

**GEAC Annual Report**  
**2019 – 2020 academic year**

**MEMBERS:**

Mark Van Selst, GEAC Chair, ASCSU (San Jose) [Psychology]  
John Tarjan, GEAC Vice Chair, ASCSU (Bakersfield) [Business]  
Mary Ann Creadon, ASCSU (Humboldt) [English]  
Eniko Cosmay, ASCSU (San Diego) [Linguistics]  
Julie Glass, ASCSU (East Bay) [Mathematics]  
Gary Laver, ASCSU (San Luis Obispo) [Psychology]  
Susan Schlievert, ASCSU (Fresno) [Curriculum and Instruction]  
Stephen Stambough, ASCSU (Fullerton) [Political Science]  
Michelle Bean, CCC Academic Senate (Rio Hondo) [English & Literature]  
Thalia Anagnos, CSU Campus Academic Affairs (San Jose)des  
Tyler Vaughan-Gomez, CSU Articulation Officer (San Marcos)  
Tiffany Tran, CCC Articulation Officer (Irvine Valley)  
Raul Arambula, CCC CO, Dean Intersegmental Support  
Melissa Lavitt, CSU CO, Assistant Vice Chancellor & State University Dean [interim]  
Dessiree Cuevas, CSSA (East Bay) [Psychology]

**GUESTS:**

Quajuana Chapman, CSU CO (re: various)  
Pamela Kerouac, College Board (re: Spanish w/ writing CLEP)  
Ginni May, ASCCC (re: AB 705 Report)  
Catherine Nelson, Chair ASCSU (re: various)  
Jodie Ullman, ASCSU (re: GETF report)  
Alison Wrynn, CSU CO (re: various)

The intersegmental nature of the committee has the consequence that sometimes topics stray from those strictly under the purview of GEAC and touch on other elements of intersegmental coordination. The intent is that the primary focus of GEAC remain on the effectiveness of the CSU GE program as a whole. The topics referred to or covered by GEAC during the 2019-2020 academic year included items from the prior annual report (listed first), the CSU CO specific charge to GEAC for the 2019-2020 year (listed second), Items identified during the 2019-2020 GEAC meetings (listed third), and, partly overlapping with earlier items, specific resolutions adopted by the ASCSU that are of relevance to CSU GE (listed fourth). The concluding section highlights items for consideration by GEAC over 2020-2021.

**CONCERNS IDENTIFIED IN THE 2018-2019 ANNUAL REPORT (July 2019):**

1. Credit for prior learning
2. GE-specific concerns re: the “online community college”
3. Revisions to IGETC Standards (regular review)
4. Progress towards a website on best practices in GE assessment
5. Continued implementation issues re: EO 1100 (Aug 2017) and EO 1110 (Aug 2017)
6. General Education Task Force (further actions and/or follow up)
7. Service learning and general education
8. Ethnic Studies (vis-à-vis GE)

9. AB705 (CCC math and English completion probability maximized within the first year)
10. Campus Autonomy in GE (vs. CSU CO implementation and changes in policy)

#### CSU CO Charge (AUG 2019)

1. CSU Guiding Notes
  - Review and make recommendations regarding revisions to the 2019-2020 CSU Guiding Notes to ensure that the course review criteria are based solely on CSU policy.
2. External examinations for CSU GE Breadth credit
  - Review the new CLEP Spanish Language with Writing examination and provide a recommendation on its suitability for CSU GE Breadth.
3. CSU campus-based GE assessment practices
  - Continue to identify trends in CSU campus-based GE assessment practices and develop best practice suggestions that can be shared across the CSU.
  - Locate links to existing campus-based websites on GE program assessment or develop materials that can be shared online so that campuses may learn from one another on GE assessment best practices

#### NEW ITEMS IDENTIFIED DURING THE YEAR:

1. Credit by exam (both annual review of, and evaluation of changes in)
  - CLEP: *SPANISH WITH WRITING* (adds writing content and assessment to the multiple-choice assessment) was recommended for approval
  - For both credit by exam and credit for prior learning the fate of “extra” units need to be addressed – excess unallocated units may paradoxically limit student options (restrictions on high unit changes of major, financial aid limitations, etc.)
2. GE and international programs
  - The vast majority of GE-equivalencies are “one-off” and thus no systemic action is likely appropriate at this time.
3. “inherent” inclusion of diversity into GE
  - This item tied into informing what ‘extra’ to be gained by a more specific ethnic studies requirement
  - Part of the implicit role of GE is in place-making for students re: belongingness
  - Exposure to how others think is tied to life-skills development around both working in teams as well as in perspective-taking
4. Best practices in advising and orientation for freshmen and transfers re: GE
  - This item is of continued interest to the committee but the mechanisms of communication and outreach were simply inadequate for sustained interaction.
5. Campus responses to the GETF report from MAY of 2019 were due OCT 2019
  - The GETF report was neither received nor rejected by the ASCSU; the general tenor of the responses was that there were many items in the report that were strong and well-received but that recommendations included in the report threatened to exacerbate tensions between system and campus requirements already stressed by EO1100 (AUG 2017) and EO1110 (AUG 2017).
  - The future of American Institutions was highlighted as a particular stressor for two overlapping reasons. First, the appearance of American Institutions, which is not a

formal part of GE under EO 1100 (AUG 2017), represented a deliberate attempt to integrate AI requirements with GE requirements – in the context of the campus changes being propagated under EO1100 (AUG 2017) this suggestion of the report was interpreted in a largely negative way. Second, the to-be-ascribed role for AI in GE was not clear in the GETF report itself (internally conflicting recommendations were present).

6. Equity gaps in Math and English attainment (this is reflected in some AB705-related action at the community colleges as well as within the CSU; this is a GE issues because both are part of the golden four in GE)
  - The tension between standards and degree progress (with an attempt to allow the attainment of both) was reflected in committee discussion. This will (justifiably) be an item of continued focus for GEAC.
  - This item also ties in with a recurrent discussion of CCC guided pathways that while not central to GE ties into student intentionality more generally
  - CSU Math Council is developing materials regarding principles and guidelines for GE area B4 (will be referred to both GEAC and ASCSU when complete)
7. Differential success in transfer students post-transfer (not strictly GE)
  - Although not a GE item specifically, there may be value in assessing the predictive value of various forms of student support for our native and transfer students (esp. re: golden four skills attainment).
8. Perceptions of, and design for, GE as a cohesive experience (at: transfer orientation, freshmen orientation, web descriptions, faculty understanding).
  - This is a question of central interest to GEAC, and was a central theme of the GETF. The 2019 2020 GEAC committee fell short in addressing this question. The item should be pursued further given a strengthened and supported mechanism of sustained interaction with campus constituencies.
  - The question of audience was raised re: transparency in assessment (who is the visibility of the assessment process to benefit) [SJSU student-facing “this is what GE is” page under development (NOV 2019)]
9. Campus flexibility in GE (a recurrent issue at every meeting of 2019-2020)
  - What are the bounds of the CSU CO-based constraint on campus GE overlays or inclusion of campus-specific elements in GE?
    - Unclear basis in policy or practice for this new behavior (unclear and contradictory advice)
    - Intent is to not disadvantage transfer students
    - Faculty increasingly feel that they do not control the curriculum re: GE
    - Ongoing questions:
      - Is it permissible for a campus to require a FYE, diversity, or other campus-specific elements within their GE requirements?
      - Can sequencing be incorporated to reinforce skills or other outcomes/reflections?
      - Is campus upper-division uniqueness possible?
      - What is the potential impact of Cal State Online?

- Can students bypass campus requirements via forced 'transferability' of upper division GE requirements?
- What is the impact on WSCUC-required assessments given that the commonality for many campuses is their shared upper division requirements?

#### 10. Annual GE Review

- Now an almost entirely online process and the system-level bugs are being worked out
- There was a request for, and action on, building an appeal process for GE denials (note: although this is a "one line" item; this is a major change in GE evaluation and was a high point for intersegmental coordination which should have good student success outcomes)
  - An earlier driver for this resubmission process was to have the reviewers be clear for the reasons for denial (the resubmission process will restrict itself to relatively minor issues and not permit wholesale resubmissions)

#### 11. Ethnic Studies

- Although the majority of the work on establishing what is desirable as an ethnic studies requirement (per the ASCSU) was developed with appropriate disciplinary and campus outreach, GEAC has a continuing role on three fronts regarding ethnic studies:
  - (i) GEAC should play a role in the definition, articulation, and system-level evaluation of the requirement ("ETHNIC STUDIES AND SOCIAL JUSTICE" per May 2020 proposed Title 5 language to the CSU Board of Trustees). As a new area of GE, there has to be a standard for defining the appropriate scope, flexibility, and system wide consistency of the requirement as instantiated in particular coursework (ASCSU and CSU CO involvement in establishing Title 5 language, executive order clarifying language, and in developing appropriate content for the CSU Guiding Notes should involve input from GEAC) [although reflecting deep legislative intrusion into the curriculum AB1460 and AB3310 could both also contribute to the definition of the CSU GE requirement]. At a minimum GEAC will need to draft the necessary additions to the CSU GE Guiding Notes;
  - (ii) The articulation evaluation process will need to be carefully considered (undoubtedly recursive and somewhat 'crowdsourced' in developing appropriate content), and
  - (iii) The currently-recommended displacement of 3 units of GE from Area D may mean a push on many campuses to recast existing area D courses as fulfilling different GE areas – when this happens at a CCC the review will use the normal system-level GE evaluation processes.

#### 12. ASSIST

- Long-delayed functionality is appearing in ASSIST
- One focus is to have articulations made more visible to students (complicated by the differential role of courses with otherwise similar names or functions within the major vs within GE)

#### 13. Open Educational Resources

- Given that some of the typically-GE courses are often very high-enrollment, it is likely that OER resources exist for these students. Adoption of OER resources for these

classes may have a particularly large fiscal impact provided that the resources themselves are judged to be of high quality and appropriate for adoption for their intended use.

14. CCC interest in stressing UC Pathways as a guide for ADT coursework

- The primary GE issue is obviously that the UC Pathways use IGETC whereas the ADTs generally use CSU GE (and thus already a difference in coursework expectations [oral communication is not a requirement of IGETC but is a CSU upper division transfer requirement])
- There are other non-GE concerns about if the often-additional requirements for the UC pathways would act as a barrier to student success if either by adoption or advising the 'stricter' pathway became the norm.
- It was presented that seven TMCs have a set of courses that could meet both UC Pathways and ADTS (it is unclear if this involved substitution of calculus for business calculus, etc)

15. COVID-19 Adaptation

- even as we experience emergency conditions, the expectations surrounding student learning outcomes have not changed, despite changes in learning modalities.
- Across the CSU, for the SPRING 2020 semester, restrictions on the use of CR/NC towards degree attainment have loosened somewhat as have timelines to request a shift in grading system (from graded to CR/NC).

16. Affiliate contact list for GE

- In essence, it is desirable to have a GE liaison for each campus.
- It might include contact information for the campus GE Director, GE Committee Chair, etc.
- The appropriate academic administrator and campus senate chair could be consulted in putting together the list
  - GE assessment coordinator
  - Person responsible for GE catalog content
  - GE advisory committee chair
  - Faculty GE director
- This request, mirroring other "discipline affinity group" type email lists has the problem of a lack of resources. It is envisioned that a joint CO/GEAC request over the summer (beginning of the fall semester) may be the best way to try to find the right people (via campus provosts).

ASCSU Resolutions pertaining to General Education (Grouped by topic)

1. Standards for Quantitative Reasoning throughout the curriculum

- [Increasing Access, Success, and Completion Through Additional Preparation in Quantitative Reasoning](#) (AS-3394-19/APEP)
- [Advising High School Juniors Intending to Enroll in the California State University \(CSU\) to Enroll in a Mathematics-Reinforcing Course in their Senior Year](#) (AS-341-20/APEP)

2. Towards the inclusion of a new requirement in General Education (Ethnic Studies)

- [Towards Implementation of an Ethnic Studies System Requirement](#) (AS-3397-19/AA)

- [Recommended Implementation of a California State University \(CSU\) Ethnic Studies Requirement](#) (AS-3403-19/AA)
  - [Response to the CSU Chancellor's Office Memo on Recommended Implementation of a California State University \(CSU\) Ethnic Studies Requirement \(March 17, 2020\)](#) (AS-3420-20/AA)
3. Concerns that the primacy of the role of the Academic Senate CSU in establishing curriculum and graduation standards for the CSU is being undermined by agents both internal and external to the CSU; the appropriateness of disciplinary consultation
    - [Re-affirming the Role of the Academic Senate of the California State University \(ASCSU\) and Campus Senates in Establishing Curriculum and Graduation Requirements](#) (AS-3421-20/FGA)
    - [Respecting and Engaging Disciplinary Expertise](#) (AS-3425-20/FA)
    - [Exploring Common Pathways for Transfer to the California State University \(CSU\) and the University of California \(UC\)](#) (AS-3413-20/APEP)
  4. In transfer for high lower-division unit majors, the desire that students not be harmed by the choice to delay some elements of GE completion where such a delay would allow better preparation for upper division coursework and expedited graduation
    - [Endorsement of Criteria for Chemistry and Physics Model Curricula \(MC\) for Transfer to Receive the Same Admission Advantage as the Transfer Model Curricula \(TMC\)](#) (AS-3415-20/APEP)
  5. The national movement to treat education as a private, rather than public, good threatens to over-focus degree production on job-preparation (without diminishing that GE outcomes are reflective of the capabilities that are desirable in job candidates)
    - [Academic Senate CSU \(ASCSU\) Endorsement of the American Association of University Professors \(AAUP\) Statement "In Defense of Knowledge and Higher Education"](#)

#### GOING FORWARD:

1. Guiding Notes (review and updating)
2. GE review (including new resubmission/appeals processes)
3. Credit by examination
4. Credit for prior learning (systematic GE considerations)
5. Ethnic Studies Implementation
  - Incorporation into GE
  - Plan to support additional GE review re: new requirement
  - Standards and transferability
6. How is GE represented by the campus?
  - To freshmen
  - To transfer students
7. Programmatic assessment of GE
8. Virtual Labs (ongoing system support)

- Faculty Development Resource Availability (Dr. Emily Magruder;  
<https://www.calstate.edu/itl>)
  - May 29 2020 “Designing virtual labs for the Fall”
  - ITL “CSU Symposium on teaching and learning” CSU: Fullerton Sept 25-26, 2020
- 9. Developing a GE affinity list (or lists) [and encouraging an annual update process]
  - This request, mirroring other “discipline affinity group” type email lists has the problem of a lack of resources. It is envisioned that a joint CO/GEAC request over the summer (beginning of the fall semester) may be the best way to try to find the right people (via campus provosts)

Prepared MAY 22, 2020 / MVS