

**CSUF General Education
Program Performance Review
2012 – 2013
Self Study
1 September 2013**

Contents and Elements of the Self-study

I.	Introduction	2
II.	Program Mission, Goals and Environment	2
III.	Program Description and Analysis	2
IV.	Major Developments in General Education at CSUF, 2001-2013	4
V.	Documentation of Student Academic Achievement and Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes	6
VI.	Faculty	9
VII.	Student Support and Advising	10
VIII.	Resources and Facilities	13
IX.	Long-term Plans and Issues	14
X.	Appendices	15

I. Introduction

The General Education (GE) Program at California State University, Fullerton (CSUF) includes lower-division and upper-division courses offered by nearly four dozen departments and programs across eight colleges. GE courses have been developed by individual instructors and by programs and departments over the last several decades. Recertification of GE courses takes place periodically to ensure that the curriculum evolves in step with changes in best practices in General Education and with changes in the GE Program's learning goals. Total enrollment in GE courses in 2012-2013 exceeded 122,000 students. The student-faculty ratio averaged across all sections was under 40. Despite the large scale of the program, it has never been scrutinized by a Program Performance Review. This self-study was undertaken by the General Education Committee, a standing committee of the CSUF Academic Senate, in the hopes that we may affirm our shared sense of what the GE Program does well and shed light on areas that may be well served by improvements or changes.

II. Program Mission, Goals and Environment

The GE program at CSUF is governed by Chancellor's Office [Executive Order 1065](#), [UPS 411.200](#) and [UPS 411.201](#).

As stated in the 2011-13 University Catalog, page 48,

The General Education program at Cal State Fullerton is the basis of a university education. It is the foundation upon which each and every major is built. The goal of the campus is to provide a well-rounded citizen, not only of the region and the nation but the world as well. Thus, this broad-ranging curriculum has been carefully designed to ensure that every graduate is exposed to current thinking and scholarship that hopefully will provide a lifetime of appreciation of the liberal arts and sciences, as well as the ability to grow intellectually, ethically, morally and technologically well into the 21st century.

The Mission and Goals of the General Education program at CSUF are amplified in [UPS 411.201](#), which states:

General education is central to a university education, and should enhance students' awareness of themselves in a complex universe, drawing upon multiple points of view. As a result of general education experience, students should acquire **knowledge** of diverse disciplinary and cultural perspectives and **skill** in comparing, contrasting, applying, and communicating effectively these perspectives in tasks considered appropriate to particular courses.

III. Program Description and Analysis

Executive Order (EO) 1065 stipulates a 48-unit distributional GE pattern for all CSU campuses. All Native CSUF students must complete a minimum of 51 semester units of

General Education courses selected in accordance with the pattern designated in UPS 411.201, which specifies an additional 3-unit course in World Civilizations beyond the requirements of EO 1065. Transfer students do not need to take these additional units if they transfer in as lower-division CSU GE certified. General Education courses must be selected from an approved list. Students should refer to the latest university online Class Schedule and Registration Guide for the most up-to-date list of approved General Education courses.

Matriculated CSUF students may complete lower-division GE requirements at a community college. In choosing equivalent courses, students must follow the CSUF GE plan and not the plan of the community college.

As required by EO 1065, all CSUF students must take nine units of General Education in residence and nine units of upper division GE. These two requirements typically overlap for most transfer students, though students who transfer upper division GE credits from a four-year university may complete the nine-unit residency requirement with courses that are not necessarily upper division.

Courses in the CSUF GE Program align with the subject area distribution requirements in EO 1065: A. Core Competencies, B. Scientific Inquiry and Quantitative Reasoning, C. Arts and Humanities, D. Social Sciences, E. Lifelong Learning and Self-Development. CSUF includes a sixth Area – Z, Cultural Diversity – based on a shared set of values defined by the University’s Mission and Goals. These Areas consist of lower division (100- and 200-level) courses in areas fundamental to a university education, and upper division (300-level) courses that draw upon, integrate, apply, and extend the knowledge and skills that are the goals of the lower division courses.

The goals of Area A, Core Competencies, are essential goals for the entire GE program. All GE courses include student-writing assignments appropriate to the course and, when compatible with the learning goals for a course, appropriate instruction in information competency. Writing assignments in GE courses involve the organization and expression of complex data or ideas and careful and timely evaluations of writing so that deficiencies are identified and suggestions for improvement and/or for means of remediation are offered. Courses incorporating information competency provide opportunities for students to find, evaluate, select, synthesize, organize, cite, and present information and arguments clearly and effectively for a variety of purposes and audiences.

New and existing courses at CSUF are added to the GE program through a process of self-nomination by departments and programs. Proposed GE courses are evaluated through a three-step process. Pursuant to modifications to the relevant University Policy Statements in Spring 2013 courses already approved for inclusion in the University Curriculum are submitted with a course change form to the Dean of the respective college where the proposing department is housed. Upon the Dean’s approval, which may include consultation with the college curriculum committee, the course is forwarded to the GE Committee which reviews the course for alignment of the course learning goals with those for General Education outlined in UPS 411.201. Upon successful review by

the GE Committee, the course is forwarded to the full Academic Senate, which votes on whether or not to forward it to the President of the University for final approval. A complete description of this process can be found in [UPS 411.200](#).

IV. Major Developments in General Education at CSUF, 2001-2013

In preparing the 2013 Program Performance Review, the GE Committee reviewed annual reports for the past decade. The GE Committee has been actively engaged in the following actions during that period of time:

Review of new and existing courses for inclusion in General Education. New courses have been accepted into the GE program in every year of the review period. There was a one-year moratorium on the approval of new courses while the GE Committee performed data collection and self-evaluation in preparation for the Program Performance Review. However, the committee continued to review course proposals as needed during the moratorium.

Recertification of existing courses in General Education. From 2002 through 2006, the GE Committee was actively engaged in systematic recertification of hundreds of GE courses. Subcommittees of the GE Committee reviewed every approved course to ensure that they genuinely addressed the learning goals for the categories in which they were certified. Recertification of a handful of carryover courses occurred in 2006-2007. The 2012-2013 GE Committee developed a process for the next recertification cycle, which will begin in Fall of 2013.

Policy Changes. The GE Committee is charged with reviewing all campus policies pertaining to the GE Program and recommending changes to the Academic Senate. The GE Committee routinely recommends minor modifications to GE policies, which can be found in Annual Reports of the committee (see Appendices). Below are listed the major policy decisions made by the GE Committee in the last decade.

All-campus GE Survey. As part of the 2008 GE moratorium, the GE Committee conducted a campus-wide survey about General Education. The results of this survey informed subsequent revisions to the GE Student Learning Objectives and the ongoing Assessment project. This survey received over 7,000 responses, representing the single largest campus-wide discussion in the history of the university to that time. The Survey results are included in Appendix 5.

Revision of GE Student Learning Outcomes. In AY 2008-2009, UPS 411.201 was revised to create new goals for student learning. This revision brought about greater alignment with area community colleges and with the CSU Executive Order, an important step towards a more transparent and comprehensible experience for incoming transfer students. The revised goals were presented to and approved by the Academic Senate on April 23, 2009. There was a two-fold revision process: first was the realignment of categories, moving from older Roman numerals specification to the more common A-E categories specified in EO 1033 (the predecessor to EO 1065), and second,

the actual rewriting of the learning goals. In the GE Committee's view, the first task could not be accomplished without also completing the second. Additionally, the GE Committee focused its efforts on maintaining the existing 51-unit GE requirement with no change in the distribution of courses.

A critical component of revising the GE learning goals was to communicate effectively, continually, and openly with the campus community. Communication efforts included a newsletter and a website to provide campus-wide information and establishing a special email account to facilitate campus feedback. Numerous meetings were held with departments and constituencies to present and discuss the revisions. One of the first meetings was with the History department to identify their preference concerning the distribution of History 110A and 110B in the new A-E categories.

Academic Affairs hosted a GE Forum to disseminate information and solicit feedback. Input from the Forum and numerous department and college meetings was encouraged and incorporated into the on-going revisions. Special presentations were given to ASI and to the Senate Executive Committee. A final H&SS meeting was held prior to presenting the revisions to the full Academic Senate. Most notable was the final vote in the Academic Senate—there were no votes against the revisions.

Double-counting. Consideration of allowing students to double count courses toward the major and toward GE began in 2009/2010 and was again raised and put to the colleges in 2010/2011 without any definitive action being taken due to the concern of its impact on FTES.. Currently, double counting is allowed in some areas. In addition there are exceptions in the College of the Arts, Engineering and Computer Science, and Natural Science and Mathematics. Moreover, courses transferred from community colleges can double-count toward the major and GE if students enter CSUF as GE or IGETC-certified. The final recommendation was that all CSUF students be allowed 3 units of lower division GE to be double-counted to provide universal equity and flexibility in their progressing to their degree. This recommendation has not yet been put into place.

Writing. In 2002-03, the GE committee concluded that essay examinations could satisfy the General Education writing requirement. That is, if the grade on the essay examination is based on both content and writing quality and if the student receives feedback on his or her writing as well and has an opportunity to profit from this feedback, then the committee feels an essay examination could meet the General Education writing requirement. It would also be important to note in the course outline how much of the examination grade was dependent on writing quality as well as indicate the learning goals met by the course (GE Committee Minutes, March 7, 2003).

Language Courses in GE. Throughout the review period there has been an ongoing discussion of the role of foreign language courses in GE. Issues under consideration include the alignment of the courses with the stated learning objectives outlined in UPS 411.201, the amount of pre-requisite coursework appropriate for GE courses, and the role of language acquisition courses in the context of EO 1033.

Second Language Requirement. In AY2004-05 the campus began a discussion of adding a second-language requirement for graduation at the university-level. Many feared that the requirement would have had a substantial impact on the GE program. This potentially significant change in university policy took up much of the committee's time in AY 04-05 and AY 05-06. Immediately after being passed by the Academic Senate, the second language requirement was suspended and after much discussion, ultimately rescinded by the Academic Senate.

Streamlining the New Course Approval Process. In 2012-2013, a representative from the GE Committee worked with an ad hoc committee of the Academic Senate to make recommendations to improve the new course approval process, which many on campus felt had become too bureaucratized and obstructive to the development of new curriculum. Significant changes to UPS 411.100 were recommended to the Academic Senate, which voted in Spring 2013 to adopt these changes. Development of an electronic submission form proposed in addition to the changes to UPS 411.100 should further alleviate impediments to course review and approval.

Variances from GE Program. Variances in the university GE pattern were recommended for approval by the GE Committee for Nursing (AY2007-08), Streamlined Teacher Education Program (STEP) (AY2004-05), Business Administration (AY 2007-08), International Business (AY 2007-08), and Computer Science (AY2005-06).

Assessment. The GE Committee has been grappling with the question of how to properly assess General Education for the entire review period. A separate Ad Hoc Assessment Subcommittee was active through AY2005-06. This effort culminated in a campus-wide call for proposals to support faculty work to develop and refine assessment strategies to measure student learning in the GE program.

V. Documentation of Student Academic Achievement and Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes

The GE Committee continues to focus on implementing and updating an assessment plan for the program. The importance of assessing the GE Learning Goals was noted in the WASC [Western Association of Schools and Colleges] 2000 Commission Action Letter. In its Report following the Capacity and Preparatory Review visit, the WASC Visiting Team noted that, "While CSUF reports that 'work has begun to align University-wide student learning outcomes with the CSUF Mission, Goals, and Strategies, the mechanisms in place to accomplish this work are not articulated.'" For the last several years, the committee has understood that part of its charge is to address this issue and to clearly articulate how the GE Learning Goals would be assessed. Therefore, drafting and implementing a GE Assessment Plan became a priority for the 2010-2011 GE Committee. The Committee unanimously approved a formal statement about the role of Assessment in General Education. This document forms the guiding principles for the GE Assessment Plan.

The GE Committee launched the first phase of the assessment program in an effort to clarify the strengths and weaknesses of the proposed plan, including its workload impact. In addition to the members of the GE Committee, the participants in the first phase included 16 faculty from six departments with classes in GE Area A (Core Competencies). These faculty participated in a one-day workshop in January 2011 led by Dr. Mary Allen, a nationally recognized expert in assessment and GE, to design a specific plan and rubric for subareas A1 (Oral Communication), A2 (Written Communication), and A3 (Critical Thinking). The faculty used these rubrics in their own classes in Spring 2011 and reconvened at the end of the semester to share their observations with the full GE committee.

The overwhelming response of the participants in phase one was that they valued the assessment task, although for a variety of different reasons. The faculty most appreciated the opportunity to talk to colleagues in other departments about what they do in their respective classes and discovered that there was much more coherence and continuity across classes than they anticipated. The faculty felt that they were approaching the GE learning goals from very different perspectives, but were achieving the same fundamental outcomes.

The faculty representing GE subarea A2, Written Communication, used the opportunity to create a rubric that could be used in multiple assessments. Starting with the rubric designed by the Writing Task Force 1 and 2, they adapted the criteria to suit the needs of assessing writing in GE as well as to explore the developmental progress of majors within the department. Links to the relevant rubrics are included in the Appendix. The results of the assessment indicate that while the writing of first-year students is generally at a level we would expect, it is weakest in the area of readability and correctness. In contrast, the writing of students completing the upper-division writing requirement is generally scored at the level of “proficient,” except in the area of organization and analysis.

The WASC Writing Task Force worked with the GE Committee and the Department of English, Comparative Literature, and Linguistics to create and test a single scoring rubric that can be used for assessing writing across disciplines and over time. In the Spring of 2010, the rubric was pilot tested in several sections of *Introduction to College Writing*, the writing course that addresses the learning goals of GE Area A2, written communication. Participating faculty reported that the rubric is especially useful for helping students see the characteristics of “effective” college writing in general and to distinguish one skill level from the next. In order to assess how effectively the course helps students achieve the objectives as represented by the rubric, several faculty members scored the final essay from a randomly selected group of students. For comparison, a second set of final essays, randomly selected from *Advanced College Writing*, were also scored with the rubric.

In terms of *focus, analysis and organization, and readability and style*, the essays from the introductory course were most frequently rated as “developing” and “proficient,” and those from the advanced writing class were most frequently ranked as “proficient and “advanced.” While this scoring affirms our expectations about student writing, the

findings also reveal that students in the introductory classes scored lowest in the area of *readability and style*. While it is possible that additional instruction would be helpful, given improvement rate evidenced in the advanced essays (25% proficient increased to 66% proficient), this may also be an area in which skills development occurs outside of formal writing instruction. In contrast, while the advanced writers' essays were consistently ranked as "proficient" in two of three areas, 44% of the essays were rated as being "proficient" and 33% as "developing" in the area of *analysis and organization*. Given that this is likely the final academic writing instruction that students will have at CSU Fullerton, instructors may need to give more attention to students' analytic and organizational skills. These issues will be raised with instructors as they plan their classes for future semesters and with tutors who are working with students and their drafts.

Additionally, in an effort to obtain indirect assessment data, we added questions about student writing to our most recent administration of the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) collected in Spring 2011. Both first year students' and seniors' responses to questions about the number and quality of writing assignments and the quality of writing instruction were significantly higher than those reported by the other participating campuses. Items on which CSUF student responses on the NSSE were rated significantly higher than those of students in the Consortium for the Study of Writing in College comparison group are as follows:

- Brainstormed to develop ideas before started drafting
- Talked with instructor to develop ideas before started drafting
- Talked with a classmate, friend, etc., to develop ideas before started drafting
- Received feedback from your instructor about a draft before turning in final assignment
- Received feedback from a classmate, friend, etc., about a draft before turning in final assignment
- Visited a campus-based writing/tutoring center to get help before turning assignment in
- Used an online tutoring service to get help before turning an assignment in
- Provided clear instructions describing what he or she wanted you to do
- Explained in advance what he or she wanted you to learn
- Explained in advance the criteria he or she would use to grade your assignment
- Provided a sample of completed assignment written by the instructor or a student
- Asked you to do short pieces of writing that he or she did not grade
- Asked you to give feedback to a classmate about a draft or outline the classmate had written
- Asked you to write with classmates to complete a group project
- Asked you to address a real or imagined audience such as your classmates, a politician, non-experts, etc.

The initial assessment was valuable in opening dialogue and clarifying the goals of assessment. In response to significant concern on our campus about the role of assessment, the 2010-2011 GE Committee wrote a document to clarify the purpose and

how assessment would and would not be used. Additionally, the fact that faculty were successful in their initial assessments and actually stated that they *valued* the experience marks a growing shift in the climate of the campus.

The second phase of the GE Assessment Plan began in November, 2011. GE Committee members and faculty representatives from multiple GE areas participated in a one day workshop with Dr. Mary Allen. Assessments plans and rubrics for Area B (Scientific Inquiry and Quantitative Reasoning) were to be designed during Spring 2012 and implemented in Fall 2012.

In AY 2011-2012, due to the diversity and/or number of courses in question, as well as the number of departments involved, it became apparent to members of the GE Committee that the prospect of carrying out such an ambitious assessment program was far beyond the resources available to the committee. To address this issue, in Spring 2012 an appeal was made to the Academic Senate to consider the creation of a new committee dedicated to Assessment of GE at CSUF. The Academic Senate responded in Fall 2012 with the creation of a standing Committee on Assessment & Educational Effectiveness. The piloting of new assessment plans in Areas C and D have been temporarily suspended until a strategy for assessing the GE program can be forged in collaboration with this new committee, although it is worth noting that assessment efforts in subarea C4, “Origins of World Civilization” are proceeding according to the original plan. This subarea is a special instance – a GE subarea with courses offered by a single department which has been actively pursuing assessment as part of a larger departmental commitment to measuring student learning.

VI. Faculty

Participating faculty in the GE program are drawn from the departments and programs with GE courses.

The Academic Senate General Education standing committee acts as the governing body for the GE program. The voting members of the committee are specified in UPS 100.001 (Bylaws of the Academic Senate) [BL11-22, pg 14]:

One faculty member from each college (two from Humanities and Social Sciences; one from Humanities and one from Social Sciences).

One faculty member from the Library/Athletics/CAPS/Extended Education (L/A/C/E) constituency.

All faculty members on standing committees are elected by the Academic Senate.

Ex officio members are specified as well [BL11-9, pg 15]:

Director of Academic Advising Services

Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Programs

Three students.

All students are appointed by Associated Students, Inc.

According to BL 07-1, elections to the GE Committee are to be held in the spring;

committee officers are to be elected in the spring for the following year.

The functions of the GE Committee are outlined in BL 89-2:

BL 89-2 GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE: FUNCTIONS

The functions of the General Education Committee shall be:

- a. To study, review, interpret and recommend, in consultation with the appropriate department or college, General Education programs for approval by the Academic Senate.
- b. To review and recommend the designation and classification of courses appropriate to the General Education programs.
- c. To review, on a regular basis, the existing GE-designated courses to ensure continued conformity to GE classification and quality standards; and to recommend changes in GE- designated courses to the Academic Senate after consultation with affected departments and/or colleges.
- d. To be responsible for the University Catalog and Class Schedule statements on General Education, including identification and classification of General Education courses.
- e. To cooperate with the University Curriculum Committee and with colleges, departments and programs to seek adequate offerings of General Education courses.
- f. To aid in the development, facilitation and creation of new courses and program proposals in General Education (following procedures outlined in UPS 411.100).
- g. To cooperate with college deans in creating General Education Committees in colleges, departments and/or programs, and to work with such committees in order to insure proper representation in General Education policy matters.

The continuing participation of the Director of the Academic Advising Center and the Associate Vice President of Academic Programs has been critical to the functioning of the GE Committee. Due to their permanent non-voting seats, they serve as much of the “institutional memory” and structural understanding of the GE Program.

VII. Student Support and Advising

The mission of Academic Advisement is to work in a collaborative partnership with students, a shared responsibility, where the advisor and student are equally invested in the educational process and holistic development of the student. The department of Academic Advisement supports matriculated undergraduate scholars by providing them necessary information pertaining to the general education curriculum, University policies, and graduation requirements. It is through this exchange of information that students are equipped with the knowledge, skills, and attitudes to make informed decisions about their academic career and efficiently progress toward a timely degree. Though the methods of delivery are diverse and include individual advisement sessions, interactive integrated advisement in the curriculum presentations, online video podcasts, distance learning location advisement, residence hall “in home” advisement, on-line advisement, and specialized workshops, the quality of advisement is consistently measured based on

established learning outcomes.

By participating in academic advisement opportunities from admission to graduation, students will:

Pre-First Semester

- Access and understand the portal
- Understand the opportunities available to complete remediation requirements by successfully enrolling in the Early Start Program if required
- Successfully register for and attend New Student Orientation
- Combine the information from their Advising Team and create a successful first semester schedule
- Understand the importance of a liberal education and articulate the value of the transferable skills their future employers will seek
- Begin to develop a network of support by connecting with a minimum of two students and at least 1 faculty during orientation

Freshman

- Clearly interpret the TDA [Titan Degree Audit], independently navigate the student portal, and accurately describe the components of their degree
- Review their 4 year road maps and TDA with their team of advisors
- Connect interests and goals to their major
- Demonstrate knowledge of basic university procedures and policies including: 1) how to find their registration date and how to register; 2) how to interpret holds; 3) university deadlines (add, drop, W); 4) and the application of grade forgiveness.
- Identify General Education requirements for which AP credit was previously earned
- Demonstrate an understanding of the CSUF graduation requirements ie. Minimum number of units required to graduate, minimum GPA requirement etc.
- Actively participate in the major exploration process by identifying majors that correspond with personal interests, academic skills, and abilities
- Identify appropriate advisors and participate in a minimum of one advising session with each while further investigating major requirements

Sophomore

- Effectively utilize their TDA to track degree progress
- Apply information provided during advisement sessions to successfully construct an intentional and liberal education
- Identify General Education requirements for which AP credit was previously earned
- Demonstrate an understanding of the CSUF graduation requirements ie. Minimum number of units required to graduate, minimum GPA requirement etc.
- Actively participate in the major exploration process by identifying majors that correspond with personal interests, academic skills, and abilities
- Identify appropriate advisors and participate in a minimum of one advising session with each while further investigating major requirements

Junior

- Critically review the TDA and take action when needed to ensure accurate records are maintained
- Confidently develop a clear plan for graduation while taking ownership of their education including identifying remaining courses, mapping which courses will be taken when, and that all graduation requirements will be met (minimum of 120 units, degree checkout- 85 units)
- Apply the knowledge and make informed decisions based on individual interests and personal growth potential
- Discuss graduate school opportunities and further investigate admission standards, required exams, as well as prerequisites (for interested students)
- For transfer students- Demonstrate knowledge of basic university procedures and policies including: 1) how to find their registration date and how to register; 2) how to interpret holds; 3) university deadlines (add, drop, and W); 4) possible grades including an incomplete; and 5) grade forgiveness.

Senior

- Analyze and be able to articulate the value of the liberal education they have earned from CSUF and the ways in which it has prepared them to accomplish goals after graduation
- Work collaboratively with faculty to identify internship, civic engagement and service learning opportunities
- Provide application deadlines for identified potential graduate school opportunities and request letters of recommendation from faculty

During the 2012/2013 fiscal year, the Academic Advisement Center successfully met the demand of 11,341 in-Center advising opportunities in support of undergraduate students at California State University, Fullerton. With a 93% evaluation completion rate, **99%** of respondents indicated they would recommend the Academic Advisement Center to other students.

The Advisement Team supported the WASC reaccreditation process by serving as participating members on the SE1, SE2, SE3 and SE6 Task Forces. In response to the recommendations of these committees, the campus wide Academic Advisors Professional Development Committee was created to support all academic advisors, optimize the CSUF Advising System, and enhance students' advising experiences. The committee is dedicated to increasing transparency, accountability, and accuracy within academic advisement to effectively facilitate graduation, close the achievement gap, and provide training opportunities for academic advisors and community college partners. Since maintaining a network of support and providing opportunities for professional development are essential components for success in the dynamic field of advising, in 2012 Academic Advisement hosted an annual Academic Advisors Professional Development Conference, a community college counselors conference, and multiple training opportunities for individual departments all of which successfully supported over 400 faculty, staff, and community college partners. Assessment results from each of the training components indicate that 100% of the participants recommend these opportunities continue to be offered on an annual basis.

Additionally, the department is responsible for maintaining a current list of Approved GE Courses, up to date General Education policies, specific information for Transfer Students, and strategies for students experiencing academic challenges. This information can be found on www.fullerton.edu/aac and is made available for students to ensure they have access to accurate advisement information.

VIII. Resources and Facilities

The CSUF GE program is funded by enrollments managed by departments. Administrative oversight is provided by the Associate Vice President for Academic Programs. Unlike some other CSU campuses, we do not have an assigned GE Program Coordinator or other support staff. The physical and human infrastructure for teaching GE classes is entirely provided by funding to the participating programs and departments through allocations from the Division of Academic Affairs; in some respects, the GE Committee acts in the capacity of Program Coordinator. Particularly in light of the increasing demands of the Assessment Program, the budget situation of GE warrants reconsideration.

IX. Long-term Plans and Issues

- Finalize the discussion of double-counting and forward recommended policy changes to the Academic Senate for action (See 2010-11 Annual Report for more detailed discussion).
- Coordinate with the Assessment and Educational Effectiveness Committee to revitalize efforts to assess student learning in the General Education program.
- Begin the next cycle of recertification of GE courses.
- Continue discussion of writing requirement in GE, coordinating with the Writing Board and the WASC Writing Task Force

X. Appendices

The most recent copy of this document is stored in a Public folder at Dropbox.com, at the following URL:

<http://tinyurl.com/ktjrbwq>

From that document, the following resources may be retrieved by clicking on the URLs listed below:

Appendix 1: GE Enrollments by College, 2006-2013.

<http://tinyurl.com/dymdtls>

Appendix 2: GE Course Distribution by Faculty Type, 2012-2013.

<http://tinyurl.com/c7jvehr>

Appendix 3: GE Enrollments by GE Category, 2006-2013.

<http://tinyurl.com/bss9kvw>

Appendix 4: GE Grade Distributions, 2006-2012.

<http://tinyurl.com/cfny2cu>

Appendix 5: All Campus GE Survey

Summary -- <http://tinyurl.com/n5pstes>

Comments -- <http://tinyurl.com/mroc69k>

Annual Report, 2012-2013

<http://tinyurl.com/luhxmxx>

Annual Report, 2011-2012

<http://tinyurl.com/moycyuu>

Annual Report, 2010-2011

<http://tinyurl.com/lun6u64>

Annual Report, 2009-2010

<http://tinyurl.com/majnuyf>

Annual Report, 2008-2009

<http://tinyurl.com/myzosj8>

Annual Report, 2007-2008

<http://tinyurl.com/ltx9dyf>

Annual Report, 2006-2007

<http://tinyurl.com/l4egxbm>

Annual Report, 2005-2006

<http://tinyurl.com/mzx6m9b>

Annual Report, 2004-2005

<http://tinyurl.com/le3gscq>

Annual Report, 2003-2004

<http://tinyurl.com/k2ffxqa>

Annual Report, 2002-2003

<http://tinyurl.com/lab9aqy>

Annual Report, 2001-2002

<http://tinyurl.com/lutm98y>

[Note to committee members – the tinyurl is already working – link to Appendix 5].

The following on-line resources, which have been referenced in the body of this report, and which may be accessed at the following URLs:

[Executive Order 1065:](http://www.calstate.edu/eo/eo-1065.html)

<http://www.calstate.edu/eo/eo-1065.html>

[UPS 411.200:](http://www.fullerton.edu/senate/documents/PDF/400/UPS411-200.pdf)

<http://www.fullerton.edu/senate/documents/PDF/400/UPS411-200.pdf>

[UPS 411.201](http://www.fullerton.edu/senate/documents/PDF/400/UPS411-201.pdf)

<http://www.fullerton.edu/senate/documents/PDF/400/UPS411-201.pdf>