

Chancellor's General Education Advisory Committee

Tuesday, January 21, 2019

11:00 am – 4:00 pm

CSU Chancellor's Office

Minutes

Attendees: Mark Van Selst, John Tarjan, Mary Ann Creadon, Eniko Csomay, Julie Glass, Susan Schlievert, Stephen Stambough (via Zoom), Michelle Bean, Thalia Anagnos (via Zoom), Tyler Vaughan-Gomez, Tiffany Tran, Melissa Lavitt

Visitors: Quajuana Chapman (CSUCO), Catherine Nelson (ASCSU Chair), Virginia May (ASCCC Executive Committee), Allison Wrynn (CSUCOO)

1. The meeting began at 11:04AM
2. The agenda was approved as posted.
3. The minutes of November 12, 2019 were approved.
4. Chair's Report
 - a. CLEP Spanish with writing.
 - i. Dr. Lavitt indicated that coded memoranda will no longer be utilized by the CSU.
 - ii. There was a question about when policy decisions become effective and if there is a possibility of sunseting policies. There was a question about how one can reference new policies in the absence of the distribution of a coded memorandum.
 - iii. The new Spanish with writing CLEP exam information can be found on the CSU CLEP page.
<https://www2.calstate.edu/apply/transfer/Pages/college-level-examination-program.aspx>
 - b. In response to an inquiry—the GE Task Force Report is available to the public but will not be explicitly referred to ASCSU standing committees for further action, as per feedback from campuses. Also, while the report touches on ethnic studies content, it has no formal relationship with current recommendations requiring an ethnic studies requirement.
5. Other Reports

- a. CO Report (Dr. Lavitt)
 - i. The CSUCO is currently engaged in the annual review of CCC course outlines of record submitted for evaluation vis-a-vis CSU GE credit.
 - ii. The implementation of EO 1110 re Early Start programs is being reviewed (West Ed implementation study, ASCSU APEP committee is in consultation). Early Start is no longer aggressively marked as required but some campuses have had successes in student enrollment for supplemental coursework.
 - iii. In response to concerns about the messaging/communications regarding Early Start. Students may not have sufficient information or support to make informed decisions regarding self-placement. Dr. Lavitt held a recent Zoom discussion with AVPs of undergraduate studies regarding Early Start. Three campuses with high participation rates with supported instruction (Cat.IV students) were invited to present.
- b. ASCSU Update (Dr. Nelson)
 - i. On AB 1460 (Ethnic Studies): Developments are being monitored. ASCSU leadership met with the primary author, Dr. Weber. They described the actions being taken by the campuses/ASCSU. Dr. Weber has some concerns that AS 3403 (first reading) did not appear to address. Specifically:
 - 1. It contains no 3 unit requirement.
 - 2. Scaffolding or distribution across courses might diffuse the learning requirements
 - 3. Ethnic studies faculty do not have final say about the course/requirements.Weber also commented on the laudable learning outcomes. AB1460 may be removed from appropriations Thursday, Jan 23, 2020. It will likely come to the CA Senate for a vote soon.
 - ii. The Quantitative Reasoning admissions requirement change before the Board has been altered significantly. There is a desire to address the concerns raised by stakeholders—including gathering more compelling data.

The proposal now involves a study over the next year which will be brought back to the Board next year.

- iii. ICAS is interested in exploring alignment between ADTs and UC pathways major transfer curricula. APEP is working on a resolution encouraging C-ID leadership to explore alignment. There are concerns about access (GPA and course requirements) and the treatment of GE in the course patterns (GE Breadth vs. IGETC).
 - iv. We believe that more resources need to be committed to our many transfer programs and initiatives.
 - c. CCCCO Report (Raul Arambula)
 - i. AB 705 (ESL Students) is currently being codified by the Board of Governors.
 - ii. Community Colleges receive performance funding if students complete required math and English in the first year. Students in the CSU are still required to do this under preexisting policy.
 - d. ASCCC Report (Michelle Bean)
 - i. Are continuing work on Guided Pathways (helping students to select appropriate coursework to achieve their educational goals).
 - e. Articulation Officers (Tiffany Tran)
 - i. ASSIST is continuing its update and upgrade. More GE information will be available on the website. CCC GE course review is currently underway.
6. AB 705 (Impacting CCCs)
- https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180AB705
- a. Is now codified in Title 5 language.
 - b. Deals with guided pathways, (placement in ESL, reading, QR, etc.). There are both system-level guidelines and campus-specific placement guidelines. Students do not have to follow these guidelines.
 - c. Has the following goals
 - i. Close equity gaps
 - ii. Increase access
 - iii. Increase throughput
 - d. We are awaiting more complete data from the fall semester to see the impact on student success. We have analysis from the RP group that show promising preliminary results but some

worrisome result relative to percentage of successful completion of transfer-level courses by underserved students.

7. GE Appeals Process (response to ASCCC proposal)

<https://www.asccc.org/resolutions/encourage-accelerating-timeline-general-education-articulation>

- a. The ASCCC request would shorten the timeline for review of CCC GE course submissions and establish an appeal process for courses which have been denied placement on the approved list.
 - i. There are concerns over
 1. The delay inherent in the process (resubmission only under the following year's process)
 2. Inconsistency in applying criteria
 3. Differential treatment of campuses in the approval process
 4. Synching timelines across curricular approval processes
 - b. The proposal in the link above would allow sufficient time for the resubmission of courses during the same academic year.
 - c. A discussion ensued about the types of issues involved in denials, the feasibility of the timeline given faculty availability, the handling of "technical" vs. substantive changes required, alignment of UC and CSU processes (GE Breadth, IGETC, TCA), the potential for retroactive approvals, etc.
 - d. ASSIST supports course review.
 - e. The CSUCO finds the implementation of this proposal problematic due to problematic timelines, alignment with UC processes, and resource issues.
 - f. A task force consisting of Michelle Bean, Melissa Lavitt, Tiffany Tran and Mary Ann Creadon will meet to further discuss the ASCCC proposal in light of today's discussion and will report back to the full committee any recommendations they feel are appropriate to address the above concerns.
8. Potential Ethnic Studies Requirement (AB 1440, ASCSU pending resolution)
- a. There is space between the legislative bill and campus preferences regarding ethnic studies requirements.

- b. This might add 3 additional units to GE (the bill would mandate that total units required for graduation not increase).
 - c. One potential treatment, mirrored in the ASCSU resolution, would include some treatment at the lower-division and a reflection component at the upper-division.
 - d. Many CCC campuses combine ethnic studies with AI requirements.
 - e. Concerns were expressed about the potential impact of such a requirement on transfer students/transferability.
 - f. Potentially, this requirement could “displace” other required GE content or limit choice in fulfilling GE requirements.
9. Campus Flexibility in Implementing/Structuring Campus GE (in the context of EO 1100 revised)
- a. The complexity of GE for transfer students is a nation-wide issue. Systems need to take the lead to make sure transfer and native students are equally able to complete/succeed in GE programs. Many states have attempted to streamline GE transfer. Courts have intervened when students have been disadvantaged.
 - b. Can 1st year experience be included—yes.
 - c. Can diversity be included—yes.
 - d. We should focus on outcomes rather than increasing units to be completed.
 - e. We can try to sequence, not mandate course patterns, etc. in upper-division GE.
 - f. There seems to be inconsistency in what is “allowed” in terms of campus requirements.
 - g. Upper-division reciprocity was added without faculty advice—and greatly limits the unique “imprint” that campuses can have on all graduates.
 - h. The faculty would like to have a more cooperative relationship working with the administration on curricular issues, particularly GE.
 - i. EO 1100 may have to be “reopened” to deal with developments like AB 1440. Perhaps it is time to also reconsider the parameters for campus flexibility in implementing GE requirements.
 - j. Legislation, educational policy should not be crafted to respond to anecdotes.

- k. There is agreement in the committee that campus innovation should be encouraged, as long as it does not impede student progress.
 - l. How can we communicate clearly to campuses it what areas they have flexibility in the implementation of EO 1100?
 - m. Might we develop a set of FAQs which clarify the parameters/flexibility within EO 1100 rev.? We can do this via the listerv? Chair Van Selst will solicit questions from campus GE chairs and the committee will work on answers virtually.
10. Possible GE implications of CCC-request to investigate alignment of some UC pathways with TMCs
- a. Seven TMC/UC Pathways seem to have a set of courses that will meet both sets of requirements.
 - b. Math—IGETC for science/engineering.
 - c. Business—CSU would have to agree to accept the year of traditional calculus in lieu of business calculus/finite math/etc.
 - d. What are the implications if students take UC IGETC rather than GE Breadth and transfer to the CSU? GE Breadth and want to transfer to the UC?
11. Potential Agenda Items for the Next Meeting
- a. CCC Students Post-transfer Outcomes
 - b. Review/Discussion of Campus Responses to the GE Task Force Report
12. The meeting adjourned at 4:10pm.