

Report of the General Education Advisory Committee (GEAC) 2017-2018

Submitted by Kevin Baaske (Los Angeles), Chair

The Chancellor's General Education Advisory Committee met five times during the 2017-2018 academic year. This document constitutes the annual report of GEAC. It summarizes the discussion and actions of the committee, and indicates those matters that might be carried over to the 2018-2019 committee.

2017-2018 Membership

Kevin Baaske, Chair, ASCSU Senator, Los Angeles

Mary Ann Creadon, Secretary, ASCSU Senator, Humboldt

Bill Eadie, ASCSU Senator, San Diego

Denise Fleming, ASCSU Senator, East Bay

Susan Gubernat, ASCSU Senator, East Bay

Barry Pasternack, ASCSU Senator, Fullerton

Paula Selvester, ASCSU Senator, Chico

Mark Van Selst, ASCSU Senator, San Jose

Jodie Ullman (Ex Officio), ASCSU Senator, Chair Academic Affairs Committee, San Bernardino

Kris Roney, CSU Campus Academic Affairs Administrator, Monterey Bay

Maggie McGlothlin, CSU Articulation Officer, Long Beach

Alison Wrynn, State University Associate Dean

Tiffany Tran, California Community College Articulation Officer, Irvine Valley

Virginia May, California Community College Academic Senate Representative, Sacramento City

Laura Hope, Executive Vice Chancellor, California Community College Chancellor's Office

Alice Perez, Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, California Community College Chancellor's Office

Jackie Escajeda, Dean, Intersegmental Programs and Credit Curriculum, California Community College Chancellor's Office

Summary

1. Much of the September and October GEAC meetings focused on the new Executive Orders 1100 (revised) and 1110. These EOs entailed significant changes to the GE and mathematics programs on some campuses. The short timeline for making these changes caused great consternation on these campuses. The EOs also created much confusion. In an effort to express these concerns and to seek clarification, GEAC spoke with Alyson Wrynn (State University Associate Dean, Academic Programs), Karen Simpson-Alisca (Assistant Director, Undergraduate Transfer Programs and Programs, Office of the Chancellor), Quajuana Chapman (Curriculum and Articulation Assistant, Office of the Chancellor), and Christine Mallon (Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Programs and Faculty Development).

2. The Committee considered a request to consider whether or not Defense Language Institute courses would be acceptable as satisfying C2 (Humanities: Literature, Philosophy, and Languages Other than English) of the CSU's General Education Breadth requirements. As part of its deliberations, the Committee met with Sandra Perez (World Languages Council), Patrick O'Rourke

(Director of Active Duty and Veteran's Affairs), and Janet Rizzoli (CSU Channel Islands Articulation Officer). GEAC also received an email from Steven D. Brown, Professor and Chair Department of Marine Transportation (CSU Maritime Academy) relating his experience as a faculty evaluator for the American Council of Education. At its January 2018 GEAC voted to recommend that the Defense Language Institute using ACE credit guidelines be accepted as satisfying GE C2 requirements across the CSU (see Appendix A).

3. The Committee was also asked to consider the acceptability of Advanced Placement Exam scores in Computer Science as satisfying the Quantitative Reasoning requirements (B4) of CSU GE Breadth. After lengthy deliberation and a time certain meeting on January 23 with Pam Kerouac (College Board) and Crystal Vernon (College Board content expert), the Committee recommended that an Advance Placement exam score of 3 or better in AP Computer Science be accepted across the CSU as satisfying B4 (Quantitative Reasoning) requirement of General Education Breadth (also in Appendix A).

4. GEAC reviewed and revised the GE Guiding Notes. Executive Order 1100 (Revised) lays out the requirements of the CSU's GE Breadth program. The Guiding Notes were created to provide guidance to faculty, predominantly at the Community College level, when they create new GE courses. The Notes are also used by those who evaluate these courses when they determine whether the new courses are acceptable. The Guiding Notes are an attempt to clarify EO 1100 (Revised) without creating new policy. After much deliberation and consideration by the Committee, the Guiding Notes were revised (see Appendix B).

4. GEAC was asked to identify best practices for assessment of CSU campus GE programs. This task was broken into three parts. First, an identification on each campus of the individual who oversees the assessment of that campus' GE program; second, an identification of the nature of the assessment program on each campus; and third, a determination of best practices. The first two steps were completed (see appendix C) and the Committee received a preliminary report on best practices. GEAC Chair Baaske reported that there were four broad approaches to GE program assessment. The first is Course Assessment in which each approved GE course on a campus is assessed individually either as part of departmental program review as required in Program Review or specifically for GE. In this approach, the achievement of student learning objectives for that course is assessed at least every seven years. The second approach is Block or Sub-Block assessment in which all of the courses in a given block or sub-block (e.g., A2 or C1) are assessed on a published timeline. Third, achievement of Student Learning Outcomes for the entire GE Program is assessed on a published timeline. The fourth approach is a combination of course and block assessment. Chair Baaske's report identified the following elements of an effective GE Assessment Program.

1. GE Program has Student Learning Outcomes for the GE Program.
2. GE Program identifies who is responsible for assessment at the course and program level
3. GE Program identifies when each component will be assessed
 - A. Assessment is conducted for each approved course according to a published timeline
 - B. Assessment is conducted for each GE Block according to a published timeline
 - C. Assessment is conducted for the GE program

4. GE Program has a committee charged with overview of GE Assessment and a Director of GE to oversee ongoing, systemic, and thorough assessment
5. GE Assessment is formative in that data is used to improve GE program

The report also identified the following campuses as exemplifying these desirable elements: Bakersfield, Chico, Fullerton, Pomona, San Marcos, and Sonoma.

Unfortunately, the full committee did not have sufficient time to explore this report in detail. It is recommended that the Committee do so in the 2018-2019 Academic Year.

5. At its last meeting, May 2018, GEAC members discussed recent messages between Executive Vice Chancellor Blanchard and campus community. In dispute were clarifications from EVC Blanchard that campuses could not further subdivide Block C Humanities. EO 1100 (Revised) identifies two subdevelopments of Block C: C1 Arts: Arts, Cinema, Dance, Music, Theater and C2 Humanities: Literature, Philosophy, Languages Other than English. Members of GEAC expressed their frustrations and concerns regarding this clarification and charged Chair Baaske with conveying the substance of these concerns to Chancellor White (see Appendix D).

Activities for GEAC 2018-2019

At its last meeting in May 2018, GEAC discussed what matters might carry over to the 2018-2019 GEAC. Here is a list of those matters.

1. Further discussion of Best Practices for GE Assessment and then sharing these Best Practices with those responsible for assessing campus GE programs.
2. In addition to the processes shared by Chair Baaske in his report to GEAC, the Committee felt it important to examine assessment techniques employed by campuses when they assessed their GE courses and programs. These techniques utilized to determine student achievement of course and program learning outcomes ought to then be shared with those responsible for assessing campus GE programs.
3. In 2018-2019, GEAC might consider the intentionality of GE. To what extent do students and the faculty know the purpose or intent of GE?
4. In the coming year, GEAC might also have a fruitful discussion regarding how the CSU GE Breadth program fits within campus missions.
5. Can English as Second Language courses be used to satisfy the Humanities requirement (C2) of CSU GE Breadth?