

California State University, Fullerton

GENERAL EDUCATION PROGRAM **PERFORMANCE REVIEW**

GENERAL EDUCATION PROGRAM PERFORMANCE REVIEW SELF STUDY

Table of Contents

- I. Introduction
- II. Department/Program Mission, Goals and Environment
- III. Department/Program Description and Analysis
- IV. Documentation of Student Academic Achievement and Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes
- V. Faculty
- VI. Student Support and Advising
- VII. Resources and Facilities
- VIII. Long-term Plans

I. Introduction

The General Education (GE) Program at California State University, Fullerton (CSUF) for Catalog Years Fall 2021 and beyond includes nearly 600 lower-division and upper-division courses distributed across 17 areas as follows:

GE Area	Lower-Division Courses	Upper-Division Courses
A.1: Oral Communication	5	0
A.2: Written Communication	5	0
A.3: Critical Thinking	7	0
B.1: Physical Science	15	0
B.2: Life Science	6	0
B.3: Laboratory Experience	16	0
B.4: Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning	8	0
B.5: Implications & Explorations in Natural Sciences & Math/Quantitative Reasoning	0	39
C.1: Introduction to the Arts	15	0
C.2: Introduction to the Humanities	71	0
C.3: Explorations in the Arts or Humanities	0	138
D.1: Introduction to the Social Sciences	25	0
D.2: American History, Institutions & Values	9	0
D.3: Explorations in Social Sciences	0	140
E: Lifelong Learning & Self Development	10	52
F: Ethnic Studies	10	3
Z: Cultural Diversity*	7	166

* Overlay Z is an overlay for which approved courses in areas B, C, D, and E double-count.

These courses are offered by nearly 50 programs and departments across eight colleges. Total enrollment in GE courses in 2020-2021 exceeded 137,000 students. Class size averaged across all sections ranged from 28 to 40 between 2016-2017 and 2020-2021, with an overall average class size of 34. As detailed in the table below, the GE committee noted that on average there are 10-14 more students per class in GE courses than non-GE courses, and the differences got larger during the pandemic. Concern has been expressed that departments use GE requirements to increase class sizes, and that larger classes reduce quality.

These data are pulled from OAIE website via the Tableau login for repeatable grades, and they include all courses with 10 students enrolled or more. The final column compares enrollment in upper- and lower-division GE vs. non-GE courses, so that in the fall of 2021, for example, there were on average 12.6 more students per section in upper-division GE courses than non-GE upper-division courses.

Term	Type	Enrolled	Sections	Avg	vs non-GE
F21	Lower Division non-GE	17345	683	25.4	
	Upper Division non-GE	69472	2687	25.9	
	Lower Division GE	37189	1011	36.8	11.4
	Upper Division GE	29303	763	38.4	12.6
	Remedial	87	3	29.0	
S21	Lower Division non-GE	16960	663	25.6	
	Upper Division non-GE	74496	2759	27.0	
	Lower Division GE	29519	768	38.4	12.9
	Upper Division GE	28345	712	39.8	12.8
	Remedial	138	4	34.5	
F20	Lower Division non-GE	18733	724	25.9	
	Upper Division non-GE	73835	2649	27.9	
	Lower Division GE	35261	876	40.3	14.4
	Upper Division GE	30147	735	41.0	13.1
	Remedial	103	4	25.8	
S20	Lower Division non-GE	17828	716	24.9	
	Upper Division non-GE	74510	2875	25.9	
	Lower Division GE	30126	894	33.7	8.8
	Upper Division GE	27912	739	37.8	11.9
	Remedial	102	3	34.0	
F19	Lower Division non-GE	19438	756	25.7	
	Upper Division non-GE	71288	2755	25.9	
	Lower Division GE	37435	1046	35.8	10.1
	Upper Division GE	27983	738	37.9	12.0
	Remedial	49	3	16.3	
S19	Lower Division non-GE	17706	733	24.2	
	Upper Division non-GE	75110	2882	26.1	
	Lower Division GE	33377	905	36.9	12.7
	Upper Division GE	25305	678	37.3	11.3
	Remedial	87	3	29.0	
F18	Lower Division non-GE	19711	777	25.4	
	Upper Division non-GE	71379	2728	26.2	
	Lower Division GE	36628	996	36.8	11.4
	Upper Division GE	25049	677	37.0	10.8
	Remedial	90	3	30.0	

This is the second Program Performance Review of the CSUF General Education Program. The [first review](#) was conducted in 2012-2013. This self-study was undertaken by the General Education Committee, a standing committee of the CSUF Academic Senate, with support from Academic Programs and Enrollment, the Office of Assessment & Institutional Effectiveness, and the Academic Advising Center.

II. Program Mission, Goals, and Environment

- A. Briefly describe the mission and goals of the unit and identify any changes since the last program review. Review the goals in relation to the University mission, goals and strategies.

Since the last GE Program Review in 2012-2013, there have been significant changes to GE areas and unit requirements. These changes notwithstanding, the program’s mission and goals vis-à-vis the University’s mission, goals, and strategies have remained consistent.

The 2021-2022 University Catalog describes the General Education Program’s critical role in developing lifelong learners and self-aware, well-rounded citizens prepared to contribute at regional, national, and global levels. [UPS 411.203](#) distills this mission into five programmatic GE student learning goals with corresponding outcomes:

Goals	Outcomes
Goal 1: Students will demonstrate and apply their understanding of fundamental concepts, methods, and theories in natural sciences and mathematics, arts and humanities, and social sciences.	Students will define, explain, and apply fundamental concepts. Students will demonstrate how a given theory is supported by fundamental concepts. Students will identify and explain the features of a particular method and explain how to utilize it.
Goal 2: Students will seek and acquire relevant information and apply analytical, qualitative, and quantitative reasoning to previously learned concepts, new situations, complex challenges, and everyday problems.	Students will analyze, interpret, and utilize verbal or numerical information. Students will formulate and explain how to implement a conclusion or plan of action by applying previously learned concepts.
Goal 3: Students will develop ideas and communicate them competently and ethically, verbally or nonverbally, both orally and in writing, in a variety of contexts.	Students will communicate ideas effectively and appropriately in a well-organized fashion, taking purpose, context, and audience into account. Students will present the ideas of others with integrity, providing appropriate attribution or academic citation.
Goal 4: Students will develop skills to collaborate effectively and ethically as leaders and team members.	Students will encourage and value the contributions of others. Students will collaborate effectively. Students will engage in civil discourse and provide constructive feedback. Students will demonstrate ethical reasoning.
Goal 5: Students will develop self-awareness, knowledge, intercultural skills, and critical reflection to participate ethically and effectively in local communities and global contexts.	Students will demonstrate a critical understanding of how the intersections of power, privilege, and oppression play out across a range of cultures and human experiences, including but not limited to their own experiences. Students will describe diverse cultures using fundamental concepts and terminology. Students will demonstrate awareness of appropriate intercultural skills. Students will describe and understand how to enact ethical and transformative frameworks and modes of

	exchange and communication that promote rights, social justice, equity, and inclusiveness.
--	--

The GE student learning goals align closely with the University’s six Undergraduate Student Learning Goals, which are stated in [UPS 300.003](#):

Undergraduate Student Learning Goals: CSUF graduates will...	Corresponding GE Student Learning Goals
I. Demonstrate intellectual literacy through the acquisition of knowledge and development of competence in disciplinary perspectives and interdisciplinary points of view.	Goal 1: Students will demonstrate and apply their understanding of fundamental concepts, methods, and theories in natural sciences and mathematics, arts and humanities, and social sciences. Goal 2: Students will seek and acquire relevant information and apply analytical, qualitative, and quantitative reasoning to previously learned concepts, new situations, complex challenges, and everyday problems.
II. Think critically, using analytical, qualitative and quantitative reasoning, to apply previously learned concepts to new situations, complex challenges and everyday problems.	Goal 1: Students will demonstrate and apply their understanding of fundamental concepts, methods, and theories in natural sciences and mathematics, arts and humanities, and social sciences. Goal 2: Students will seek and acquire relevant information and apply analytical, qualitative, and quantitative reasoning to previously learned concepts, new situations, complex challenges, and everyday problems.
III. Communicate clearly, effectively, and persuasively, both orally and in writing.	Goal 3: Students will develop ideas and communicate them competently and ethically, verbally or nonverbally, both orally and in writing, in a variety of contexts.
IV. Work effectively as a team member or leader to achieve a broad variety of goals.	Goal 4: Students will develop skills to collaborate effectively and ethically as leaders and team members.
V. Evaluate the significance of how differing perspectives and trends affect their communities.	Goal 5: Students will develop self-awareness, knowledge, intercultural skills, and critical reflection to participate ethically and effectively in local communities and global contexts.
VI. Recognize their roles in an interdependent global community.	Goal 5: Students will develop self-awareness, knowledge, intercultural skills, and critical reflection to participate ethically and effectively in local communities and global contexts.

Both sets of student learning goals reflect the [University’s Mission Statement](#), which elucidates CSUF’s role as a “comprehensive, regional university with a global outlook” committed to providing curricular and co-curricular experiences that help students to “develop the habit of intellectual inquiry, prepare for challenging professions, strengthen relationships to their communities and contribute productively to society.” With these student outcomes in mind, the University has set the following goals for faculty, administrators, and staff:

- To ensure the preeminence of learning
- To provide high-quality programs that meet the evolving needs of our students, community and region
- To enhance scholarly and creative activity

- To make collaboration integral to our activities
- To create an environment where all students have the opportunity to succeed
- To increase external support for university programs and priorities
- To expand connections and partnerships with our region
- To strengthen institutional effectiveness, collegial governance and our sense of community

B. Briefly describe changes and trends in the discipline and the response of the unit to such changes. Identify if there have been external factors that impact the program (e.g., community/regional needs, placement, and graduate/professional school).

During the period of review, the GE program has significantly changed three times to comply with state legislation or Executive Orders from the Chancellor's Office. As a result, there are four different cohorts on campus with different GE requirements, as determined by their catalog year: Spring 2018 and earlier; Fall 2018-Spring 2019; Fall 2019-Spring 2021; Fall 2021 and beyond.

Executive Order 1100 (EO 1100, 2017) mandated double counting of major and GE units, reduced the GE unit cap from 51 to 48 (or 49 including a B.3 laboratory course), capped Area D: Social Sciences at 12 units, eliminated the Intermediate Algebra requirement for courses in Area B.4: Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning, and restricted upper-division GE units to Areas B, C, and D. Beyond the sea change that double counting represented for all units on campus, CSUF's Area D.2: World Civilizations & Cultures was eliminated to comply with the reduced unit cap, and categories D.3, D.4, and D.5 were renumbered to D.2, D.3, and D.4, respectively. In addition, Area C.3: Explorations in the Arts or Humanities and Area C.4: Origins of World Civilizations changed to Areas C.4 and C.3, respectively, in catalog year 2018-2019. Area E: Lifelong Learning & Self Development was no longer permitted to offer courses to fulfill upper-division GE requirements. These changes were implemented for students in catalog year 2018-2019. Effective catalog year 2019-2020, Area C.3: Origins of World Civilizations was removed from the GE package, and Area C.4: Explorations in the Arts or Humanities reverted to Area C.3. The lower-division requirement for Area C became 3 units from Area C.1, 3 units from C.2, and an additional 3 units from either C.1 or C.2.

[Assembly Bill No. 1460](#) (AB 1460, 2020), which added Section 89032 to the Education Code, mandated that California State University "require, as an undergraduate graduation requirement, the completion of, at minimum, one 3-unit course in ethnic studies." A revision to Executive Order 1100 (EO 1100, 2020) created a new GE category, Area F: Ethnic Studies. In order to comply with the 48 GE unit cap, CSUF removed D.3: American Government from the GE package, making American Government a Graduation Requirement effective catalog year 2021-2022. That same year, D.4: Explorations in Social Sciences became the new D.3. To accommodate the new graduation requirement, high-unit programs were granted a waiver for 3 lower-division units in Area C.

The campus expects that [Assembly Bill No. 928](#) (AB 928, 2021), which seeks to provide a singular lower-division GE path for students transferring from community colleges to the CSU and UC systems, will result in significant changes to the current GE package. Specifically, we anticipate a reduction of six lower-division GE units to be implemented by Fall 2025.

The upheaval to the GE program wrought by assembly bills and executive orders has required an all-of-campus response, as illustrated by the four Academic Senate/Academic Affairs Retreats dedicated to GE during the period under review (Spring 2014, Fall 2017, Spring 2019, Spring 2022).

But it also important to notice that the changes forced on the university through assembly bills have disproportionately affected the humanities and social sciences. This directly impacts the education we offer. In our mission statement we aspire to help students “thrive in a global environment,” but since the last GE PPR we have stopped requiring students to take a class in world history and have seen a reduction in students studying world languages. A serious discussion of GE at Fullerton also requires a wider discussion of the kind of education we seek to provide on our campus.

C. Identify the unit’s priorities for the future.

The GE program is large, and the regular administration, maintenance, and assessment of the program consumes significant time and resources.

A top priority for the next three years must be to provide input and guidance to both the CSUF campus community and the Academic Senate of the CSU in order to implement the requirements of AB 928 and a revised CSU GE Breadth Requirements without sacrificing elements of the GE program that the CSUF faculty deem essential for our students. This can be an opportunity for the campus community to take a step back and reflect on the overall program.

Additional priorities include reexamining the role of Overlay Z including how it can best complement and support Area F, sustainably reimplementing timely recertification of GE courses, and exploring strategies to better inform and support the CSUF faculty with all things GE.

An ongoing issue that needs to be resolved is the relationship between field expertise and learning outcomes. At present, the committee and campus appear divided on whether instruction by field experts is necessary to provide quality. In some areas, most conspicuously the Ethnic Studies requirement, it has been mandated that only certain disciplines can offer courses. The present UPS standard, on the other hand, is that a course must simply demonstrate that it meets a preponderance of learning objectives for the GE area proposed. There is no requirement, for example, that biology is taught in the Biology department or by someone with a Biology degree, or that the oral communication requirement is taught by the Communication Studies department or by someone with a communication degree. This creates friction over course quality and is exacerbated by budget structures that discourage cooperation and reward department-level GE enrollment growth (see section VII-A below). This issue should be directly confronted and resolved by the Academic Senate. External to our campus, there is a vigorous debate about whether the “fewer requirements more options” is a positive or negative development. Our campus should consciously confront the question and establish clear standards. This foundational issue lies at the core of many external mandates and criticisms and the GE program should address this with its curricular policies.

D. If there are programs offered in a Special Session self-support mode, describe how these programs are included in the mission, goals and priorities of the department/program (e.g., new student groups regionally, nationally, internationally, new delivery modes, etc.).

All lower-division GE courses can be taken more cheaply at community colleges. However, it stands to reason that CSUF would believe that its own courses have considerable value, and there should be more to the decision about where to take the course than cost and convenience. The campus should develop a purpose statement about what its goals are for special session lower-division GE offerings that clearly communicates to students and departments. There is a need to regularize student demand, faculty compensation, and have a master plan for the number of offerings and the number of students.

III. Department/Program Description and Analysis

- A. Identify substantial curricular changes in existing programs, new programs (degrees, majors, minors) developed since the last program review.
- B. Describe the structure of the degree program (e.g., identify required courses, how many units of electives) and identify the logic underlying the organization of the requirements.

The GE Program at CSUF is governed by Chancellor’s Office [Executive Order 1100](#), [Executive Order 1110](#), and CSUF Academic Senate [UPS 411.200](#), [UPS 411.201](#), [UPS 411.202](#), and [UPS 411.203](#).

EO 1100 stipulates a 48-semester unit distributional GE pattern consisting of 39 lower-division and nine upper-division semester units for all CSU campuses. An additional laboratory course of not more than one semester unit may be added for a total of 49 semester units. The CSUF GE Program aligns with the subject area distribution requirements set forth in EO 1100:

EO 1100 Areas	Semester Units	CSUF GE Areas	Semester Units
Area A: English Language Communication and Critical Thinking	9	Area A: Core Competencies	9
Area B: Scientific Inquiry and Quantitative Reasoning	12-13	Area B: Scientific Inquiry and Quantitative Reasoning	12-13
Area C: Arts and Humanities	12	Area C: Arts and Humanities	12
Area D: Social Sciences	9	Area D: Social Sciences	9
Area E: Lifelong Learning and Self-Development	3	Area E: Lifelong Learning and Self-Development	3
Area F: Ethnic Studies	3	Area F: Ethnic Studies	3
		Overlay Z: Cultural Diversity	3 (overlay; must double-count with a course in Area B, C, D, or E)

General Education courses must be selected from an approved list. Students should refer to their Titan Degree Audit (TDA) as well as to the Undergraduate Studies and General Education’s [“General Education at CSUF” website](#) to see approved GE courses for their respective catalog year.

Transfer students may transfer to CSUF as lower-division GE certified by a California Community College or another CSU by fulfilling one of three optional patterns: CSU General Education Breadth, Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC), or University of California (UC) Campus Lower-Division. All students must take nine units of General Education in residence and three units of upper-division GE in each of Areas B, C, and D. These two requirements typically overlap for most transfer students, although 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.

UPS 411.201 stipulates that all GE courses shall include student writing that “involves the organization and expression of complex data or ideas.” Instructors must provide careful and timely feedback to foster student improvement. Evaluations of student writing are factored into final course grades.

As per UPS 411.202, a grade of “C-” or higher is required to satisfy areas A.1, A.2, A.3, and B.4. A grade of “D” or higher is required to satisfy all other GE areas.

UPS 411.200 outlines the GE approval process for two types of courses:

- Courses that are already part of the university curriculum
- Courses to be added as new topics within a variable topics (VT) course that has already been approved for general education

Courses may be proposed for inclusion in the GE program by sponsoring academic units through a course change proposal. Courses must be already part of the university curriculum. Such course change proposals are approved at the college level by their respective deans and announced to campus twice per year. The fall cycle begins on September 1, and the spring cycle, on February 1. The announcements initiate a two-week period during which academic units may submit questions about proposed courses, and subsequently, a two-week period during which academic units may convert their questions to challenges. Questions and challenges are submitted to the Associate Vice President, Undergraduate Academic Programs (AVPUAP). Upon the conclusion of the challenge period, course change proposals for Areas A-E and Overlay Z are forwarded by the AVPUAP to the GE Committee, along with any challenges. Course change proposals for Area F are forwarded by the AVPUAP to the Ethnic Studies Requirement Committee, along with any challenges. The Ethnic Studies Requirement Committee forwards its recommendations to the GE Committee. The GE committee forwards its recommendations to the Academic Senate for review and recommendation to the President. The approval process described above also applies to courses approved in a GE category for which academic units are seeking to add Overlay Z.

New topics proposed for an existing GE variable topics course are forwarded by the college dean to the Office of Academic Programs. The AVPUAP forwards the proposal to the GE Committee (Areas A-E, Overlay Z) or the Ethnic Studies Requirement Committee (Area F). These committees are authorized to approve new topics for GE without further approval by the Academic Senate or the President.

During the period under review, the GE Committee and, for courses proposed for Area F, the Ethnic Studies Requirement Committee have reviewed nearly 100 courses for inclusion in the GE program:

Semester	Courses approved by GE Committee/Ethnic Studies Requirement Committee (GE Category)
Fall 2013	ENGL/CPLT 356 LBST 335
Spring 2014	N/A

Fall 2014	<p>ANTH 383: Prehistoric North America (D.5) CRJU 100: Crime, Law and Justice (D.1) HIST 395: History of the First World War (D.5) READ 390: Critical Literacies, Advocacy and Community Involvement (E) SOCIO 325: The American Drug Scene (E) SPAN 325: Contemporary Culture of Spain (C.3) SPAN 326: Spanish-American Modern Culture (C.3)</p>
Spring 2015	<p>BIOL 151: Cellular and Molecular Biology (B.2, B.3) CPRL 346: Vietnamese Buddhism (C.3, Z) RTVF 372: World Cinema (1895-1950) (C.3, Z) RTVF 373: World Cinema (1950-1990) (C.3, Z) RTVF 374: World Cinema (1990-Present) (C.3, Z) VIET 385: Advanced Vietnamese Cultural Communication (C.3, Z) VIET 390: Viet Culture Thru Cinema and Literature (C.3) VIET 395: Vietnamese Literature and Arts (C.3)</p>
Fall 2015	<p>AMST 324: American Immigrant Culture (C.3) ASAM 230: Civic Engagement through Asian American and Pacific Islander Studies (E, Z) CPRL 100: Introduction to the Study of Religion (D.1) CPRL 321: Psychology of Religion (D.5, Z) CPRL 370: New Religious Movements in the U.S. (D.5) DANC/AFAM 371: African American Concert Dance History (C.3, Z) GEOG 330: California (D.5) GEOG 352: National Parks (D.5) LBST 322: Cross Cultural Social Thought (D.5, Z) LBST 340: Food Studies in the Social Sciences (D.5)</p>
Spring 2016	<p>AFAM 388: Hip Hop Culture (C.3) AMST 345: American Dream (C.3) BUAD 300: Professional and Career Development (E) CNSM 100: Introduction to Learning and Thinking in Science and Math (E) COUN 252: Career and Life Planning (E) HESC 115: Introduction to Environmental Health and Safety (E) PHIL/LING 375: Meaning and Mind (C.3) PORT 105: Introduction to Lusophone Culture and Language (C.2) PORT 214: Intermediate Lusophone Culture and Language (C.2)</p>

	UNIV 100: Foundations for College Success, Life-Long Learning and Self-Development (E)
Fall 2016	AMST 345: American Dream (C.3)
Spring 2017	ANTH 101: Introduction to Biological Anthropology (B.2) HCOM 215: Introduction to Digital Media Studies (D.1) HCOM 305: Digital Media Literacy (E) HIST 341/LBST 341: Ancient Eats: Food and Foodways in the Ancient World (C.3) LBST 337: Science, Technology, and Society (E)
Fall 2017	CHIC 106: Introduction to Chicano Studies (D.1) CHIC 220: Chicana/o Identities (D.1) CHIC 369/CTVA 369: Border Cinema (C.3, Z) GEOL 110L: Introduction to the Natural Environment: Laboratory (B.3)
Spring 2018	AFAM 107: Introduction to African American Studies (D.1, Z) ASAM 201/HIST 201: The History of Asian Pacific Americans (D.1, Z) CHEM 111: Nutrition and Health (E) COMM 233: Mass Communication in Modern Society (D.1) ECON 202: Principles of Macroeconomics (D.1) FIN 310: Personal Financial Management (B.5) GEOG 120: Global Environment Problems (E) GEOG 160: Human Geography (D.1) GEOL 110: Physical Science (B.1) GERO 133/SOCI 133/HESC 133/HUSR 133/PSYC 133: Introduction to Gerontology (D.1) HIST 110B: World Civilizations Since the 16 th Century (D.1, Z) HONR 210B: Honors Seminar: World Civilizations since 1500 (D.1, Z) MATH 115A: College Algebra (A) (B.4) THTR 160: Acting for Non-Majors (C.1)
Fall 2018	CNSM 101: Think Like Einstein (A.3) GEOG 110L: Introduction to the Natural Environment: Laboratory (B.3) GERO 313: California Gold: Diversity and Aging (D.4, Z) HIST 386A: American Social History 1750-1860 (D.4) ISDS 361A: Business Analytics I (B.5) LTAM 100: Introduction to Latin American Studies (D.1) NURS 402: Population Health Nursing (D.4)
Spring 2019	BIOL 103: Biology of Disease (B.2) BIOL 306: Biology of Aging (B.5) BIOL 360: Biology of Human Sexuality (B.5) HIST 110A: The World to the 16 th Century (C.2, Z)

	<p>HIST 360: Modern Asia: Nationalism and Revolutionary Change (D.4) HONR 210A: Honors Seminar: World Civilizations and Cultures (C.2, Z) PORT 301: Advanced Portuguese through the Arts (C.3)</p>
Fall 2019	<p>AMST 324: American Immigrant Cultures (Z) COMM 315: Mass Media and Diversity (D.4) HCOM 308: Quantitative Research Methods (B.5) HCOM 315: Social Media and Communication (D.4, Z) HCOM 370: Sport Communication (D.4) HIST 311: World War II (D.4) KNES 380: Philosophy of Human Movement (C.3, Z) PHYS 305: Physics of Sound (B.5)</p>
Spring 2020	<p>CHEM 200: Chemistry for Nursing and Allied Health Professionals (B.1) HIST 200: Ideas, Books, and Beliefs: Texts that Changed History (C.2) HIST 210A: Baseball History (C.2) HIST 230: Clashing Steel: Classic and Medieval War and Society (D.1) HIST 231: Roar of Cannons: Modern War and Society (D.1) PUBH 350: Nutrition (B.5) SPED 425: Language and Culture for Special Populations: Foundations of Culture and Language and the IEP (D.4, Z)</p>
Fall 2020	<p>AMST 345: The American Dream (C.3, Z) CHEM 111: Nutrition and Health (B.1) CTVA 305: Diversity in Television (C.3, Z) LBST 337: Science, Technology, and Society (B.5) READ 201: New Literacies for Academic Success (E) READ 360: Literacy Education for Social Change (D.4, Z) VIET 204: Intermediate Vietnamese-B (C.2)</p>
Spring 2021	<p>AFAM 101: Introduction to Ethnic Studies (F) AFAM 160: Introduction to Black Creative Expression (F) AFAM 260: Black Lives Matter Creative and Critical Ideas (F) AFAM 280: Introduction to African American History (F) AFAM 361: Black Environmentalism (F) AFAM 389: Black Latinx Identity (F) ASAM 101: Introduction to Ethnic Studies (F) ASAM 202: Ideas, Imagination and Intersections in Ethnic Studies/Asian American Studies (F) ASAM 303: Community, Liberation and Action</p>

	in Ethnic Studies/Asian American Studies (F) CHIC 101: Introduction to Ethnic Studies (F) CHIC 106: Introduction to Chicano Studies (F) CHIC 201: Chicana and Chicano Environmentalisms (F) NURS 345: Pathophysiology (B.5)
Fall 2021	AFAM 103: Critical Race Theory (A.3) HIST 325/LBST 325: Cross-Cultural History of Medicine (B.5) WGST 320: Gendered Techno-culture (C.3, Z)
Spring 2022	RLST 307: Non-violence, Animal Rights and Diet in Jainism (C.3) GEOL 110T: Topics in Earth Science (B.1) HONR 304T: Honors Seminar in Lifelong Learning (E)

The perpetual state of flux and uncertainty surrounding the GE program has stalled the campus's efforts to review and recertify existing GE courses. For one, the approval of new courses to the GE program and the implementation of multiple policy changes has consumed the lion's share of the GE Committee's time and energy during the period under review. Furthermore, it makes little practical sense to review a slate of courses for recertification in a GE category that may be discontinued shortly thereafter.

- C. Using data provided by the Office of Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness to discuss student demand for the unit's offerings; discuss topics such as over enrollment, under enrollment, (applications, admissions and enrollments) retention, (native and transfer) graduation rates for majors, and time to degree (see instructions, Appendices A and B).

Individual departments offering courses in GE decide which GE courses to offer and make adjustments based on student demand for those courses. There is generally no centralized coordination of GE course offerings. GE courses that have not been offered within a five year period are removed from the GE program.

- D. Discuss the unit's enrollment trends since the last program review, based on enrollment targets (FTES), faculty allocation, and student faculty ratios.

With a few exceptions enrollments across GE areas have largely been steady. The enrollments in Area B.5 doubled from approximately 6,000 to 12,000 students per year starting in Fall 2019 due to the new upper-division requirements of EO 1100. Area F was first offered in the 2021-2022 academic year with an enrollment of approximately 3,100 students.

In Fall 2020, at the height of the pandemic, there was an unexpected increase in the enrollments in Area A.1, from a typical fall enrollment of 2,700 students to a Fall 2020 enrollment of 3,252 students. This was managed by the offering of additional sections by the affected departments. This was followed by a decrease in A.1 enrollment in Fall 2021 to 2,338 students. These pressures exacerbated the difficulties identified below in the budget discussion; however, it should be noted that enrollment swings have considerable impact on departments offering GE courses to incoming students, and a goal of strategic enrollment management should be to add predictability to the process.

IV. Documentation of Student Academic Achievement and Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes (provided by OAIE)

Because student learning is central to our mission and activities, it is vital that each department or program includes in its self-study a report on how it uses its own formal or informal tools to gauge the quality of student learning in its degree program(s) and/or what plans it has to build systematic assessment into its program(s). Please provide information on the following aspects, and if applicable, please feel free to include relevant documents in the appendices.

- A. Describe the department/program assessment plan (e.g., general approach, time table, etc.) and structure (e.g., committee, coordinator, etc.), and if applicable, how the plan and/or structure have changed since the last PPR.

The primary recommendation from the last PPR was to develop a sustainable GE assessment process aligned with the WSCUC core competencies. The assessment of GE program is achieved through the approach of a [GE Faculty Learning Community](#) (FLC), a campus-wide assessment effort. Our GE program includes a significant number of lower-division and upper-division courses offered by many departments and programs across the colleges. As the [2013-14 GE Program Performance Review](#) noted, this “decentralized” structure necessitates a sustainable and manageable assessment process, focusing on GE as a holistic program (as opposed to individual courses).

Mandated by the CSU system requirements, the GE breadth objectives ([UPS 411.201](#)) are used to guide GE course development but are not ideal for learning assessment. Therefore, the Academic Senate approved in 2015 an overarching, assessable set of GE Learning Goals (GELGs) ([UPS 411.203](#)). The GELGs guide the GE assessment effort at CSUF, with a focus on the upper-division GE courses as students exit from the GE program.

In 2016-17, CSUF launched the GE FLC to engage faculty who teach GE courses in assessing student learning. Coordinated by the Office of Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness (OAIE), the GE FLC brings together GE faculty (full- and part-time) from diverse disciplines to collaboratively identify comparable course-embedded assignments, develop common scoring rubrics, apply the rubrics to assess student learning, and interpret and disseminate results on campus. The Academic Senate’s GE committee determines which GELG to focus on each year. In 2016-17, nearly 50 faculty across disciplines participated in the GE FLC to assess the GE program’s impact on student critical thinking skills. The data collected from 2,251 students across 15 courses demonstrated the majority of students (over 75%) met the faculty’s expectations on critical thinking skill development on all rubric criteria (i.e. scoring at “Proficient” or “Advanced” level), and thus achieved the GE critical thinking learning goal.

The GE FLC was renewed annually since and has been implemented in a similar fashion every year with a new group of faculty to assess the rest of the GELGs – Teamwork (2017-18), Diversity (2018-19), Written communication (2019-20), and Oral communication (2021-22). It should be noted that in 2020-21, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, a full-scale GE FLC was not feasible. Instead, two faculty members from previous GE FLCs conducted a reflective review of the data collected thus far and gathered past faculty participants’ feedback to determine whether the FLC approach should be continued. The positive findings from the review supported the continuation of the FLC, and hence the return of the GE FLC in 2021-22. Details of the GE FLC and findings are available at the [OAIE](#).

[website](#).

Beyond CSUF, the GE FLC model has received positive feedback at national gatherings such as the AAC&U annual conference and has been featured by the [National Institute for Learning Outcome Assessment](#) as a best practice.

- B. For each degree program, provide the student learning outcomes (SLOs); describe the methods, direct or indirect, used to measure student learning; and summarize the assessment results of the SLOs.

As mentioned earlier, the five GE learning goals and associated learning outcomes are detailed in [UPS 411.203](#). Generally speaking, they cover areas of general knowledge understanding and application, critical thinking, written and oral communication, teamwork, and diversity. These areas align with [the university-wide undergraduate learning goals](#), as well as the [WSCUC core competencies](#).

Through the GE FLC, both direct and indirect measures are used to assess the GE learning goals/outcomes. For direct assessment, faculty use a common rubric (determined through the FLC) to score comparable assignments in their GE courses that address the relevant learning goals/outcome; For indirect assessment, students in these GE courses are administered a survey that mirror the rubric criteria to seek their self-perception of their mastery of the learning goal/outcome. Results from both sources of data are compared, with the indirect assessment data typically being more positive than the direct assessment results. The results from direct assessment are also disaggregated based on student demographic variables (gender, UR status, first-gen status, etc.) to seek a more nuanced understanding of student learning. Again, details of the findings are available at the [OAIE website](#).

- C. Describe whether and how assessment results have been used to improve teaching and learning practices, and/or overall departmental effectiveness. Please cite specific examples.

As part of the GE FLC, the faculty meet during the summer to review the results of the GE assessment and recommend ideas for improvement. These recommendations are then brought forth to the Academic Senate's GE Committee, who takes them into consideration in its guidance on the GE curriculum. The GE FLC faculty participants are also expected to disseminate assessment results – university-wide and their own courses – among their colleagues to promote changes at the local level. Several past participants have been using the rubrics consistently in their own courses, and some have implemented such practice in courses at multiple levels to track student progress (i.e. comparing student performance in lower division and upper division courses).

- D. Describe other quality indicators identified by the department/program as evidence of effectiveness/success other than student learning outcomes (e.g., graduation rate, number of students attending graduate or professional school, job placement rates, etc.).

While not exclusively focused on GE program itself, the university administers an undergraduate exit survey every other year. The survey asks the graduating seniors whether the CSUF education helped them meet the WSCUC core competencies. Over the past three administrations, most of the students responded positively to this question, with over 85% of respondents providing an affirmative answer

in regard to written/oral communication, critical thinking, and information literacy. The only competency that comparatively lags behind is quantitative reasoning, where the percentage of respondents who provided an affirmative answer is in the 60% range. To help address this disparity, the Department of Mathematics initiated three programs to promote quantitative reasoning skills beginning in fall 2018. First, in response to Executive Order 1110, the GE courses Math 110 (Liberal Arts Mathematics) and Math 120 (Introduction to Statistics) were redesigned to include more hands-on learning with an emphasis on data collection and interpretation. Second, ALEKS – McGraw Hill’s artificial intelligence online assessment and learning tool – was implemented in summer 2018 for all business, science, math, and engineering incoming freshmen to evaluate and refresh their math skills prior to enrollment in GE calculus courses Math 130, Math 135, or Math 150A. And third, the assessment and grading practices for all multi-section math courses have been more closely aligned to ensure access and equity for all students. These improvements are anticipated to result in strengthened quantitative reasoning skills both for students who take only one GE math course and for those who major in a field requiring calculus or higher-level math courses.

- E. Many department/programs are offering courses and programs via technology (e.g., online, etc.) or at off-campus sites and in compressed schedules. How is student learning assessed in these formats/modalities?

The GE FLC selects faculty who teach courses that address the relevant GELG, regardless of the course modality or location. While all the participating courses thus far were offered at the Fullerton campus, there have been a small number of courses that were taught online. The assessment approach for these online courses remains the same as the in-person courses, i.e. a common rubric is applied to score the assignment that demonstrates student mastery of the relevant GELG. The adjustment is primarily done by the faculty of these courses to ensure that assignment is appropriate and comparable to the assignments in other GE FLC courses.

V. Faculty

- A. Describe changes since the last program review in the full-time equivalent faculty (FTEF) allocated to the department or program. Include information on tenured and tenure track faculty lines (e.g., new hires, retirements, FERP’s, resignations), and how these changes may have affected the program/department’s academic offerings. Describe tenure density in the program/department and the distribution among academic rank (assistant, associate, professor) [see instructions, Appendix C]. Attach faculty vitae (see Appendix D).

Courses in the GE program are taught by faculty from the departments and programs offering those courses. There are no faculty allocated specifically to GE.

- B. Describe priorities for additional faculty hires. Explain how these priorities and future hiring plans relate to relevant changes in the discipline, the career objectives of students, the planning of the university, and regional, national or global developments.

- C. Describe the role of full-time or part-time faculty and student assistants in the program/department's curriculum and academic offerings. Indicate the number and percentage of courses taught by part-time faculty and student teaching assistants. Identify any parts of the curriculum that are the responsibility of part-time faculty or teaching assistants.

Few GE courses are taught by student teaching assistants (TA's). Since Fall 2016, student TA's have taught a small number of courses in Human Communications, English, Chemistry, Geology, Physics, Biology, Mathematics, Art, and Theater.

VI. Student Support and Advising

- A. Briefly describe how the department advises its majors, minors, and graduate students.

The Academic Advising Center provides General Education advising to the entire undergraduate student population. As we transition to the 2023-2024 Academic Year and beyond, we will be adopting a new organizational structure, described below.

New Students:

In New Student Orientation, the first-time freshmen are provided an introductory overview of all of the General Education requirements. These overviews are accompanied by explanations of the "why" of General Education and the prestige of the liberal arts education. For Summer 2020 and 2021, these overviews were delivered virtually, via on-demand, interactive video modules where the new students complete comprehension checks and feedback surveys, to ensure that they learn the content. These activities were required before a first-time freshman could register for their first semester during virtual operations. The Academic Advising Center collected extensive student feedback on the role of online GE advising in building their confidence and understanding as they took steps to plan what classes to take to fulfill their General Education requirements. Feedback was consistently positive. Summer 2022 brought further experimentation, integrating online, interactive General Education advising modules into in-person team activities for new freshmen in an on-campus Orientation program. Online self-service modules continue to be required for students who elect to complete their Orientation program virtually. Over the course of the past year, more than 1,000 students revisited the General Education video modules online, indicating that students find those to be useful and informative resources. That activity, combined with thousands of soundly positive reviews in student feedback surveys, has shaped our new direction for General Education advising for incoming students. The intention is to continue delivering General Education advising to entering, new students via interactive online video modules, reinforced as a requirement for access to register for their first semester of enrollment.

For new transfer students, the General Education introductory modules are optional. Often, for transfer students, the opportunity to double-count General Education with their upper-division major requirements is addressed in their major advising. Most new transfer students engage with the optional General Education advising modules.

Year-Round General Education Advising:

Throughout the year, the Academic Advising Center currently offers drop-in (or virtual pop-in),

appointment-based and group General Education advising sessions. The monthly student utilization of these services exceeds 1,200 individual visits in peak times of each semester, shortly before and during the opening of new registration windows. That does not include group participants. These General Education advising visits involve:

- a. Review of student progress, and clarification of remaining General Education areas and units to complete;
- b. Consultations on summer or other non-CSUF enrollment to fulfill General Education courses by way of transfer units, by student request;
- c. Clarification or instruction on how to read the Titan Degree Audit to help the student understand how to monitor their progress in General Education and other requirements, particularly overall units toward the degree;
- d. Consultation and troubleshooting in instances where students bring concerns over an error in the reporting or Titan Degree Audit display of their previously completed or in-progress General Education units;
- e. Support in student selection of proper General Education courses to make efficient progress toward their degree and prevent redundant General Education enrollments;
- f. Support in long-term planning for completion of all General Education requirements;
- g. Referral to appropriate learning support and all other student success resources related to students' needs toward completion of their General Education requirements.

Partner Involvement in General Education Advising:

The General Education advisors of the Academic Advising Center regularly visit partner areas such as Athletics, Diversity Initiatives and Resource Centers, the Educational Opportunity Program and other units by invitation, to provide group overviews and related guidance.

The College of Business and Economics Advising Center team of major advisors is fully trained in General Education advising. The students in this college are not required to seek General Education advising separately from their major. Many of the students in this college continue to visit the AAC, as well as their college's advising center, for the most thorough guidance in both areas.

The year 2022-23 holds promise to bring significant innovations to General Education advising and the overall structure of academic advising at CSUF. The purpose of the pending changes is to address the currently fragmented structure that isolates General Education and major advising into different units, as well as the advising within each college. In the spring of 2022 campus-wide forums welcomed input from staff and faculty campus-wide, as we look to develop an advising culture that is centered around consistency and cohesion, robust professional development, and an emphasis on relationship-building between advisors and their students. It is the position of the General Education Committee, as representatives of their faculty peers, that integrated major and GE requirements are best represented through *integrated advising* of both kinds of requirements as well.

As of fall, 2023, the Academic Advising Center will be dissolved, particularly with regard to serving as a home of General Education advising for all students. Instead, expanded teams of professional academic advisors will be affiliated with each college. Those advisors will carry caseloads of 300 students each. The students will remain with their assigned advisor for their first two years of enrollment, where they will receive holistic, integrated academic advising that addresses their major preparation, General Education, co-curricular engagement and overall wellness needs. The professional advisors will engage their students with faculty and their disciplines through a variety of

partner activities to prepare the students to transition to faculty major advising in their third year of enrollment and thereafter.

Advisor Training:

The AAC currently houses the Assistant Director for Training and Faculty Relations. This individual regularly provides updates to the AAC Team as well as the campus-wide team of graduation and retention specialists. They lead the annual “General Education Advising Forum” to promote campus-wide awareness of ongoing changes to the General Education requirements. In addition they regularly respond to departmental or individual requests within the colleges and a variety of Student Affairs units, to train them on General Education requirements as well as our supporting technology tools.

This training function will develop further, with the organizational structure transition. A Director will be appointed to oversee and coordinate all General Education and related academic advising training. A team of assistant directors will work with the Director to sustain and standardize General Education advising training.

- B. Describe opportunities for students to participate in departmental honors programs, undergraduate or graduate research, collaborative research with faculty, service learning, internships, etc. How are these opportunities supported? List the faculty and students participating in each type of activity and indicate plans for the future.

Study abroad and study away experiences contribute to the breadth and depth of knowledge that students develop as part of a comprehensive General Education program. Here students develop skills and dispositions that are transferable to a wide variety of employment and academic settings. These include enhanced appreciation for diversity, a broadened world-view, and an international understanding of the discipline. Beginning in 2017, the Study Abroad and Global Engagement (SAGE) staff adopted a web-based program to initiate a consolidated record keeping process to track GE courses that offer a faculty-led study abroad component. From 2017-2022 the following GE courses included this high impact practice:

- AMST 320 (London)
- ANTH 342 (Indonesia)
- ART 311 (London)
- ART 312 (Mexico)
- COMM 370 (Italy)
- CRJU 385/499 (Australia)
- ECON 335 (Spain, Italy, Greece)
- ENGL 355T (Ireland)
- GEOG 373 (Costa Rica)
- HCOM 320 (Greece and Barcelona)
- HIST 320 (Germany)
- HIST 340 (History)
- HSS 350 (Germany and Mexico, and Spain)
- HSS 350 and PSYCH 361 (Mexico)
- HUM 250 and HIST 340 (Italy)

- HUM 350 and LBST 322 (Vietnam, Cambodia)
- HUM 350 and LTAM 300 (Japan)
- MATH 150A (Uzbekistan)
- MATH 338 (Thailand)
- READ 295 (Mexico)

Often supported by the Center for Internships and Community Engagement and SAGE, study abroad and study away programs contribute to the General Education Program's role in developing critically aware and fully informed citizens prepared to contribute locally and abroad.

VII. Resources and Facilities

- A. Itemize the state support and non-state resources received by the program/department during the last five years (see instructions, Appendix E).

The GE program is large and complex. It is primarily funded by enrollments managed by departments offering GE courses. The Office of Undergraduate Academic Programs oversees the GE curriculum, the Academic Advising Center provides advising for the GE program, and the Office of Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness manages assessment of the GE outcomes. Unlike some other CSU campuses, CSUF does not have a GE Program Coordinator position. Therefore, coordination of these activities falls to the GE Committee. There is no separate allocated budget to support the GE program's further development, professional development of GE instructors and faculty serving on the GE Committee, or the creation of campus-wide messaging campaigns to highlight recent and upcoming changes to the GE program and to promote the value of GE.

Because there is little official coordination between units and the budget is not the explicit purview of the GE committee, GE operates on an *implicit* budget model. Department budgets (especially OE&E, Consolidated Course Fee, and Self Support/TADCP buckets) are largely driven by enrollment. Simultaneously, for obvious reasons there are considerable cost savings to offering large-enrollment sections. Thus the implicit budget model rewards and therefore encourages departments to have their courses qualified as GE offerings to increase enrollment and then offer them in large sections. Rather than operating implicitly, there are considerable improvements to be made if class sizes are carefully reviewed through a pedagogical lens^[1] and the "fewer requirements more choices" model (which encourages many different courses within GE areas) is critically examined.^[2] There is always some balancing between cost and quality; the concern expressed here is that scales for many GE offerings are tipped in favor cost savings and quality concerns are not being carefully balanced. Departments are faced with an often Faustian choice between making targets and holding the line on quality; in competitive GE areas those that hold the line on quality run considerable risk of enrollment declines or course cancellations.

Given the enormity of the task the GE committee is tasked with, if it is to accomplish more than routine curricular review its membership should receive professional development support. The members of the Academic Senate or the GE committee should be able to attend professional conferences that address General Education, such as those offered by WASC, AAC&U, etc.

The modality of GE courses is in need of urgent review. At present, online modalities relieve classroom space issues and have much higher student enrollment demand. On the other hand, course quality is a very open question; because the campus was forced into an all-online modality and

instructors did the best they could there is a lingering but untested feeling that online quality is inadequate. We do not contest that high-quality online instruction is possible but are fearful that this is an assumption rather than a fact, and we encourage serious study in the near future of the intersections between course content, instructor interest and aptitude, and student factors that can make it successful.

A good GE program requires intentional, data-driven, and thoughtful balancing of large vs. small course sizes, student choice vs. requirements, and online vs. face-to-face modalities. In short, there are good reasons to worry that class size decisions have tipped too far in the direction of large classes, excessive student choice, and more online offerings. We are further worried that these trends are driven by budget scarcity and not educational mission. Our strong recommendation is that three factors are carefully studied and that resource augmentations are made where appropriate.

A structural concern is that so long as most of the benefits and costs are weighed at the department level rational department actors will pursue the best interests of their departments, and there is not at present a clearly defined forum where campus-wide issues and patterns are considered and discussed. We recommend that the GE committee work with Academic Affairs and the Academic Senate to identify the appropriate structure for campus-wide GE forms. If that entity is to be the GE committee, reviews of appropriate resourcing and authority is in order.

^[1] <https://thesenateforum.wordpress.com/2020/11/20/class-size-effects-on-students-and-instruction/>

^[2] E.g., https://www.goacta.org/news-item/college_students_need_solid_uniform_base_before_learning_what_they_want/

- B. Describe the current library resources for the program/department, the priorities for acquisitions over the next five years and any specialized needs such as collections, databases etc.

GE is not a separate part of the Pollak Library's acquisitions budget. Acquisitions funds are allocated to departments and programs. The library does purchase both online and print materials that would be useful to GE courses requiring research assignments, but that use cannot be differentiated from the materials purchased for disciplinary purposes.

The Electronic Core Collection is supplied by the Chancellor's Office to all of the CSU campuses to support the core curriculum. While the Pollak Library does not pay anything for these resources since it is funded by the CO, it is a critical component of the library's offerings for GE courses.

Here is the description and the list of some included resources: A CSU collection of subscription databases including scholarly articles, popular news and magazine articles, business data, and e-books. It spans a range of disciplines including business, humanities, social sciences, law, technology, music, physical sciences, and life sciences.

- ABI/Inform (business)
- Academic Search/Business Source Premier*
- Academic Complete eBooks
- ACLS (humanities eBooks)
- America History & Life/Historical Abstracts
- Communication Source
- CQ Researcher*

- Ethnic NewsWatch*
- GenderWatch*
- Global Newsstream (regional, national, international news)
- Grove (Oxford) Music*
- JSTOR (13 collections) (humanities)
- Oxford English Dictionary*
- Project Muse (humanities)
- PsycInfo / PsycArticles
- Westlaw

* Databases of special use to general education classes in the CSU core collection

Additional databases of use to GE course that are not in the CSU collection are:

- African American Studies Center
- AP Images
- Art Full Text
- Biography Index
- Chicano Database
- Ethnic Diversity Source
- Fergusons Career Guidance Center
- Gale E-books
- Gale in Context: Opposing ViewPoints
- Garland Encyclopedia of World Music Online
- General Science Full Text
- Humanities Full Text
- Literature Resource Center
- Music Periodicals Index
- Omnifile Fulltext Mega
- Oxford Art Online
- Oxford Bibliographies
- Oxford Reference
- Readers Guide Full Text
- Social Science Full Text

The library provides information literacy instruction at all levels, from introductory to upper division and graduate. Each instruction session is tailored to the different needs of students in finding, accessing, and assessing resources. Prior to the pandemic, librarians provided around 730 sessions during the academic year. Instruction was predominantly in-person but included significant amounts of virtual instruction as well. During 2020/2021 librarians, much like other faculty, shifted to completely online offerings. Librarians conducted over 600 online instruction sessions during the campus closure.

Just a cursory comparison to the number of GE courses offered and the number of Information literacy (IL) sessions provided does not begin to reach all necessary IL sessions that could potentially be needed by GE courses with research requirements. The library does not have the library instruction faculty to reach all GE courses with in-person instruction.

To help alleviate this problem, Pollak Library instruction and research librarians have been creating digital learning objects (DLOs) on a variety of information literacy topics. Beginning in 2011, with the Spark Tutorials for University 100, videos and tutorials are available for instructional faculty to embed in their course Canvas sites. The addition of an Online Learning Librarian to work with both instructional and library faculty expedite the creation of DLOs in 2019 is helping to provide better organized and sustainable information literacy instruction for General Education courses.

Coordinated IL across Area A, including a possible requirement to take advantage of the library instruction requires further consideration.

VIII. Long-term Plans

- A. Summarize the unit's long-term plan, including refining the definitions of the goals and strategies in terms of indicators of quality and measures of productivity.

The key priorities for the GE program are the following:

- Implement changes required by the upcoming revision of the CSU GE Breadth Requirements (EO 1100) made in response to AB 928
- Develop and implement a sustainable model for GE course recertification
- Review and revise the GE Learning Goals following the initial round of assessment
- Review and revise Overlay Z following the implementation of Area F
- Communicate ongoing need for professional development of faculty serving on the GE committee
- Promote professional development of GE course instructors
- Create a campus-wide messaging campaign to highlight recent and upcoming changes to the GE program and to promote the value of GE
- Explore budgeting models that uncouple GE funding and enrollments
- Implement broader GE coordination across departments
- Recommend departments to center students when deciding scheduling and modality
- Align GE advising and instruction as part of an integrated degree