# Cal State Fullerton

# External Review

## Table of Contents

# Program Performance Review for the CSU:Fullerton GE program

PPR Site Visit Review Team:

· Mark Van Selst, SJSU

· Danny Paskin, CSULB

· Merri Lynn Casem, CSU Fullerton

The general format for each section of the report (organized by themes) will be:

| |
|---|
| TITLE |
| DESCRIPTION OF ISSUE |
| FEEDBACK or COMMENTARY |
| RECOMMENDED ACTIONS (will include IDENTIFIED RESOURCES OR REQUIREMENTS) |

# STRUCTURE: COMPLIANCE WITH SYSTEM POLICIES ON GE and UNIQUE ASPECTS AT CSU:FULLERTON

TITLE: Structural Compliance with CSU GE

DESCRIPTION OF ISSUE: does the CSU:Fullerton program align with CSU System Policies?

FEEDBACK or COMMENTARY: largely yes, with three possible exceptions.

Issue #1: The historic use of AREA E to meet the upper division GE unit requirements (CSU Upper Division GE requires three units from each of areas B, C, and D). There do not appear to be any system restrictions on using upper division coursework to meet lower division GE requirements but it is often noted that upper division coursework requires prerequisites that may not be appropriate in meeting the intentions driving lower division GE objectives.

Issue #2: The addition of Area Z (Cultural Diversity) overlay is not required by system policies but is not seen by the external reviewers as in conflict with system policies. Depending on how Area Z is implemented (sections 400.200, 400.201, 400.202, 400.203 ) it may or may not be required for students accepted into a program via transfer with an Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT)-based degree (SB1400, STAR Act). Area Z is generally taught at the upper division and in Area C, D, or E. Any student having completed lower division GE requirements, cannot be held to additional lower division GE requirements after transfer, but would be held to graduation and Upper Division GE requirements.

Issue #3: Unit Distribution Changes (UPS 400.202 IV B 1). These changes to unit distributions should be explicitly made available on a one-off basis to students but not approved systemically without system level authorization for such variance (see what was previously EO-1100)

Issue #4: Ethnic Studies. Given the recency of the reduction in Area D from 9 lower division units to 6 lower division units and the various constraints and criteria for inclusion of a course in AREA F (Ethnic Studies) the reviewers were interested if there were any concerns re: the implementation at CSU:Fullerton. It was represented to the review team that the implementation of Area F at CSU:Fullerton has been working smoothly and in compliance with CSU System expectations with the effective use of cross-listing and effective evaluation protocols.

Issue #5: Upper Division GE (content). The prior review focused heavily on the evolution of GE Pathways. These seem to have been largely discontinued, in part due to funding FTES constraints and conflicts.

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:

Issue #1: review any remaining upper division courses qualified for lower division GE coverage (cf., Areas A, E, & F) for consideration of moving them to the lower division (some may remain in the upper division due to programmatic needs). Area F (or other) approvals for upper division courses used for lower division GE can induce confusion about whether such courses meet CSU GE upper division GE unit requirements. An additional recommendation is to review upper division GE courses in AREAs B, C, and

D to ensure that they require a prerequisite of completion of the Golden Four (Oral Communication, Written Communication, Critical Thinking, and Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning) in order to comply with the CSU Policy on GE.

Issue #2: clearly define overlay Z (Area Z) as an overall GE campus requirement ( note: "*Subject-area certification does not exempt students from completing unmet lower-division graduation requirements that may exist outside of the GE requirements at the campus awarding the degree.*" -- CSU Policy on GE); clarify the use of transfer courses to meet upper division B, C, D requirements in the absence of meeting Area Z requirements (is implicit but could benefit from a clarifying statement – would a student be exempt from Area Z if they transfer from another CSU with UDGE complete prior to transfer? ("*Upper-division GE requirements satisfied at one CSU campus shall be accepted as fulfilling the same requirements at the CSU campus granting the baccalaureate degree.*")

Issue #3: CSU policy on GE clearly requests campuses to have a policy on exemptions. This policy appears to meet that need. Consider clarifying this policy to highlight the individual vs programmatic nature of the CSU:Fullerton exemption process.

Issue #4: Ethnic Studies. No recommendation. Implementation appears to be exemplary.

Issue #5 (a): GE Pathways. The use of linked or sequenced courses in GE can be a high impact practice that can lead to a more cohesive experience for the student. GE Pathways represents one such attempt. The funding/FTES inter-departmental concerns of compensation for GE is a common one. The sometimes proposed solution of having a separate GE college or agency can balkanize GE and, in particular, harm smaller departments that rely on GE offerings for much of their support and outreach to potential majors (some majors are "donors" of students to other majors whereas other majors are "recipients" of major changes after enrollment/transfer). No recommendation.

---

TITLE: Degree Audit

DESCRIPTION OF ISSUE: the four (and soon to be more) possible GE patterns that a student might be held to were explicitly mentioned in several different settings.

FEEDBACK or COMMENTARY: The changes to CSU:Fullerton GE package as a result of the changes to CSU System Policies on GE (was EO1100, now policystat), and the subsequent changes to accommodate the legislative addition (AB1460, 2020) of Ethnic Studies will soon (2025) be followed by the Cal-GETC lower division GE package for transfer students that was developed to meet another legislative mandate (AB928, 2022). Advisors (esp. at the department level) are unlikely to be fully versed in the nuances of catalog rights and in assessing different GE packages.

IDENTIFIED RESOURCES OR REQUIREMENTS: Strengthen the GE degree audit – there are several different GE pathways that a student might be on and it will be important that the students GE package default to an appropriate catalog year but be changeable (San Jose State University has an implementation of the degree audit that both sets the appropriate catalog year for GE and also allows the ability to bifurcate GE and program catalog years). This is a potentially expensive (time and resources) recommendation.

TITLE: Overlay Z (Cultural Diversity)

DESCRIPTION OF ISSUE: Can potentially add units, often delaying graduation

FEEDBACK or COMMENTARY: One of the unique characteristics of the CSU: Fullerton GE requirements, compared to other CSUs, is its requirement of students completing a 3-unit "overlay" campus-specific graduation requirement on culture diversity (Area Z). Although commendable for embedding cultural diversity within its curriculum, the overlay - "a requirement that's not in GE and not in the major" - is said to be a common cause of delays in graduation for seniors.

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS: confirm through data analyses, through the Office of Institutional Assessment and Planning, the validity of this claim. If confirmed, consider one or more of several options: (i) eliminating the requirement (least ideal approach), (ii) embedding the outcomes into other (major or GE) requirements, (iii) increase the adoption of the Titan Degree Audit by students (assuming Overlay Z is appropriately implemented in the audit), (iv) address the issue (even if tentatively) through advising, and/or (v) through a student-centered informational campaign that better explains the requirement and how to fulfill it (Associated Students Inc. could potentially assist in the development and implementation of such a campaign).

---

TITLE: American Institutions

DESCRIPTION OF ISSUE: overlay with GE

FEEDBACK or COMMENTARY: The CSU policy on AI is modified by CSU Policy on GE to potentially allow double counting ("*CSU campuses may permit up to 6 semester units or 8 quarter units taken to meet the United States History, Constitution and American Ideals Requirement*") to allow GE courses to also satisfy AI requirements. CSU Fullerton policy on AI is 400.210 -- this policy allows 3 units of GE to double-count with AI.

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS: consider developing upper division GE courses that also meet AI requirements - may allow additional programs to become compliant with ADT transfer pathways via double-counting AI with UDGE as it would allow AI requirements to be overlaid with UDGE for transfer students (useful since ADT-based transfer students are not required to meet AI requirements prior to transfer and the soon-to-be implemented Cal-GETC package will be common to the UC and CSU. The UC considers AI to have been met for graduates from California High Schools and thus may be de-emphasized in advising within the California Community College system potentially leading to an increase in the number of students who will not have met the AI requirements prior to transfer.

# ASSESSMENT

TITLE: Information Literacy (WASC standard for assessment)

DESCRIPTION OF ISSUE: Information Literacy is listed as a WASC standard but is not explicitly identified within CSU GE or IGETC requirements (nor does it appear to be explicitly called out in the CSU:Fullerton GE standards).

FEEDBACK or COMMENTARY: Upper Division GE is the common experience of CSU:Fullerton students and is where the WASC assessments occur. The PPR for GE (Fall 2022) and comments from the library faculty during the site visit seem to place the burden of information literacy education on library staff and library-based module development.

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS: Consider building an intentional sequence of development for Information literacy within the CSU:Fullerton GE requirements (including reinforcement in the upper division GE requirements), potentially explicitly incorporating information literacy requirements.

---

TITLE: Specificity of Outcomes/Goals

DESCRIPTION OF ISSUE: The earlier GE review identified a failure of the prior goal attainment to be effectively assessed. Five new programmatic GE outcomes were established. These outcomes yield better assessment processes.

FEEDBACK or COMMENTARY: Commendable

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS (will include IDENTIFIED RESOURCES OR REQUIREMENTS): monitor for effective assessments to continue (maybe by timeline or public reporting requirements).

---

TITLE: Intentionality in GE

DESCRIPTION OF ISSUE: How does a student come to understand GE (see PPS p.18) ? The common answer to "what is GE?" is that it is a list of courses that you have to take for your first two years. Missing from the answers provided by the freshman math class the reviewers visited was any mention of the overall goals or intentions behind the GE requirement other than "to be introduced to other possible majors"

FEEDBACK or COMMENTARY: A perennial issue is how to transmit the value of the whole GE package. It was noted that a more nuanced understanding of the value of GE was present for the upper division students who met with the review team but evident in our meeting with the first-year students in the second semester mathematics/quantitative reasoning (Area B4) course. The evidence for a developmental perspective is a positive indicator for the value of the CSU: Fullerton GE program, but the early lack of intentionality should be addressed. The reviewers recognize that some instructional faculty may not know or appreciate GE structures and thus may inappropriately reinforce student beliefs or attitudes.

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS: include outreach about the goals and intentions of GE in workshops for faculty such as those proposed for "closing the loop" on assessment by the Faculty Learning Communities (FLCs).

---

TITLE: Diversity of GE Experiences

DESCRIPTION OF ISSUE: double counting may reduce the value/diversity of GE as experienced by the student.

FEEDBACK or COMMENTARY: CSU:Fullerton changed their implementation of GE to allow double counting GE and the major (EO 1100 revision, AUG 2017). Taken to the extreme, students may have a high portion of their major coursework met by General Education offerings that may not be commonly available to students in other major programs given prerequisites or enrollment restrictions. To the extent that this limits the diversity of the classroom (all ENGR majors, etc.), this could be problematic in the development of an appreciation for the value of alternate viewpoints.

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS (will include IDENTIFIED RESOURCES OR REQUIREMENTS): Given how relatively recently the requirement GE credit can overlap with Major credit this is an issue worth following although there is no other recommendation at this time.

---

TITLE: Instability in the structure of CSU GE

DESCRIPTION OF ISSUE: Change to CSU GE requirements redirect energy from assessment to instead engage in policy revision.

FEEDBACK or COMMENTARY: The PPS identifies four separate changes to CSU GE requirements and the additional possibility of further change prompted by AB928 (Student Transfer Achievement Reform Act of 2021) and the forthcoming requirement for transfer students to have a singular GE pathway for the UC and CSU (the 34 unit "Cal-GETC" pattern as approved by ICAS Feb 2023). These changes and required revisions to campus GE policies redirect much of the effort that could have been directed at assessment to instead focus on campus policy revision.

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:

recommendation 1: Given the last two major upheavals in GE were prompted by legislative action it is likely beyond the scope of this report to address timeline and the requisite changes. On the other hand, the categories and definitions of the GE areas have remained largely unchanged (with some unit variations) and thus continued assessment efforts are justified.

recommendation 2: an effective degree audit system should be able to handle GE pattern by catalog year. it may be advantageous to allow the system to bifurcate GE catalog year from major program catalog year (SJSU has an implementation that follows this model). Advisors will still need to be aware of the differences (pros and cons) for various possible GE patterns for use in advising students.

recommendation 3: Although it is beyond the scope of the review team's knowledge, the "vanilla" Peoplesoft implementation for campus degree audits should include a generic CSU GE evaluation that

accommodates catalog year variations and that can be tailored to fit individual campus needs (overlay Z, sequence- or major-based approvals). If such a structure does not yet exist we recommend that CSU: Fullerton request such an implementation from the Office of the Chancellor to take advantage of economies of scale and also offload some of the costs associated with programming degree audits to the Office of the Chancellor.

TITLE: Faculty Learning Communities as an Assessment Tool

DESCRIPTION OF ISSUE: Current GE assessment follows the five pragmatic outcomes defined in the PPS document at a nominal rate of 1/year.

FEEDBACK or COMMENTARY: This is a good practice and should be retained.

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS (will include IDENTIFIED RESOURCES OR REQUIREMENTS):

Recommendation 1: It may be advisable to expand the role of the FLC to "close the loop" on assessment and present out at an end of year workshop for the instructors teaching in the area of assessment to spread best practices and work towards greater consistency and comprehension of the goals to be achieved. Additionally, rubrics, tools, and other resources may be housed in the office for faculty development or in another stable home. The expanded function (may require additional support (e.g., faculty co-lead for the FLC) .

Recommendation 2: it may be worth considering tying the GE program review cycle to the WASC review (likely predating the WASC report by a year or so) -- this could lead to less replicated effort and better direction for the programmatic review.

TITLE: Modality of Instruction

DESCRIPTION OF ISSUE: Concerns have been raised about the fidelity of online versus in-person classes (and asynchronous vs. synchronous).

FEEDBACK or COMMENTARY: This is a common concern and should be addressed in the normal WASC or other full-campus evaluation processes.

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS: This is an issue that is well beyond GE alone.

TITLE: Biology / Engineering Critical Thinking Waiver

DESCRIPTION OF ISSUE: Assessment of waived GE content

FEEDBACK or COMMENTARY: When a program asks for a Chancellor's Office GE Waiver it is generally a waiver for transfer admission without the golden four (often critical thinking). The typical case is that the program argues that the content is otherwise covered within the major. If the content is covered in the major then it should be assessed.

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS: Ensure that GE assessments are performed for "content-covered" waivers for those programs that were awarded a Chancellor's Office GE waiver on the basis that the content was covered via major program coursework and/or other program requirements.

# IMPLEMENTATION

TITLE: GE Bottlenecks

DESCRIPTION OF ISSUE: are there identified bottlenecks that limit GE completion?

FEEDBACK or COMMENTARY:

issue #1: Possible bottlenecks in the attainment of GE can stem from the requirement that all students complete writing and mathematics/quantitative reasoning in their first year -- Early Start/ preparation sequences for mathematics (ALEKS) can work for the STEM disciplines and may be recommended based on the strong prerequisite sequences present in many of the STEM programs. First year biology has also been identified as a STEM-based bottleneck course given its broad use across science majors.

issue #2: High Drop/Withdrawal/Failure (DFW) courses; repeats can limit opportunities and create additional demand.

issue #3: Recommended course sequences (course planners) may inadvertently create bottlenecks for high enrollment majors (e.g., recommending oral communication in the first semester as a de facto first year experience / orientation to college due to its high engagement and low class size).

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS (will include IDENTIFIED RESOURCES OR REQUIREMENTS):

TITLE: Lecturer Faculty versus Tenure/Tenure-Track Faculty use in teaching GE

DESCRIPTION OF ISSUE: Lecturer faculty may be over-represented in GE instruction

FEEDBACK or COMMENTARY: The role for adjunct faculty is often debated. While it is true that many lecturer faculty have multi-year full time or near full time multi-year contracts and may serve as program directors or other leadership roles, it is also true that some of these faculty members (i) may not know their teaching assignment until the last minute, (ii) have no professional development regarding General Education, and (iii) may be employed at several different sites. It is also true of tenured and tenure-track faculty members that they may not have any professional development regarding GE and/or (especially in an era of additional attention to under-enrolled courses) a teaching assignment that may change at the last minute. Arguments can be made that tenured or tenure-track faculty should be integral to introductory major coursework, in highlighting the diversity of disciplinary perspectives encountered in GE, and throughout the major including capstone or culminating experiences. The CSU reliance on lecturer faculty ensures that all of these domains will not all be extensively covered from the tenure/tenure-track ranks.

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS (will include IDENTIFIED RESOURCES OR REQUIREMENTS): The underlying issue seems to be more about professional development and access to resources supporting GE

TITLE: "Ownership" of GE areas by departments/programs

DESCRIPTION OF ISSUE: a systemwide tension exists for some areas of GE to be more or less restricted to faculty from one or from very few disciplines.

FEEDBACK or COMMENTARY: The constraint that Ethnic Studies (Area F) be offered by, or cross-listed to, an Ethnic Studies prefix is a strong example of such a constraint. For most GE areas the determination of appropriateness of the course is based on the course syllabus and review by a set of faculty who are experts in the domain who make a recommendation to the larger GE committee. In domains such as the Oral Communication or the American Institutions requirements different campuses have sought different solutions (fully restricting to fully open). CSU:Fullerton has some implementations that are program specific (American Institutions) and others that are open to qualified courses from other departments (oral communication).

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS: no recommendation. This is a campus-specific implementation decision with the caveat that transfer coursework should count for the relevant domain provided that it is CSU GE certified (technically CSU GE requires area certification but course-by-course transfer is common).

TITLE: Recertification being folded into GE Committee's duties

DESCRIPTION OF ISSUE: Currently, efforts for recertification of previously approved GE classes are listed under the duties of the GE Committee.

FEEDBACK or COMMENTARY: The GE Committee is already in charge of a number of high priority, high workload tasks. Expecting the same committee, composed of 15 members, including students and ex-officio administrators, is obstructive.

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS: Creation of a separate University Committee devoted specifically to recertifying previously-approved GE classes. This committee would also be in charge of defining and updating the model and cycle for the recertification process.

TITLE: Creation/hiring of a GE Director or GE Coordinator

DESCRIPTION OF ISSUE: The university lacks a person whose task is primarily to oversee specifically and assist with GE on campus.

FEEDBACK or COMMENTARY: The duties of a "GE Czar" on campus are currently folded into the job of the Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Academic Programs. That person, however, oversees a number of vital tasks at CSU: Fullerton. A GE Director or GE Coordinator, on the other hand, would be able to more closely focus on GE, assisting and acting as a link between faculty, administrators and staff, as well as the GE Committee, on "all matters GE". The usefulness of this proposed role was highlighted by a number of different parties with which this group talked.

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS: Hiring of either a GE Director (a full-time staff person specifically devoted to the many aspects of GE on campus), or a GE Coordinator (a faculty member with extensive knowledge of GE, with partial release – often 6 WTUs) to coordinate GE effort on campus.

---

TITLE: Faculty use of GE assessment data

DESCRIPTION OF ISSUE: Although data is available for assessment of GE, faculty often do not have the time, space or room to do a proper, purposeful examination of this data.

FEEDBACK or COMMENTARY: Allow faculty to better access and use the already-available GE assessment data could lead to improvements in both the GE classes themselves as well as on the use of university resources (such as scheduling, rooms) devoted to GE on campus.

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS: Creation of structural mechanisms that'd allow faculty to better use this data. On the one hand, that would mean better access of faculty in general to this data, through a repository that's easily accessible and with which faculty are familiar, as well as campus workshops or similar to present this data to faculty. On the other hand, it potentially involves additional workload for faculty which raises the issue of compensation and/or incentives.

---

TITLE: Information on GE Certification

DESCRIPTION OF ISSUE: Lack of a central, complete guide on GE certification.

FEEDBACK or COMMENTARY: Although the GE Committee should be commended on its great and timely work certifying GE classes, the university currently lacks a central, readily-available and complete guide on what's involved in certifying a GE class, including the proper procedure. As cited in our meeting with the GE Committee, Faculty members are often guided to reach out to the AVP for Undergraduate Academic Programs, instead of a self-serve resource. Moreover, the only current webpage that discusses GE certification ("FAQ for Faculty") directs interested faculty to UPS 411.100, which does not discuss GE certification, instead of UPS 411.200, which does.

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS: The University in general and the GE Committee especially should create a more readily-available and thorough online guide that explains GE certification, including procedures and requirements that are updated as needed. Such a guide, with a link as simple as "fullerton.edu/ge" or similar, could also be put under the purview of a GE Director or GE Coordinator, if such a position is created. See csulb.edu/gegc as an example of such an online guide. Otherwise, in the least, the current FAQ page must be (continuously) updated and checked for accuracy.

---

TITLE: Intentionality in GE

DESCRIPTION OF ISSUE: GE as a program rather than a checklist.

FEEDBACK OR COMMENTARY: During the site visit a number of parties, including individuals in both student meetings, mentioned the need for better guidance. Ideally students would see GE as a more cohesive, relevant and individualized GE program, instead of the common approach of picking classes to

meet a checkbox list (often focusing on those that are considered easier, more popular, or better fit a student's schedule rather than for intentional educational outcomes).

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:

Recommendation 1: Consider expanding the GE orientation YouTube video into a short canvas module.

Recommendation 2: Consider having Departments/Programs/Concentrations produce GE recommendations (e.g., bolding some elements of a GE list by area) and incorporating these into their recommendations in the two- and four-year course planners (e.g., those currently used as the basis for the computerized planning tool).

Recommendation 3: Consider having a faculty director of GE or staff position monitor demand by GE area for use in scheduling recommendations and requests (esp. for additional courses). The current model focuses at the department level for course demand metrics rather than at the overall demand by GE area. This action may also help to unearth bottlenecks in course taking patterns and help with the earlier concern of the incentives to meet Departmental rather than University level needs.

---

TITLE: GE tracking for Study Abroad / Faculty Led Programs

DESCRIPTION OF ISSUE: Commend and consider expansion of programs such as SAGE web-based resource keeping

FEEDBACK or COMMENTARY: Having to reinvent the wheel is a common experience in GE articulation.

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:

Recommendation 1: Encourage continuation of the web-based GE record-keeping

Recommendation 2: Encourage a similar structure for other study abroad experiences

Recommendation 3: for in-state or out-of-state articulations consider a mechanism to have the articulation officer aware of the one-off substitution with a recommendation to implement or not-to-implement a new rule

---

TITLE: Library Collections and GE

DESCRIPTION OF ISSUE: Library Collections (both at system and campus level) tend to be driven by departmental needs.

FEEDBACK or COMMENTARY: Consider whether centralizing a request specific to each GE goal to augment department-level requests is both practical and desirable.

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS: Consider having the GE committee, the FLC groups, or others interface with the library to directly make recommendations regarding resources useful to GE per GE area (rather than course) -- there may be some undiscovered commonalities or unrecognized patterns of resource desirability.

TITLE: Issue with "messaging" of GE across campus

DESCRIPTION OF ISSUE: Many actors directly involved highlighted the issue of what message is sent and received (in the case of students) concerning GE across campus, as well as how that message is sent out

FEEDBACK or COMMENTARY: Although the information is available, many with whom this group spoke raised the lack of a cohesive, efficient and effective method of sending information about GE to students, and how students receive and retain that information. Information concerning advising, for example, is currently spread through many different websites, sometimes with outdated information, and managed by many different people. Students expressed many concerns regarding the availability of academic advising and the difficulty of getting help with enrollment choices.

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS: University should focus, on the one hand, on cleaning its advising information available online. As it moves away from a University-centered advising and into a fully College-based advising model, it should take advantage of this chance to create strong college-based advising webpages, that majors are taught to seek out. Moreover, students showed a preference for newer technologies as an additional and sometimes more efficient way of communicating with them. That includes the use of text messages, which are more proactive (reaching out to students) than websites, and easier to highlight than traditional emails. Students were also excited about using apps like NAVIGATE for advising. Group advising sessions (esp. re: enrollment/registration) may alleviate some unmet demand for advising services in an effective manner.

# SUMMARY

The CSU GE implementation at CSU:Fullerton is consistent with relevant statewide policies. Notable modifications and features include: limiting the American Institutions requirement to 3 units in GE (and the non-GE requirement of a specific AI course); the Cultural Diversity requirement (Overlay Z); the use of Faculty Learning Communities as a development and assessment tool.

Concerns raised in the Program Planning Review (2022) include: enrollment counts for GE versus non-GE courses, definition and assessment of GE goals, structural impediments to inter-departmental collaboration, and difficulties in the planning course offerings to meet university rather than departmental level needs.

The review team met with a diverse group of stakeholders and came away with the impression that the GE program at CSU:Fullerton is healthy. Commendations include the use of Faculty Learning Communities in assessment, the breadth of Area F course offerings, the strong recognition (at the assessment level) that GE is a program rather than a set of courses, and the recognition that improvements to the GE program may be resource-intensive. Recommendations include considerations for both assessment and implementation. The largest single recommendation is to further develop the Faculty Learning Community leadership and close the loop regarding FLC recommendations.