algebra as they went along with the pilot. Seems like not that much has to be done. How can we see what their math competence is? Exit ELM? Should we define what we want from these pilot programs?
- Bill: we asked for data in the September meeting, but that was divided and left unclear.
- Mark: we should say to these pilots: if you want to play you must show certain things.
- Ken: CSU should say: this is how much algebra you should have.
- Steven: some people teaching pilots believe we will waive the intermediate algebra requirement. This is wrong. We haven’t changed that requirement, and the Task Force has not said so.
- Bill: Common Core may be rethinking intermediate algebra at high school level.
- Ken: for stats pathway curriculum, we will waive the intermediate algebra requirement. We did say that. But it all ends when pilot ends, unless we say that’s ok to continue.
- Mark: what are we expecting from these pilots?

- Mark Wheeler: question to Mark VS: what kind of data would you expect? How about if all the pilots submitted the math content they are including, and what they think meets quantitative reasoning?
- Denise: meta-question will come up: are there students who can meet their life goals without intermediate algebra under their belts?
- Ken: right, and we should not shy away from that question. It is the ultimate question.
- Denise: there is a problem with community college advising, though. Or it is difficult to do the advising.
- Barry: if you ask that, you should also ask it about history, chemistry, biology. Do you need them?
- Mark: question to ask is: have we changed admission standards? No, and send a clarifying statement emphasizing that they have not changed as a result of approving the pilots. Before students arrive on our doorstep, we still need them to meet our admission standards, which include intermediate algebra standards. This is what they need to know.
- Mark: by approving CAP, we gave a waiver for needing intermediate algebra. CAP has only a tiny amount of algebra.
- Ken: we were not told by CAP rep in September that it has virtually no intermediate algebra. However, interesting that only CAP shows better outcomes for quantitative reasoning skills. Statway hasn't done the work to show that.
- Mark Wheeler: do we want a motion that informs pilots of our clear intention for what we want from the pilots, and what data we want? Don't remember not wanting algebra content.
- Ken: I can get in touch with Pam Walker and find out what kinds of evidence the pilots are gathering under AB 770 money.
- Elizabeth: uncomfortable with telling community colleges that if they send us students with B4 credit, they still don't meet our requirements.
- Susan: we have already offered these pilot students a limited exemption to intermediate algebra. We can't go back on this.
- Mark: in practice we are doing this. But for these pilots, can we ask for data on how much quantitative reasoning they have?

Maybe we should ask for syllabi and assignments. But right now we are asking for nothing.

- Susan: GEAC memo does ask for data on persistence rates, success rates, grad rates. Where is the review of the Statway curriculum from before?
- Ken: to pilot proposers we said: give us Statway or CAP course proposals. Kate said, everyone knows what “statistics pathways curriculum” is, so use that phrase in your memo.
- Catherine: we should ask to see the syllabi for these pilots.
- Ken: we can use ideal or abstract curriculum from Statway and CAP and review proposals with those in mind.
- Denise: why not invite Statway and CAP to come and talk about what they’re doing in their courses? Ask them why they think this is a valuable quantitative reasoning course. Eventually, this will take us to the question of what do the students need?
- Ken: then just do check-ins like we do for online oral comm
- Mark: what do community college syllabi require in terms of outcomes and course content?
- Jeff: not sure—your question is if there is a floor *before* they start a course.
- Denise: maybe an advising note on syllabus and catalog that says this course will prepare you for or will not prepare you for . . .
- Bill: summarizing—we really do want to look at syllabi for pilots as a way of examining what level of math knowledge is being assumed or taught.
- Ken: ask Pam Walker what is the nature of the evidence that colleges are expected to be gathering under AB 770. Also, ask Statway and CAP what their ideal models of curriculum would be. Also, find out how many and who are doing these pilots and form them into a learning community. His takeaways from this GEAC meeting and what he will do.
- Mark: like to discuss a different idea. It is his belief that quantitative reasoning is part of upper division GE already. Is it? Senate resolution to make sure? See what’s there?
- Catherine: there is only one place in EO 1100 about upper division GE, and only a brief section on its requirements, but no explicit requirement about the courses themselves. This would be a new requirement.

- Ken: Both are right. Language Catherine cited is the only language about upper division GE. But earlier language says 12 units across the breadth. Agree it would be great to have an across the curriculum requirement, but this should be a campus decision.

WICHE project

Mark: Tom Krabacher (taking Debra David's place) distributed a letter summarizing what's happening with the project. Two points: 1) it will soon become self-sustaining; 2) several more states want to join. WICHE is just a group. Passport Project of WICHE will lose its funding from Lumina Foundation soon. Also, lead in WICHE for Human Society and the Individual has completed a draft that will now be open for feedback. We are actively participating in the writing of the descriptors, but we will not take part in the Passport Project aspect.

Meeting adjourned at 4 pm.