Minutes

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

**Visitors:** Quajuana Chapman (CSUCO)

1. The meeting began at 11:00am
2. The agenda was approved with a postponement of lunch until 12:30.
3. The minutes of January 21st were approved.
4. Chair’s Report—None
5. Other Reports
   a. CO Report (Dr. Lavitt)
      i. We have Coded Memoranda on credit-by-exam (see EO 1036).
         1. Potential changes to this EO are currently being vetted across the campuses.
         2. An exhaustive list of alternative ways in which students can demonstrate learning by credit are included in current policy (in a Coded Memorandum).
         3. The new legislation for the Community Colleges may impact our policy.
      ii. All new and existing CSU policies will reside on [https://calstate.policystat.com/](https://calstate.policystat.com/)
      iii. Question: how will campuses faculty leaders be informed when policies arise or change? Answer: we will continue to inform campuses but will need to address the mechanisms by which we do this.
   b. ASCSU Update
      i. Has made a recommendation regarding a 3-unit Ethnic Studies course or course overlay which has been vetted by the campuses.
      ii. As a result of postponement of GWAR exams, faculty are concerned about a potential removal of the GWAR requirement.
   c. CCCCO Report—No report
   d. ASCCC Report (Michelle Bean)
      i. Are busy working on emergency policies and procedures.
      ii. ICAS is continuing to meet, engage in advocacy, etc..
      iii. ASCCC is continuing to focus on their three priorities for the year.
         1. Faculty and Staff Diversity
         2. Shared Governance
         3. Guided Pathways
a. A comprehensive overview of guided pathways (identifying pathways to completion and assisting students to complete) was provided to the committee.

iv. The ESL component of AB 705 is being explored.
   1. ESL students have 3 years to complete freshman composition.

v. Links of Potential Interest
   1. ASCCC president's update page: http://createsend.com/t/y-08DD892A6CBA17FA
   2. Guided Pathways Canvas modules resource page: https://ccconlineed.instructure.com/courses/2634/modules

e. Articulation Officers (Tiffany Tran)
   i. ASSIST is working on
      1. Providing major and department views of articulation information
      2. A list of user requests/initiatives prioritized by the Policy Advisory Committee at its last meeting two weeks ago.
   ii. The CIAC meeting is likely to be cancelled.
   iii. We are looking at aligning TMCs with UC Major Pathways for 7 large majors—this would likely mean including IGETC rather than GE Breadth for these pathways.

6. General Comment—even as we experience emergency conditions, the expectations surrounding student learning outcomes have not changed, despite changes in learning modalities.

7. Early Start
   a. Clarification was provided about system conversations regarding moving students to enroll in and complete appropriate coursework. Guided self-placement was a tangential topic that was touched upon at the recent system meeting.

8. GE Resubmission
   a. The subcommittee is working on a policy recommendation. It would include a 10 day window for resubmission of courses with “minor” issues (non-content related; missing checkmark, other technical details).

   https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=201920200AB1460
   a. Discussion Topics Included
      i. Potential CCC companion bill
         https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201920200AB3310
      ii. The ASCSU recommendation (course, learning outcomes)
         https://www2.calstate.edu/csu-system/faculty-staff/academic-senate/resolutionssummaries/January_2020_Resolution_Summaries.pdf
      iii. Preferability of a lower-division requirement (with completion flexibility for some STEM majors)
      iv. Overlay vs. stand-alone course
      v. Feasibility of the current list of course outcomes
      vi. Feasibility of implementation dates
      vii. Impact on high-unit majors
      viii. Potential double-counting (Area, government, US history)
      ix. Existence of courses potentially fulfilling this requirement on CCC campuses
      x. Difficulty small colleges might have in implementing an Ethnic Studies requirement
b. We also discussed developing a set of guidelines/issues to be considered if an executive order were to be drafted for inclusion of Ethnic Studies in the curriculum.
   i. Might it be putting the cart before the horse given the dynamic nature of the legislative process?
   ii. The CSU campus survey on Ethnic Studies requirement design and implementation was criticized.
      1. We have little confidence it represents true campus consensus.
      2. Discussions on campus were often heated among faculty and students.
      3. Flexibility in implementation seems to be a common theme.
      4. Concerns were raised about subverting normal curricular processes if the ES requirement were implemented as indicated.
   iii. There are potentially profound implications for
      1. Transfer
      2. ADTs
      3. High unit majors
   iv. Can we work cooperatively across segments, with our senates, with CFA?
   v. Chair Van Selst is drafting a set of issues/potential impacts relative to an Ethnic Studies requirement for consideration by the group going forward.

10. Campus Flexibility in GE implementation
   a. We discussed how we can get more clarity to the campuses about in which areas campuses have flexibility in implementing EO 1100 requirements.
   b. A list of potential questions to be addressed:
      i. Can campuses require students to take a course from a sub-Area (e.g., philosophy as a part of Area C, sociology as a part of Area D)?
      ii. Can Area E be fully or partially fulfilled by an upper-division course?
      iii. Can FYE courses be accommodated in Area E?
      iv. Can students be required to complete courses with an overlay such as diversity, a theme, reinforcing a skill?
      v. Can GE courses have prerequisites? Be sequenced?
      vi. Can we have a residency requirement for GE?
      vii. Are there limits on double-counting?
      viii. Can a campus decide not to double-count AI courses?
      ix. Finally, who has the authority to decide questions like these? Where is that granted? What role does GEAC have in providing advice on these decisions?

11. Affiliate Contact List for GE-related Questions/Issues
   a. Such a list would be very valuable.
   b. It might include contact information for the campus GE Director, GE Committee Chair, etc.
   c. The appropriate academic administrator and campus senate chair could be consulted in putting together the list
      i. GE assessment coordinator
      ii. Person responsible for GE catalog content
      iii. GE advisory committee chair
      iv. Faculty GE director

12. The meeting was adjourned at 3:40pm.