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1. Summary of the General Education Program

The General Education Program at California State University, East Bay is required for all California State University campuses. The campus designs its own implementation of the program but the shape and content of the program follows the requirements of The California State University’s Executive Order 1065 (see below) which describes GE components. East Bay’s freshman year is a unique implementation of foundational and disciplinary courses required by the Executive Order and was designed by faculty to address the needs of East Bay’s students. The successes and challenges of the freshman year program, CSUEB’s Freshman Learning Communities, are a major focus of this 5-year review.

Resources: Like academic programs across the campus, the General Education program is slowly recovering from a significant period of under-funding and limited personnel resources. These items and their effects in the last six years are thoroughly addressed in the following pages.

Student Learning: Assessment activities in general education have been a hallmark of the program since 1998 when the learning communities began at East Bay. Initially we relied on indirect measures of student learning through the use of the start-of-the-year Entering Student Survey and the end-of-the-year College Student Experiences Questionnaire. These data have been important to understanding the issues and challenges our students face in their first year and how or if those challenges have changed, diminished or grown. In addition to this almost 15 years of data, the report will include measures of direct assessment and the effects of non-Academic Affairs divisions on the quality and success of our students.

Developing a robust assessment policy, designing measures and strategies for assessment, using data to refine our GE program, and directly assessing student learning in GE were three of the five issues in the GE 5 year plan. As fully explained in that segment of the report, much has been accomplished in this area.

Faculty and students: The faculty are a significant issue for the teaching in general education classes. The faculty who teach all but the freshman seminar are not GE faculty but lecturers and tenure-track faculty who belong to the disciplinary departments offering GE courses. While there is no necessary problem with this bifurcation in theory, in practice, the ability to control quality of teaching in the courses is problematic for guaranteeing good teaching and good learning in GE classes. As noted in the self-study, outside the upper division courses and a few departments participating in the freshman program, GE is too often the responsibility of part-time lecturers who often do not know they are teaching a GE course, are unfamiliar with the learning outcomes or the nature of our students. This is a significant problem in the freshman learning communities because the courses in the clusters should be thematically integrated across all classes in the clusters and throughout the year. The faculty do not, however, carry the full burden of this problem because, until summer 2014, we had no funding for faculty to come together in the summer and collaborate on curriculum integration. That changes this coming summer. Provost Houpis has committed to providing stipends for faculty to work together in the summer to integrate learning in their classes.

A final issue relates to the faculty who teach our freshman seminar, a crucial component of the freshmen learning communities. These faculty are graduate teaching associates or part-time
lecturers who exist in a unit with no official structure—they are not members of an academic department although they teach General Studies units. The issue was directed to FAC to recommend a structure that would validate the unit, assure that the chair is included in training and meetings for chairs, that all collective bargaining information is received. FAC did not suggest any way to structure an academic department for the General Studies instructors.

GE program serves all students who attend East Bay. Native students complete a minimum of 72 units of general education courses; transfer students complete a minimum of 12 units of general education courses. The CSUEB GE program is at the minimum number of units required by the Executive Order.

Curriculum: The general categories of subject matter are designated in the Executive Order that governs general education in the CSU. The East Bay GE program has learning outcomes for all areas save one (discussed below). A hallmark of our GE program is that discipline areas do not have control over which departments can teach in which GE areas, as used to be. Instead, any course that satisfactorily addresses the learning outcomes, no matter the department or college, may offer a course in that GE area. Issues remaining:

- There is a paucity of course offerings in the humanities, critical thinking, and composition.
- Most of the GE courses, at lower and upper division, count for both major credit and GE credit. Although less true for the sciences, appropriateness of a single course counting for both the major and general education should be addressed by the faculty.

Five year plan
There are two major issues that will be addressed over the next five years: assessment activities and the transformation of general education program design.

Assessment: While the first efforts have been made to close the loop on the assessment of critical thinking by reporting the results of our 4 quarter effort to assess critical thinking competence. Academic Year 2014-15 will be a time to review critical thinking student learning outcomes and the rubrics used for assessment in light of the assessment data. These efforts will be undertaken in the fall of 2014. In fall 2014 the GE Subcommittee will begin work on assessing student writing competencies and social justice and diversity. The focus will be work in composition classes and in upper division humanities and social science classes that incorporate writing. The courses in upper division humanities and social sciences along with courses at lower and upper division level that have been approved for GE and the Cultural Groups and Women’s requirement will be the focus of General Education’s support for the developing competencies in these areas.

Transformation of GE to semesters: The university’s change from quarters to semesters will be a time for faculty to re-imagine the curriculum our students take in majors and in general education. The same Executive Order covers the course and content requirements for general education taken either at a semester campus or a quarter campus. None the less, the effects will be such that we cannot just “convert” what we currently require to a semester GE program. There will be hard decisions to be made about some of the CSUEB unique GE requirements and their place in the smaller unit semester allotments.
2. Self-Study

2.1 Summary of Previous Review and 5-Year Plan

The last 5-year Review and Plan was the first time CAPR had reviewed General Education. Because of that, the 5-Year Review covered almost 10 years of the current General Education Program. The focus points, however, were similar to what will be found in the 2013-14 review.

**Curriculum:**
1. the challenges of assessment for a program that “owns” only 3 units of the 72 unit requirement,
2. addressing the issues that arise when upper division majors courses are simultaneously GE courses

**Faculty:**
1. the reliance on graduate students and part-time lecturers to teach the freshman seminar component of the freshman learning communities
2. the heavy reliance on lecturers to teach general education classes;
3. a lack of resources to support faculty teaching in the freshman learning communities,

**Resources:** a lack of staff for the administration of the GE program and the other work done in the GE offices.

**What we’ve done to date**

**Curriculum:** There have been no changes in the GE requirements since the last review. The program remains at the system minimum for the number of units required for GE. The GE program has continued to collect data from entering freshmen and those same students at the end of their freshman year.

The past six years have seen stability in the GE curriculum, although there have been two calls for cluster proposals (calls go out every three years) and new clusters have been added while others have been retired and still others remain active since the inception of the freshman learning community structure in fall 1998.

The challenges remain as they were in the last review: developing a robust assessment plan for a program where almost the entire curriculum is developed and taught by major departments. While this is the way GE works at East Bay, the problem created is that the assessment of student learning is made problematic. Neither the faculty nor the courses are under GE control and departments and faculty have their own assessments of their courses to complete. In the face of the situation, developing a productive and cost-effective way to assess the program was very difficult. Then, in the past two years we have seen exciting assessment milestones met.

1. After two years of effort, the proposed plan for assessment of General Education student learning outcomes was approved by the Academic Senate in Fall 2013. The plan, already in need of modification, lays out an assessment calendar and a protocol for assessing student learning.
2. The GE assessment plan anticipates a yearly rolling process where one program outcome and several area outcomes are assessed each year. After a round of assessing both lower and upper division critical thinking results and no area outcome, it is clear that the cycle
requires approximately two academic years to complete. The data, collected and assessed in summer 2013 and the fall and winter terms of AY 2013-14, were reported to the GE Subcommittee on May 12, 2014 and the response to those results in terms of changed learning outcomes and/or rubrics will be the first order of duty for the subcommittee in fall 2014.

3. Perhaps the most important aspect of the Senate's plan for assessment of student learning in general education is that the responsibility lies with the subcommittee and its members. That allows the subcommittee to both assess and respond to assessment results to adapt the requirements and the implementation of those requirements. Moreover, using a standing subcommittee to do the assessment means that the effort is sustainable for a program that “owns” few of the courses in that program.

4. The university purchased a Blackboard module that allows for the anonymous sampling of student work for use in assessment activities. This is a significant assistance, not only technically and practically, but it also protects the instructors and the students from any anxiety that the results will affect student grades or faculty RTP decisions.

Faculty: There has been little change in most of the issues raised in the last report.

There is still no official department for the lecturers and Graduate Teaching Associates who teach the General Studies freshman seminar course. This circumstance results in a feeling of disenfranchisement among those teachers. Despite reassurances, they feel impermanent and every year the rumors arise suggesting that they are all going to lose their positions. The department chair is often left off the meetings for academic department chairs that provide training on hiring, newly negotiated CBAs, and other issues that affect the lives of these instructors.

There are still an abundance of lecturers teaching general education courses for their departments. This is not inherently a problem except that often those faculty are hired at the last minute and are often not told that the class they are to teach is a GE class (and likely also a major’s class). The faculty hired are discipline experts and may or may not be prepared for students taking their class who are taking their first and maybe only course in the discipline. It is also the case that the GE learning outcomes for the class are not familiar to the lecturer and so not addressed in either the pedagogy or in the content.

To be clear, there are long-time lecturers who have taught GE classes for a number of years and know that they are to teach in ways to support the GE SLOs. When long-term entitled lecturers are used, the problems described above are minimal. It is the last-minute hire that creates the biggest problem for meeting GE learning outcomes or for collaboration with others in freshmen learning communities.

To address this problem, the Academic Senate endorsed a GE Subcommittee proposal from CIC to require GE learning outcomes be included on the syllabus of every GE course taught. (CIC ??) Recent efforts have been made to assure that faculty and department chairs know that this is now a requirement.
Freshman Learning Communities: There is one area of significant progress in this portion of the 5-year plan: the funding for cluster faculty has been returned! Two years ago, A2E2 funding was allocated to support “enrichment” activities for freshman learning communities. These activities are designed by the faculty to demonstrate to the freshmen that the issues they study have relevance in the contemporary world.

This summer 2014, the faculty teaching in the clusters offered during AY 2014-15 will be provided with $1000 stipends to join with their colleagues in the other discipline courses and in the composition, public speaking, freshman seminar, and information literacy courses to develop a truly integrated curriculum for our incoming freshmen. The Provost has committed to returning the funding for the faculty. Such funding has been unavailable since 2005 and the effects of that loss are documented in the extended report. The results of returning the funding for faculty support are many-fold. First, the faculty will see that their hard work for our freshmen is valued by the senior administration. Second, the faculty will experience the component of the freshman learning community program that they held the most valuable part of the program during its first five years—working with colleagues outside their home department. Third, and no less important, our students will see that learning to write well is valued in their discipline courses and that learning to write or speak is a way of learning content from their classes. Librarians teaching the information literacy course will find their tasks far easier if students have papers in their discipline classes that the librarian can use to model good research practices. The freshman seminar teachers will know what the students are doing in their other classes and can adapt their curriculum to include, refer to, and be taught in the context of the courses in the learning community.

Resources: Here there has been a little progress and the lack of resources still hampers work. The Senior Director of Undergraduate Studies and General Education has seen her tasks grow far faster than additional support has appeared. In fact, the MOU from the last GE Review noted at every place that increases in resources were recommended, including staff, that nothing could be done at the time but “If and when additional funds become available in Academic Affairs…”

The MOU also addressed the need for a campaign to re-educate the campus community and prospective students and their families about the freshman program in particular and the GE program as a whole. Unfortunately, during the subsequent years, the University Advancement department that handles public relations, the development of brochures and booklets and the like, was hampered by loss of funding and positions just as the academic programs have been.

Initially, we thought that a revision of webpages to highlight the freshman learning communities and provide critical information for applicants would be a quick fix. After 2 years of work on an ad hoc committee to improve student information on the campus’ website, nothing has changed, primarily because the person in Advancement who met with the committee was temporary (for more than a year) and could not help us make such changes. Now that there is a new Vice President for Advancement in place and a new media person on board, I hope we can address the communication issues identified in the 5-Year review.
2.2 Curriculum and Student Learning:

General Education policy and implementation: General Education is a required set of courses that all CSUEB students must complete to achieve a baccalaureate degree. The fundamental components are described in the Chancellor's Executive Order 1065 (attachment A1). The purposes, learning objectives, and academic requirements are outlined in the Executive Order along with the rules that govern area requirements, native student requirements, and pathways for transfer students coming in to the CSU as junior or senior students.

The General Education requirements include the “soft skills” that rank the highest for employment, according to an Association of American Colleges and Universities’ national survey of business and non-profit leaders:

**Cross-Cutting Capacities vs. Choice of Undergraduate Major**

- Nearly all those surveyed (93 percent) say that “a demonstrated capacity to think critically, communicate clearly, and solve complex problems is more important than [a candidate’s] undergraduate major.”
- More than 9 in 10 of those surveyed say it is important that those they hire demonstrate ethical judgment and integrity; intercultural skills; and the capacity for continued new learning.
- More than 75% of employers say they want more emphasis on 5 key areas including: critical thinking, complex problem-solving, written and oral communication, and applied knowledge in real-world settings.
- Employers endorse several educational practices as potentially helpful in preparing college students for workplace success. These include practices that require students to a) conduct research and use evidence-based analysis; b) gain in-depth knowledge in the major and analytic, problem solving and communication skills; and c) apply their learning in real-world settings.

**Continued Importance of Liberal Education and the Liberal Arts**

- The majority of employers agree that having both field-specific knowledge and skills and a broad range of skills and knowledge is most important for recent college graduates to achieve long-term career success. Few think that having field-specific knowledge and skills alone is what is most needed for individuals’ career success.
- 80 percent of employers agree that, regardless of their major, all college students should acquire broad knowledge in the liberal arts and sciences.
- When read a description of a 21st-century liberal education, a large majority of employers recognize its importance; 74 percent would recommend this kind of education to a young person they know as the best way to prepare for success in today’s global economy.

General Education is a responsibility of the faculty as a whole. The Academic Senate through the Committee on Instruction and Curriculum and its subcommittees (General Education Subcommittee, Critical Thinking Subcommittee, and Writing Skills Subcommittee) govern General
Education policy and courses. The Chancellor’s Executive Order 1065 describes the goals of General Education in the CSU as follows:

CSU General Education Breadth requirements have been designed to complement the major program and electives completed by each baccalaureate candidate, to assure that graduates have made noteworthy progress toward becoming truly educated persons.

These requirements are designed to provide the knowledge, skills, experiences, and perspectives that will enable CSU students to expand their capacities to take part in a wide range of human interests and activities; to confront personal, cultural, moral, and social problems that are an inevitable part of human life; and to cultivate both the requisite skills and enthusiasm for lifelong learning. Faculty are encouraged to assist students in making connections among disciplines to achieve coherence in the undergraduate educational experience.

Courses approved for GE Breadth should be responsive to the need for students to have developed knowledge of, or skills related to, quantitative reasoning, information literacy, intellectual inquiry, global awareness and understanding, human diversity, civic engagement, communication competence, ethical decision-making, environmental systems, technology, lifelong learning and self-development, and physical and emotional health throughout a lifetime.

CSU East Bay’s implementation of Executive Order 1065: Each CSU campus designs a program to reflect the unique mission of the campus while keeping the spirit of the requirements and goals intact. At East Bay, the only difference in the system requirements is found in the unique CSUEB Area F requirement (see chart below). At East Bay we hold our students to four units of Performing Arts and Activities rather than Area E: Life-long Learning and Self-Development. We have attempted to use the Area E definition in GE patterns in the past: it has been a lower division requirement and two different upper division requirements during iterations of East Bay’s GE patterns between 1990 and 2004. During the last (2004) revision of East Bay’s GE requirements, the faculty decided that a more meaningful approach to the requirement was to hold students to at least four units of Performing Arts and Activities supporting our students’ creativity and/or physical health and designed to complement the independent learning skills of GE Areas A: Communication in the English Language, B4 Quantitative Reasoning, and G, Freshman Seminar and Information Literacy. Opportunities for our students’ to develop their creative, practical and physical skills along with the abilities to speak and write effectively, think clearly and do effective and ethical research with an understanding of quantitative data are the skills of life-long understanding and self-development. The GE requirements as East Bay has defined them since 2004 are detailed below:
### General Education Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Specific Requirements</th>
<th>Units Required (minimum)</th>
<th>Area Total Units (minimum)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A: English Language Communication &amp; Critical Thinking</td>
<td>A1: Oral Communication</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A2: Written Communication</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A3: Critical Thinking</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Area Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Scientific Inquiry and Quantitative Reasoning</td>
<td>B1: Physical Science</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B2: Life Science</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B3: Science Laboratory</td>
<td>0 - 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B4: Quantitative Reasoning</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B5: Science Elective</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B6: Upper Division Science</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Area Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>20 units (minimum)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: Arts and Humanities</td>
<td>C1: Arts</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C2: Humanities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C3: Elective</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C4: Upper Division Arts and Humanities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Area Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>16 units</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: Social Sciences</td>
<td>D1: Social Science Elective</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D2: Social Science Elective</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D3: Social Science Elective</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D4: Upper Division Social Science</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Area Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>16 units</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F: Performing Arts &amp; Activities¹</td>
<td>Freshman Seminar 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service Learning</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G: Freshman Requirements</td>
<td>G1: Freshman Seminar 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G2: Freshman Seminar 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G3: Information Literacy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Area Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4 units</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>22 (minimum)</strong></td>
<td><strong>72 (minimum)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Graduation Degree Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Units Required (minimum)</th>
<th>Area Total Units (minimum)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Second Composition</td>
<td>English 1002</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Freshman Learning Communities:** Executive Order 1065 tells the campuses that they each have the responsibility to help students learn the skills and strategies of integrating their learning from one course to another to provide coherence in their programs of study: “Faculty are encouraged to assist students in making connections among disciplines to achieve coherence.” CSUEB’s ¹ Transfer students who have completed a certified Area E course use that course in place of the GE Area F requirement.
unique freshman program is designed to be a foundational experience in integrative learning, helping the student make connections and, when done well, they experience their first year GE learning community classes as a coherent exploration of a common theme or topic.

Freshman learning communities are collections or “clusters” of courses designed to meet graduation and GE requirements. The structure is yearlong and all freshmen enroll in one cluster in their first year. Some learning communities are designed for specific majors where the first year is a demanding year of introductory courses in the major. Most learning communities are developed for the general population of entering freshmen. An example of each type, major and general is provided below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Molecules Chemistry &amp; BioChem majors</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>801-14</th>
<th>TTH</th>
<th>2:00-3:50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>910-12</td>
<td>TTH</td>
<td></td>
<td>2:00-3:50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1001-13</td>
<td>TTH</td>
<td></td>
<td>2:00-3:50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1000-02</td>
<td>MWF</td>
<td>9:20-10:30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Communication Chemistry (lecture) | 1101-01 | MWF   | 12:00-12:50 |
| Cal (lecture)                     | 1101-1A | MW    | 9:20-11:50 |
| Labs                               | 1101-1C | MW    | 2:40-5:10p |
| 1101-1G                            | MW      | 2:40-5:10p |
| 1101-1H                            | MW      | 2:40-5:10p |
| GS                                 | 1011-15 | F     | 2:00-3:50 |
|                                    | 1011-16 | F     | 8:40-10:30 |
| Library                            | 1210-05 | Online |       |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Ancient World any student</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>801-19</th>
<th>MW</th>
<th>4:00-5:50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>910-08</td>
<td>MW</td>
<td>12:00-1:50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1001-04</td>
<td>MW</td>
<td>4:00-5:50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1000-14</td>
<td>MW</td>
<td>2:00-3:50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication History</td>
<td>1017-01</td>
<td>MWF</td>
<td>10:40-11:50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>1201-01</td>
<td>MWF</td>
<td>10:40-11:50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>1013-01</td>
<td>MWF</td>
<td>10:40-11:50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS</td>
<td>1011-17</td>
<td>MW</td>
<td>12:00-12:55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1011-18</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>8:40-10:30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1011-19</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>8:40-10:30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>1210-06</td>
<td>Online</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The foundational courses, Communication (public speaking), English composition, Library Information Literacy, and General Studies freshman seminar, are the same for every cluster. What changes are the bolded courses above: the “discipline area” courses in science, humanities and social sciences. As the two examples illustrate, in the sciences, whether the cluster is designed for the major or for the general population, science courses are usually large (90 student) lectures. Courses from the other colleges are most often capped at 30 and are discussion formats.

Second Year GE: The bulk of GE requirements are in the lower division, freshman and sophomore years. The lower division requirements are 60 units spread across all areas of GE. Freshman learning communities include between 13 to 25 GE units; the smaller range is typical of a student
who takes 12 units of remedial math and 12 units of remedial composition. Remedial or developmental courses count for financial aid, full-time enrollment but do not carry baccalaureate credit. Students are advised to complete all lower division GE and graduation requirements while in their second year.

While we have a robust freshman program, we have nothing formal or structured for second year students. When the revision of CSUEB’s General Education program was approved in 1996 to be effective in Fall 1998, it included both freshman and sophomore learning communities. The second year learning communities included additional courses in GE Areas A (critical thinking), B (science areas not taken in first year), C (humanities requirements not taken in the first year), and D (social science courses not taken in first year). The foundation courses (Communication, English, Critical Thinking, Information Literacy, and Quantitative Reasoning) were not included in the second year clusters. Thus, the two clusters students took in their second year constituted 8 units of their full-time enrollment.

In the 2003-4 CIC review of General Education, a decision was made to eliminate the sophomore clusters. The GE office had no funding to support the faculty in keeping the sophomore year clusters integrated and some faculty felt the second year learning communities violated the assumption that non-majors courses were for exploration and structured three course sequences violated the freedom to explore. The last year they were offered was AY 2004-5. Freshman year remained intact and second year students were free to take whatever courses they wanted in their second year. (CIC 02-03 12-amended).

**Upper Division GE:** Executive Order 1065 requires that all students graduating from a CSU complete three upper division General Education courses after they achieve junior status. The Executive Order does not specify the upper division required class areas. CSUEB’s GE program has for many years required an upper division humanities and social science course. In 2002-3 the Academic Senate approved a recommendation from the GE Subcommittee and endorsed by CIC to replace the upper division capstone (Area E) with a science course. The subcommittee members felt that our students needed additional instruction in science and scientific methods. The speed of change in the sciences and in technology requires graduates who are comfortable with the methods of discovery and testing that underpin the sciences.

The change from a capstone to an upper division science requirement was a change requested by the GE Subcommittee of CIC. The subcommittee members felt that the university had a weak definition of lifelong learning and self-development and that our students needed more understanding of scientific methods and processes. The subcommittee members were motivated by experiences with students who reject the “idea of science” as a way of knowing. The creation of non-major upper division science courses are intended to help support CSUEB’s students’ learning in the sciences, and especially our transfer students who might otherwise take no science after transfer.

While we may be in need of spaces for lower division humanities and social sciences, there is no such paucity in the upper division offerings, at least not by total number of seats.

- 33 upper division science courses are approved for B6
• 152 upper division humanities courses are approved for C4, of which all but 51 courses are offered by two departments: History (57) and Philosophy (44)
• 115 upper division social science courses have been approved for D4. Political Science has the largest number of approved courses with 26, Anthropology 19, Ethnic Studies 17 and Economics 16.

There are significant differences in the nature of the courses offered for upper division GE between the sciences and the humanities and social sciences. Unlike the lower division where most courses are designed as introductory to a major or are service courses for other departments’ requirements, the upper division general education science classes are designed especially for general education students. The sections are large and the topics of general interest: Humans and Sex, Geology of the Western National Parks, Climate Change, Exercise and Well-Being, Stars and Galaxies, and Stress and Coping to name just a few. The courses in the humanities and social sciences are courses designed for the major and approved for GE.

**AY 2013-14 Upper Division GE courses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Winter</th>
<th>Spring</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science B6</td>
<td>1950 seats in (30) sections</td>
<td>2275 seats in (35 ) sections</td>
<td>1690 seats in (26) sections</td>
<td>5915 (91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities C4</td>
<td>1890 seats (54) sections</td>
<td>1925 seats (55) sections</td>
<td>1260 seats (36) sections</td>
<td>5075 (145)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences D4</td>
<td>2590 seats (74) sections</td>
<td>2520 seats (72) sections</td>
<td>2345 seats (67) sections</td>
<td>7455 (213)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly and Annual seat totals</td>
<td>6430 seats</td>
<td>6720 seats</td>
<td>5295</td>
<td>18,445</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The differences among the areas are obvious in the table above, both in the number of seats and (sections) offered to meet upper division GE area. One reason for the differences is the enrollment cap that is in place for upper division humanities and social sciences. This is due to the learning outcomes requiring significant writing in the courses.

The GE subcommittee, guided by GE student learning outcomes to support communication in English, quantitative reasoning, information literacy, and finding too few departments with writing intensive research-based classes in the majors, brought the lower division skill areas into the upper division. The descriptions for each of the discipline areas, science, humanities, and social science follow.

• Beyond the specific science learning outcomes, B6 courses “must support students’ acquisition of advanced numeracy, information literacy, and critical thinking competencies.”
• Beyond the specific humanities learning outcomes, C4 courses must “emphasize an advanced writing component and include significant oral communication or manual communication (sign language) and advanced critical thinking skills.”
Beyond the specific social science learning outcomes, D4 courses must “apply the research findings of the social sciences to significant contemporary problems and emphasize advanced writing and information literacy skills.”

With no enrollment limits due to writing, the sciences are able to offer more seats with fewer sections. The upper division humanities and social science courses require many more class sections in part because of the required writing enrollment cap. Another issue of departmental “double dipping” is addressed below.

Observations about the lower division requirements as implemented at CSUEB:

1. The freshman learning communities are returning to their early days when there was strong support for the faculty teaching in the clusters. Provost Houpis has committed to providing $1000 per instructor in the discipline (science, humanities, social sciences) and the foundation courses (oral communication, composition, information literacy and freshman seminar) to work together during the summer to integrate learning across the courses. This support for faculty was lost in 2006 and will return this year for the learning communities offered in fall 2014. The earlier years when support for faculty to collaborate in the learning communities was provided, was the period of freshman retention that was consistently around the 80% mark.

2. We lack lower division courses in GE humanities and social sciences, and, particularly courses in the humanities. Second year students often approach advisers to help them enroll in freshman learning community courses because of the lack of free-standing lower division GE courses. Science offers more options for second year students than do the departments offering humanities and social science courses.

3. It is important to note that most courses in the humanities and social sciences are designed for both majors and GE so it is impossible to determine how many seats are available for the non-majors.

4. All majors in the sciences require courses from other science departments and those service courses are approved for GE credit. In other words, students may use GE approved courses for major requirements and “double count” them for both uses. One example of this is Biology 2010 and 2020. Sections of this Anatomy and Physiology pair are offered most every term. There are 260 spaces in the classes in spring 2014. One or both of those courses is required for major options in Kinesiology, Health Sciences, and Nursing. Biology majors take only 2010 if pursuing the Forensic Science option.

5. Regardless of the multiple uses for GE courses, there are considerably fewer seats in the humanities than in the sciences or social sciences (see below); the social sciences offered approximately 600 fewer lower division seats in AY 2013-2014 than the science seats available for general education students. See the table below for the specific listing of lower division GE areas and the number of total seats in any of the sections approved for GE, except cluster classes. All cluster seats are reserved for freshmen. To understand the numbers in the tables, the reader must remember that because many of the classes meet both major and general education requirements in all three areas of science, humanities,
and social sciences, it is impossible to determine how many of the seats offered are filled by students taking the course for general education purposes and how many are filled by students meeting major requirements.

### Lower Division Seats for General Education (not including cluster courses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GE Area: Lower division</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
<th>Winter 2014</th>
<th>Spring 2014</th>
<th>Annual Total 2013-1014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower division B: Natural Sciences</td>
<td>1355</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>3215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower division C: Humanities</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>1695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>0²</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>1100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower division D: Social Sciences</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>2685</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Observations about upper division GE:

1) The use of upper division GE courses for both the major and for GE is a critical issue for the faculty to explore. This kind of double dipping of students has a long history at East Bay. However, there is an inherent tension when the faculty want to push the majors to use the tools of the discipline to explore an issue in depth but must simultaneously introduce the students taking the course for GE who may have never had a class in the discipline before. If the instructor chooses to push the majors in the class then the general education student may be lost in class and likely to be at the bottom of the grade distribution. On the other hand, if the instructor focuses the class for the general education student majors in the class will likely experience a less-rich class than were they able to engage the issues and topics in a more nuanced and critical way. Either option the instructor chooses is likely to disadvantage some students in the class.

2) The dominance of a few departments in the GE lists in humanities and social sciences is an issue best addressed when the change to a semester system is occurring. As noted later in this review, the change to semesters will require the faculty to explore the shape of our GE offerings.

---

2 No seats were available for general education purposes except for continuing language study. Other lower division GE classes were offered during the year but were restricted to freshman students as they are part of a freshman learning community.

3 Modern Languages and Literatures language courses are listed separately since the classes are sequential and not open to most students after the start of a sequence. Some students place in a language section higher than the first class and new sequences may be started in winter term, demand permitting.
3) The final issue is explored in the section on assessment activities where we found notable differences between the quality of critical thinking displayed in papers for discipline classes compared with students taking the course for general education purposes.

4) Whether or not the differences in class size and in courses for both majors and GE students vs. pure GE enrollments affects the quality of learning is simply not known. As we expand the GE assessment efforts, we may be able to address those issues.

**Student learning outcomes assessment plan, implementation, summary results, and measures to improve the program based on assessment**

**Assessment:** Just before the last 5 year review, and in preparation for a Western Association of Schools and Colleges accreditation visit, faculty were provided with stipends to develop rubrics to assess one learning outcome in the sciences, humanities, social science, and the Cultural Groups and Women’s required course. The data suggested that some 25% of the students across the courses assessed in that effort were not achieving expected levels of competency on the learning outcome assessed. These data were taken back to the GE subcommittee of the Committee on Instruction and Curriculum, and discussed. Little came of this first effort at direct assessment due to changes in senior administration and continued reduction in state funding, and a recognition that the cost of the assessment efforts were not sustainable, even if we were to receive renewed funding at appropriate levels.

Starting shortly after the CAPR first ever review of the GE program, plans were developed, in consultation with the GE Subcommittee and the chair of CIC, to create a sustainable model for assessing learning in general education courses. Although slow to come to fruition, in fall 2012, the Academic Senate approved a plan for GE Assessment that located the work in the GE Subcommittee. By making assessment the work of the committee, we now have a sustainable model for assessing student learning. The report provides the data on the first significant effort at assessing critical thinking at both the lower and upper division levels of learning.

Although assessment is usually understood as a measure of student learning, in this section of the report, special attention is given to the examination of the relationship between and among freshman enrollment numbers, remediation needs, admits status (regular or exception) and student retention and graduation. Over the 15 years of the freshman learning communities we have had the highest retention rates in the recent history of Hayward/East Bay to the lowest retention of the same time. What this report documents is a slow and steady growth in our retention and reasons to expect continued growth in retention and graduation given new resources and support for our native (as opposed to transfer) students.

The students’ own experience of their first year will be described on items that reflect the General Education Learning Outcomes and the CSUEB Institutional Learning Outcomes.

**Student Learning Outcomes:** in 2004-05 the Academic Senate approved GE learning outcomes for all GE areas with the exception of Area F, Performing Arts and Activities.
Assessment Plans: in fall, 2013, the Academic Senate approved the General Education Assessment Plan (12-13 CIC 6) and (Appendix B). This plan includes an alignment of the GE SLOs with the Institutional Learning Outcomes (Appendix B), policy commitments for GE assessment, a timeframe for GE assessment (already in need of revision), and the GE Subcommittee and faculty responsibilities for GE assessment.

In addition to the Senate-approved plan to directly measure student learning, the GE program office has collected student reports on their learning annually, with rare exception. These data tell us about what the freshman experiences have been and are compared to a national norm for freshmen.

Institutional data also provides a picture of our students and their successes and struggles at the university. These data are included in the report.

Finally, in AY 2012-13 a PEIL group studied the freshman learning communities, exploring student, faculty, and administrator attitudes and experiences with the learning communities.

Program Outcome Assessments: The first part of this report will look at the students who enroll as freshmen at Cal State East Bay. The institutional data, combined with self-report data gives a clear picture of the preparation and retention of students into their second year.

This first graph provides a vivid picture of the challenges we have faced in rapid growth of freshman enrollment, loss of funding for freshman faculty and the learning communities and their effects on student retention.
1998 to 2005 was a period of relatively steady growth in the freshman class. The number of students ranged between 732 and 840. With the stable enrollment, maintained in the earlier years by exception admissions (students who did not meet the admission requirements) that were diminishing slightly over those seven years. Norma Rees was the university's President during those times. In June 2006, we welcomed a new President, Mohammad Qayoumi. That fall, we had our largest enrollment of freshmen at 872 and the numbers continued a steep climb during his tenure. Unfortunately, the high numbers were sustained by increasing the numbers of exception admissions. In fall of 2008, fully 40% of the freshmen were exception admits! The effects on retention were immediate and significant. We went from 82% retained from 2001-2003; we experienced a small drop to 81% in 2004 and in 2005, 80% of the students returned for their second year. If you follow the blue line that traces the enrollment of exceptions, the retention rate follows just behind. We had our lowest number of exception admits in those years of 80-82% retention. As exception admit numbers increased our retention rates declined. The apex of exception admissions occurred in fall 2008 and the smallest percentage of students were retained from that same class. We lost 10% more (71%) students from the 2008 class than we lost in any of the earlier years in the new century. The freshman class of 2009 had only 27% exception admits and our retention rate began to recover as it increased to 74%.

In 2010, James Houpis joined the university as Provost. He understood the impact of exception admissions on the campus and on the students who were admitted but were so underprepared
that they left, usually due to failures to meet remediation requirements or abysmal grades. When President Qayoumi left East Bay to become president at San Jose State University, President Morishita was disturbed by the high exception admissions and the low retention rates. He made the decision that no students without full preparation in English and Math were to be given exceptions, except in rare circumstances. In his first year as our permanent President, the exception admits dropped to their lowest point in 15 years: 6%! The uptick in retention has been slower to respond but this year’s data document 78% of the students who began in 2012 returned for their second year.

Exception admissions and remediation needs: As exception admissions increased, so did the percentage of students who required some level of remediation in math and/or English. The way that remedial composition and remedial mathematics needs follow the line of the exception admissions, is a clear indication of the challenges faculty teaching the freshmen faced. In particular, we find that students with low scores on their English Placement Test are particularly challenged in their reading competencies. They are doubly challenged: they need to read more and more of their reading is non-textbook reading without the skills to comprehend the reading and what they are supposed to “get” from the readings.

It is instructive to see that retention is less determined by remediation when the freshman learning communities are supported and the faculty are integrating the learning. That can be most clearly seen in the first half of the freshman program’s existence than in current years.
So, who are our freshmen now? Our freshmen comprise the most ethnically diverse class at East Bay.

In addition, 56% of our freshmen are first generation students! That is, they are first in their families to attend college. This poses a significant challenge for our faculty and for student support services. These students may well have family who are supportive and encouraging about their college enrollment but rarely do their families have the knowledge of the work required to be a successful student. Many are important earners for their families and need to maintain a steady income, while learning to be successful university students. Their families know what it took for them to succeed in high school and may assume that is all they need to succeed in college. They need resources and support from the university to help them be successful. At least one-third of our freshman class has no access to the internet at home. They rely on their phones and "hot spots" to connect to the internet, making working in Blackboard or doing research from home next to impossible.

57% of our freshmen qualify for Pell grants and 76% receive some sort of financial aid. These are very successful students who have made their way through to university but lack the resources to be successful or as successful as they could be. The freshman learning community program is designed to support such students, at least in helping them to build community with other students, to learn strategies for success from their faculty and particularly their freshman seminar classes, and to see the purpose for studying composition and mathematics. Their needs, however, require the whole campus to provide support structures for these academically qualified students succeed in their goal of a college degree.

One final observation from our institutional data: while freshman enrollment has continued to increase, the percentages of freshmen in the lowest level of English composition have fallen, as has the overall level of remediation needed in English. In fall 2008, 42% of the students were taking the lowest level of remedial composition while 28% were taking 900 level remedial composition classes. In fall 2013, 18% were in 900-level remediation in composition and 31% were taking 800 level remedial composition courses.

There is no clear trend in Math. While overall math remedial numbers are lower than those for composition and have continued on a slow but steady decline, the distribution among the three levels of math remedial classes has remained much more consistent. In fall 2008, 21% were in a three-course sequence of remedial math, 44% were taking the two-course sequence, and 14% were taking a single remedial math course. In fall 2013, 18% were enrolled in the three-course sequence, 39% were in the two-course sequence, and 14% were taking the single course.

None the less, our students report significant improvement in their basic skills. As the chart below demonstrates, about 70% of the students report improved writing skills and 66% report improved analytical skills while 58% report improved quantitative reasoning skills. These percentages mark a steady increase in students reporting improved analytical skills and quantitative reasoning skills. The percentage of students reporting improved writing

4 The percentages of first generation, Pell grant eligibility, and financial aid recipients are data supplied by IRADS. Reports may be found in Appendix B.
competencies is as high as it ever has been but the improvement reported sank during the middle years of the freshman program.

What accounts for the improvement? While that is not possible to say, at least with the data at hand, there are some indication in the students’ own reports of their learning activities. Surely their faculty support their improved sense of their skills. The data from the College Student Experiences questionnaire shows that the faculty play an important role in the freshman students’ lives; at least equal to the students are similar campuses and often quite a bit more interaction outside of class than their national cohort.
### Experiences with Faculty Years 2007-2012

% of students who responded Occasionally/Often/Very Often

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Year CSEQ taken</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>ROM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FAC1 Talked with your instructor about information related to a course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you were taking (grades, make-up work, assignments, etc.).</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>823</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAC2 Discussed your academic program or course selection with a faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>member.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>84.3</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>87.4</td>
<td>86.6</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>823</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAC3 Discussed ideas for a term paper or other class project with a faculty member.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>84.3</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td>79.8</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>76.4</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>821</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAC4 Discussed your career plans and ambitions with a faculty member.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>917</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>817</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAC5 Worked harder as a result of feedback from an instructor.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>86.5</td>
<td>86.6</td>
<td>88.6</td>
<td>88.2</td>
<td>88.4</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>820</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAC6 Socialized with a faculty member outside of class (had a snack or</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soft drink, etc.).</td>
<td>N=</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>820</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAC7 Participated with other students in a discussion with one or more</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faculty members outside of class.</td>
<td>N=</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>820</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAC8 Asked your instructor for comments and criticisms about your academic performance.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>817</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAC9 Worked harder than you thought you could to meet an instructor’s</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>83.7</td>
<td>81.9</td>
<td>86.2</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>84.9</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expectations and standards.</td>
<td>N=</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>917</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>967</td>
<td>819</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAC10 Worked with a faculty member on a research project.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>961</td>
<td>817</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be easily seen in the chart below, there is a consistency in the reporting of interactions with faculty in the years since the last GE Review. The research on student success clearly indicates that connections between students and their faculty are critical to their continuation as students.
The high numbers we see in these data are important indicators that when the opportunities arise, faculty connections with students are remembered and valued.5

While one might expect that students might see improvement in their writing and analytical thinking from taking an information literacy class with our librarians, the impact here is less than clear. While more of our students use the library as a quite place to read or study than the national norm, our students use the library less than their national cohort (see table on next page).

The following suppositions are the Senior Director’s alone and not supported by any causal data but are offered as possible explanations of this less than desirable use of our research facilities when compared to their peers at other campuses. In other words, while it would be comforting to assume that all 18-19 year-olds are too reliant on Wikipedia or some other source found on the web, our students likely have no more and may have less access to the web than their peers. So, I speculate that the more important numbers are the steady decline in the use of the library in most every category. There has also been a decline in the writing assignments in the discipline classes in the freshman learning communities. As the class sizes increased in a number of learning communities and the ability of the faculty to work together to support learning in all learning community classes, students saw less value in the library. In addition, the information literacy class was disconnected with the discipline classes in the learning communities since the faculty had not been supported in collaborating on the curriculum and assignments. Librarians were quite useful in the early years in helping faculty refine research assignments to better support student learning, to guide students to identify a strong research question, to help students be better researchers by targeting the students where they are rather than where we wish them to be in their first year. I offer this explanation in part because the use of the library has declined from the first collaborative meetings of the faculty teaching in the learning communities and the subsequent years (07-08 CAPR 18)

5 The low percentage of students who responded positively on question number 6 is expected, as many faculty do not engage students in social settings as much as in the classroom and their offices.
### Experiences with Library Years 2007-2012

**% of students who responded Occasionally/Often/Very Often**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Year CSEQ taken</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>NORM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LIB1 Used the library as a quiet place to read or study materials you brought with you.</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85.9</td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>919</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>834</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIB2 Found something interesting while browsing in the library.</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>917</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>829</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIB3 Asked a librarian or staff member for help in finding information on some topic.</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>917</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>826</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIB5 Used an index or database (computer, card catalog, etc.) to find material on some topic.</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>919</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>826</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIB6 Developed a bibliography or reference list for a term paper or other report.</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>78.1</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>826</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIB7 Gone back to read a basic reference or document that other authors referred to.</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>829</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIB8 Made a judgment about the quality of information obtained from the library, World Wide Web, or other sources.</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>916</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>826</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
So, where do our students gain their confidence in improved writing? The answers must be from their writing classes. The data from the Chancellor’s Office Dashboards project supports an earlier study done by tracking remedial composition students throughout their careers at East Bay. What we found was that students who started in English 800, the three quarter sequence of remediation in composition, were MORE likely to graduate than those students who started at college-level composition skills! In a longitudinal study by Vincent Tinto, international renowned researcher in success models for under-represented minority students and students needing remediation, found that our freshmen who took three quarters of remedial English composition felt better prepared in their classes than their college-ready students. Rather than see themselves as under-achieving students, they saw themselves as under-prepared students whose capacity to learn was not marked by their remedial status. The data students report on their writing experiences in their freshman year suggest that while they are less active than in the past, their writing experiences are typically at the same level or more frequent than their national cohort. These data are confirming that when we support students and ask them to write papers, with the right direction and help of their composition faculty, they are engaged in the right activities to improve their writing competencies. I would expect the writing numbers to climb again when the faculty are able to collaborate in the learning communities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSEQ Writing Experiences</th>
<th>Year of Administration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used a dictionary or thesaurus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Often</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Often/Very Often</td>
<td><strong>71%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thought about grammar, etc., while writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Often</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Often/Very Often</td>
<td><strong>83%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asked others to read your writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Often</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Often/Very Often</td>
<td><strong>65%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred to a style manual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Often</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Often/Very Often</td>
<td><strong>49%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>548</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Critical Thinking Assessment Pilot Project:

During the last two years, the GE Subcommittee members, in collaboration with the ILO subcommittee of CAPR engaged in a significant critical thinking assessment project. Starting in winter 2013, the GE Subcommittee faculty used the VALUES rubric (appendix B) recommended by Executive Order 1065 for critical thinking to assess a small sample of freshmen final papers in a critical thinking class.  

The assessment effort resulted in all 10 papers receiving the lowest score of 1, benchmark or beginning competency.  The faculty realized that there were significant differences among the papers that were not reflected in the benchmark scores given all.  The committee then rewrote the papers.  

---

The papers were from a mega-section of 90 students taking PHIL 1000, the Critical Thinking Workshop. The unique enrollment in this class was an experimental effort and may not have produced representative work by first year students. We will work with papers from the normal 30 cap PHIL 1000 classes next year.

### Table of Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revised a paper two or more times</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Often/Very Often</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>916</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>978</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asked for writing advice</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Often/Very Often</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>916</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>978</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prepared a major report for class</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Often/Very Often</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>916</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>973</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
rubric to include a level lower than the original benchmark category and included Milestone level 3 as the highest level for the first year critical thinking rubric. That revised rubric was then used by many of the subcommittee members who were available in summer 2013 to assess approximately 50 first-year papers. The results of this pilot, as for student learning presented in the report: Critical Thinking Assessment Pilot First-Year Critical Thinking Course (Appendix B) are reproduced below:

Patterns in student learning/needs: The assessment team identified the following patterns in student learning and needs as they relate to critical thinking.

1. Almost all students stated their own position on an issue/problem clearly.
2. Most students were able to acknowledge at least one claim that conflicted with their position on the issue/problem.
3. Almost all students had difficulty establishing the credibility of the source(s) used in their argument.
4. Many students had difficulty developing their ideas, either failing to explain the significance of the evidence they presented or making claims without providing sufficient evidence.
5. Although attempts at counter-arguments were present in many student papers, writers often had difficulties refuting claims on the other side, using the counter-argument to further their own position, and/or identifying the assumptions of people with a different perspective on the issue/problem.
6. Providing relevant contextual information was difficult for many students.
7. Describing the relationships between the issue/problem and conclusions, consequences, or implications was difficult for many students.
8. Many students seemed to struggle with narrowing an issue/problem appropriately for the argument essay assignment.

The GE subcommittee will continue to revise and assess until we believe that we have created the best rubric for first-year competency in critical thinking that we can.

The ILO Subcommittee and the GE Subcommittee collaborated in working on the upper division critical thinking competencies of our students. 19 faculty from all of the colleges participated in the project. The faculty worked to revise the same VALUES rubric that the GE Subcommittee used. The papers were collected from all participating faculty’s classes and those that carried GE credit were assessed by the GE Subcommittee members while those courses that were strictly majors courses were assessed by the ILO subcommittee members. The results from that pilot project are as follows:

There were noticeable differences between the performance of students in upper division GE classes and those in a class in their major. GE Students scored highest on their ability to explain the issues relevant to the assignment. Their weakest score was on the quality of evidence indicator. For students taking a major class, they were strongest on their ability to state their position and their weakest score was on context, assumptions, and alternate viewpoints. These differences made sense to the faculty participants. Students in GE can take a position but do not know the disciplinary evidence or sources of evidence as well as majors might. The majors have the strong opinions about their major subject matter and as new learners are less likely to be able to articulate alternate viewpoints.
These data will be used to revise the student learning outcomes in GE, to guide the revision of the rubrics used, and to strengthen the requirements for courses applying for GE credits in those courses requiring “advanced critical thinking”. This last component, strengthening the requirements for applying for GE “ comes from the faculty and support staff observations that for students to do their best work, they need assignments that call for the expected work. Many of the participating faculty noted that the pilot and its outcomes will affect the way they create instructions in their assignments. One additional observation worth noting is the comments from faculty who shared the rubric with students before they did their assignments. To the person they remarked that when students had the rubric before the assignment, their work was significantly improved. This observation should be shared widely but certainly will be used by the GE Subcommittee in the future to inform our decisions about awarding GE credit to individual courses.
I had the pleasure of reading CSU East Bay’s GE Program Review Report in December 2014 and then visiting the campus on January 26, 2015. The report identifies several areas of focus, including resources, faculty, curriculum, and student learning. In looking back over the past five years, special attention in these four areas is paid to the University’s exemplary Freshman Learning Communities, which support students in their transition from high school to college at the same time as introducing them to the breadth, depth, interconnections, and intellectual possibilities that a GE program can convey to students. The report also raises broader issues, questions, and challenges (most of which also surfaced during my visit), including:

- Structural issues
  - Oversight of GE
    - Who “owns” GE curriculum and courses?
      - Who should be responsible for evaluating GE courses?
      - Who should be responsible for staffing GE courses?
      - How can departments attract more tenured and tenure-track faculty to teach GE courses?
      - Should GE courses “belong” to the departments, or should they be housed together in a GE College?
    - What is the role of the GE Subcommittee vis-à-vis oversight of the GE program? How much power should the GE Subcommittee have to hold departments accountable for the success of its GE courses?
    - What problems arise as a result of offering so many combined major/GE courses?
      - Does allowing students to double-count courses for GE defeat the purpose of GE?
      - Does offering combined major/GE courses require courses to be too broad and/or easy for majors or too specialized and/or difficult for GE students?
  - The status of the General Studies Department
    - How is it and isn’t it like other departments?
    - What can (or should) be done to bestow legitimacy on the department and elevate the status of faculty teaching in it?
    - Who has/should have oversight of this department?
• Faculty issues
  o “Bifurcation” of faculty: the fact that GE courses are taught through the departments
  o A sizeable percentage of GE faculty are lecturers, many of whom may have little interest in or knowledge of GE goals and learning outcomes
  o Many of the Freshman Seminar instructors are teaching associates who do not even enjoy lecturer status
  o General Studies (i.e. Freshman Seminar) instructors have no sense of belonging to the university

• Curriculum and Assessment
  o To what extent should GE courses be connected? That is, should the GE curriculum be organized into themes or pathways that students choose and pursue?
  o Should the GE Subcommittee be charged with assessing courses according to the GE outcomes
  o In addition to the freshman surveys, which indicate a high degree of success for the Freshman Learning Communities, are there other measures that might be worth implementing, e.g.
    ▪ Retention and graduation data
    ▪ Indicators of faculty professional growth resulting from summer collaboration among Freshman Learning Community faculty

• Freshman Learning Communities
  o What are the logistical challenges (recruiting faculty and departments, scheduling, etc.) facing the FLCs?
  o How can quality of every cluster be maintained?
  o How can course content be integrated as fully as possible?
  o How can the quality of the Peer Mentors be maintained?

• After the first year
  o What programs (e.g. Sophomore Year Experience) can/should be implemented to support students beyond their first year?
  o Should these programs be implemented at department and college levels, or should they be implemented campus-wide?
  o To what extent should Upper Division GE courses be organized into integrated clusters of courses?

All of these questions—and, indeed, this entire GE review—have taken on particular significance in light of CSUEB’s upcoming conversion from the quarter to semester system. Conversion was, understandably, the main topic of conversation throughout the day I spent at CSUEB. To state the obvious—and to paraphrase every person I spoke with—this conversion provides a unique opportunity for faculty and administration to examine and rethink GE rather than merely to continue the existing format. (In fact, as was pointed out to me during my visit, the current program cannot convert mathematically from quarter units to semester units; therefore, much about the configuration of GE has to change.) Everyone I
spoke with seemed very happy about this opportunity: I was told many times that the campus, as a whole, has “lost our vision” of GE and the value it can bring to an undergraduate education. Without continual self-examination and assessment, a GE program has the tendency to devolve into little more than an a la carte menu of requirements, unrelated to students’ perceptions of what really matters in their educational experience, that they must check off, one by one, in order to graduate. Tenured and tenure-track faculty are, for the most part, very removed from the GE program: too many neither teach nor advise students in GE, leaving those tasks to lecturers and professional staff, respectively.

Throughout my visit, the question on everybody’s mind seemed to be: What elements and qualities of the current GE program should be maintained, and what should be changed? I applaud the GE Subcommittee’s decision to hold a series of forums on conversion and to begin with some kind of vision statement about the GE program—not just because this statement should help with subsequent decisions about how to structure the program and allocate requirements to each GE Area, but, equally important, these meetings should draw faculty into much-needed conversation about the nature and purpose of GE and how best to meet the goals that people agree upon. By now those conversations must be well underway, and I hope that the GE Subcommittee has been able, as they strategized in the meeting I attended, to steer the discussion away from protection of territory (which was what many committee members expected would draw faculty to the meetings), to higher-level conversations about these loftier considerations.

With regard to the key questions (above) that surfaced in my review of GE, and the respondents’ comments throughout the day, here is what I hope will be addressed in the conversion conversations and subsequent discussions and decisions about the new GE program:

**Structural Issues**

From what everyone told me, clearly, a top-down, whole cloth revision of GE would be next to impossible to develop or implement. First of all, given the short conversion timeline, it would not be possible for faculty concerned about protecting “territory” to significantly change their views. For this and many other reasons, top-down curricular restructuring is unbelievably difficult to design and implement and, even when it is implemented, too often it is never fully endorsed by faculty. And, most important of all, the leaders of this effort (Faculty Leads, GE Subcommittee, etc.) seemed more focused on reinvigorating GE, course by course, by connecting courses to agreed upon values and outcomes. That is:

- Build new GE courses on the Institutional Learning Outcomes, thereby tying into an overall vision of GE
- Use the ILOs to infuse better connections among courses
- Implement pedagogy based on Integrate High Impact Practices that engage students and connects course content to a GE vision statement and the ILOs
This seems to be a very worthwhile and doable plan—one that is more likely to gain reasonably wide faculty acceptance and to be implementable over the short timeline that the university is facing. As was suggested in the GE Subcommittee, the University could even "rebrand" GE by giving it a new name, i.e. "Core Curriculum", whose purpose is to educate the whole student through exploration of broad and disparate areas of knowledge connected through their common ILOs. This approach, as was pointed out, is not at all new: it is the cornerstone of a liberal education.

A key element of this rebranding effort should be to develop a plan for communicating this liberal education philosophical stance to students, faculty, and the entire campus community. It was pointed out to me that advisors in the Advising Center are important conveyors of this message, that they make a point of telling students that GE teaches students transferable skills that prepare students for life and work in the 21st century. In fact, from what I learned, GE advising is solely the purview of professional advisors. But this leads me to wonder: If faculty have nothing whatsoever to do with GE advising, what is the message that this strict division of advising responsibility between professionals (GE) and majors (faculty) conveys to students about the value of GE? It would seem to me that no matter what professional advisors say about the importance of GE, this division of labor would convey the opposite message—that the only thing that matters is the major.

Conversion also provides a perfect opportunity for the GE Subcommittee to assert its oversight of GE, particularly in the area of assessment. While the campus looks to this group to provide leadership in the conversion process, the committee should reassert its role in assessing the effectiveness of the GE program as a whole. Even if departments continue to be responsible for determining and assessing course content, the GE Subcommittee should be responsible for assessing pedagogy and the course’s alignment to the ILOs.

There was considerable discussion about the purview of the GE Subcommittee. While there was consensus among all the players about its key role in assessment of the GE program, there was not agreement about the notion of ownership. Where should GE courses reside, in the departments or in a University College? While creation of a University College would facilitate GE curriculum development, oversight, and assessment—as well as bringing much needed tenured and tenure-track participation in the GE program—there is the possibility that it might “ghettoize” the faculty assigned to teach in the College. The possibility of creating a two-tiered system cannot be ignored. More than one faculty member indicated to me that they would not want to teach in a University College because their teaching would be limited to very general courses with too little focus on their expertise and research interests. One possibility to consider would be to have the GE budget held centrally, with funding allocated to departments to teach courses in designated GE Areas. The departments could still determine what specific courses to offer and which faculty to assign to teach these classes. While this plan may not necessarily increase permanent faculty involvement in GE, it would ensure that adequate GE
courses are available to students and that the distribution of GE offerings matches student needs in each GE Area.

Elevating GS to the level of a department would help the Freshman Learning Communities continue to flourish. At SSU, a curriculum committee for our University Studies Department was recently established, the expectation being that this committee (with the AVP for Undergraduate Studies serving ex officio) will provide much-needed faculty oversight of the Department. The oversight will lend legitimacy (in the eyes of faculty and administration) to the department; moreover, the committee will be able to champion interdisciplinary curriculum initiatives that come from University Studies. I can imagine similar benefits for CSUEB if it created a comparable entity to oversee GS.

You could achieve the same goal without elevating the status of GS (or, for that matter, creating a University College) by re-imagining the role of Senior Director of Undergraduate Studies and General Education and turning it into an AVP or Dean-level position. GS could be part of a Dean of Undergraduate Studies’ portfolio, along with General Education, Freshman Learning Communities, Sophomore Year Experiences, and other student success initiatives. If Advising were also a responsibility of the Undergraduate Dean or AVP (as is the case here at Sonoma State University), then the disconnect between students’ GE coursework and advisors’ message about the value of liberal education, to which I alluded above, would stand a better chance of being received and understood by students. With a Dean of Undergraduate Studies, the rebranding of GE could be a focused, coordinated effort.

Faculty
From listening to the discussions about conversion to semester scheduling, the faculty-related issues listed above are not currently under consideration. The problem of faculty “allegiance” to their departments, and not to GE, will continue to be a concern unless something changes. The solution of creating a University College, as mentioned above, would go a long way toward getting faculty (or at least a subset of the faculty) to focus their attention and energies toward GE; but it might create more problems than it solves. The idea of a dual appointment—in both a home department and a University College—was discussed in several meetings I attended on my visit to CSUEB. This might be a viable compromise; still, I worry that departments might have difficulty staffing their major courses with permanent faculty, and that potential candidates for open positions might prefer to look elsewhere for employment.

Rather than causing the disruption that changing college or departmental structure would engender, the most practical (and least disruptive) solution, as suggested above, would be to create a Dean of Undergraduate Studies position. This high-level administrator would be able to work with fellow deans to devise ways to support, evaluate, and help GE faculty to understand the goals of the GE program in general and their GE course in particular.
Curriculum and Assessment

From listening to the conversations throughout the day, it seems clear that there is little interest in implementing any broad whole cloth restructuring of the GE program. A variety of well-founded concerns seem to be pointing faculty and administration in the direction, as mentioned above, of focusing more on improving the quality of GE offerings and strengthening their connection to the ILOs. The most consistent concerns I heard were:

- We don’t want to create a plan so rigid that creates specific pathways that might slows students down as they proceed through their course of study
- We don’t want to create something that veers so far from the GE Areas that it makes transferring to other campuses difficult for students

Thus, as one person said to me, “We need to balance innovation with the CSU requirements.”

There seemed to be less agreement on how to structure the upper division GE requirement. On the one hand, many noted the value of connected courses. The new GANAS program strikes me as a shining example of supporting a cohort of students through a year of integrated year of study. But this type of program creates tremendous logistical challenges, especially around scheduling. How much effort does it take (indeed, is it even possible?) to schedule all three courses so that no students have conflicts with required major courses? Even putting aside that concern, there was strong advocacy for a cafeteria-style upper division GE program. Many members of the GE subcommittee argued that this is the time (perhaps the last time for most students) that students have the opportunity to explore worlds of knowledge in a more or less random way, following their interests and instincts to explore and enjoy areas of study that they would otherwise never encounter. This is a compelling way to look at upper division GE, especially for students who entered CSUEB as freshmen and are well on their way to focusing on their majors; but for the many transfer students, it might well be worth exploring themed upper division GE programs like GANAS, which, in spite of the logistical challenges, are worthwhile for the learning community and connection to the University that they create for these new transfer students.

Conversion discussions did not address the issue of combined major and GE courses. Everyone I spoke to about this noted the problems that this arrangement creates. But until the University has enough faculty and funding to offer both types of courses separately, having courses meet GE and major requirements simultaneously will be an unfortunately fact of life at CSUEB, as it is on so many other CSU campuses. Until that time, the university, as one person told me, will need to find that “sweet spot”—creating courses that are neither too easy nor too hard, neither too narrow nor too broad, that meet the goals of both majors and the GE program. Perhaps the short-term fix for this problem is to create professional
development opportunities for faculty to explore ways to meet GE ILOs at the same time as meeting content and skill goals particular to the major.

**Freshman Learning Communities**

The Freshman Learning Communities, as mentioned above, are a shining example of interdisciplinary/interconnected curriculum that, from what I could discern from perusing the surveys and talking with faculty and Peer Mentors, supports first-year students transition into college. The funding supporting faculty summer collaboration plays an essential role in helping faculty develop curriculum that will help students see the breadth of and connection among various areas of knowledge—which is just what an introduction to General Education should provide for students. The Senior Director of Undergraduate Studies and General Education is also key to this successful integration, orienting faculty to the unique challenges of teaching freshmen and providing the necessary guidance and support as faculty develop their connected syllabi. It is unfortunate that not all faculty avail themselves of this opportunity, as it strikes me as a rare chance for collaboration and professional development—as well, of course, as the way to provide the best learning opportunity for the students. A Dean of Undergraduate Studies might be able to continue the work that the Senior Director has begun and to entice more faculty to participate in this program.

The Peer Mentor involvement, while quite expensive, is also key to the program’s success. It is these students, who only recently went through the same experiences themselves, who provide that bridge between faculty and students. I spoke with several of the Peer Mentors and was impressed by the level of training that they received and the depth of understanding they already had about how best to support the freshmen. Of course, the students who most benefit from the Peer Mentor program are probably the Peers themselves. Every one of them told me how much they had learned from their Peer Mentor training and experiences about leadership, learning, and how to succeed in the academy. These students were, in a word, amazing!

I was glad to note that nobody spoke ill of the Freshman Learning Communities or even hinted, in their conversations discussions, at any interest in discontinuing the program. My visit, along with the data provided in the report, convinced me of the Freshman Learning Communities’ value to students and to the strength of the GE program. But not everyone has the same opportunity that I had to examine the Freshman Learning Community program--and any complicated and expensive program like this one, whose weight is carried primarily by one person (in this case, the Senior Director of Undergraduate Studies and General Education), is never secure without ongoing evidence of its success. In order to promote the program and convince all constituents of its importance, I would suggest collecting more data and types of information (in addition to the student surveys provided in the report) about the program and sharing these findings widely across the university community, for example:
• A year-end report on what integrations and activities have come out of the faculty training
• Examples of the annotated syllabi that faculty develop during the summer workshops
• Faculty feedback on what they gained from the summer workshops and the experience of teaching in this program
• Retention and graduation data for students who complete the Freshman Learning Communities

GE After the First Year
While upper division GE, as discussed above, seems to be on practically everybody's mind, there was little conversation about developing a sophomore year program. While most colleges and universities have come to embrace the research that advocates development of academic, co-curricular, and extracurricular support for freshmen as they transition to college life, far fewer institutions of higher learning have explored the need to continue that support into the second year—in spite of the data that shows that retention rates between the second and third year typically plummet. Students who have been nurtured and supported for a year are suddenly left to fend for themselves. After the freshman year, in which students (hopefully) learn how to navigate college life, sophomore year is when students begin asking new questions: Why am I here? What should I study? Their concerns turn sharply towards academics and the connections of their studies to their lives and careers.

Sophomore year programs need not be copies of the freshman learning communities. Rather than being cross-disciplinary, they can successfully focus on a particular area of study, introducing students to particular disciplines and the kinds of research and creative exploration that characterize study in the disciplines. Thus, a sophomore year experience can introduce students to the High Impact Practice of undergraduate research. With the complexities of scheduling becoming even more intense for students during their second year, I would suggest exploring ways to identify particular GE courses as SYE classes—so-designated because of the courses’ self-conscious examination of the discipline, introduction of undergraduate research, and relevant co-curricular opportunities for students to explore majors and careers related to the course. At Sonoma State, we were awarded ASSI funding to hire a Sophomore Year Experience coordinator who works with SYE instructors in three Schools, providing logistical and co-curricular support, training Peer Facilitators (students majoring in the discipline who provide academic support to students), and championing the program across campus. Without this coordinator, the program would be less robust, especially when it comes to co-curricular planning; but the courses—simply by virtue of their self-conscious attention to exploration of the discipline and research requirements—would still be very worthwhile.
Final Comments
It was inspirational to meet administrators, faculty, and students who all recognize the potential value of a robust GE program, who are well aware of the ways that the current program falls short of its goals, and who recognize the rare opportunity that the upcoming conversion from quarter to semester system provides for addressing those shortcomings and infusing new energy into the GE program. Of course, I didn’t meet the vast majority of faculty; nor did I attend the conversion forums that were scheduled to begin a week or two after my visit. I recognize the extent of the challenge ahead, and the possibility that many faculty members could resist any serious exploration or attempts to reform, restructure, or revitalize GE. But, having met the leaders of this effort and having noted their missionary zeal and political acumen (and, from what I could tell, the level of respect that their colleagues have for them), I am confident that their guidance through the process will generate enthusiasm about the possibilities and will, ultimately, result in an exciting new GE program.
Response to the External Review Report
Submitted by Nancy Thompson
Interim Director of General Education and Chair of General Studies

The external reviewer’s report was divided into several main areas: structural issues, faculty, curriculum and assessment, freshman learning communities, and GE after the first year.

Structural issues:

Both the External Reviewer and the former Director of GE implied a preference for courses dedicated to General Education and controlled by the GE office—i.e., the issue of who “owns” the curriculum—while recognizing that such a major overhaul in the current system would be impossible. The alternatives, described by the Reviewer as “doable,” were to connect GE courses more closely to the ILOs, to incorporate High-Impact Practices (HIPs) and to “rebrand” GE by renaming it the Core Curriculum. Some of these changes are already being implemented in the process of semester conversion. The GE Subcommittee has revised the GE SLOs and is in the process of connecting them to the ILOs. In addition, the committee has proposed overlay requirements in Diversity, Social Justice, and Sustainability, that not only support the ILOs, but that will make the connections between GE courses in different disciplines more explicit. New GE application forms are also being devised that will ask departments to describe specific assignments and explain how each will support the revised GE SLOs. Faculty Development has sponsored a number of workshops on HIPs and how instructors can incorporate them into the courses they are redesigning as part of the work of semester conversion. I have not heard any particular interest in retitling GE as the Core Curriculum. I doubt whether a name change would do much to change the structural issues that were of concern to the Reviewer and Director, but it might emphasize for students the importance of classes which are often regarded as peripheral to their majors and not really relevant to their future careers.

I applaud the Reviewer’s stress on communicating the importance of GE and a liberal education to students. He observes that the division of labor between advising in AACE for GE and advising by faculty for the major may make GE seem less integral to the Bachelor’s degree, and he has a valid point. Unfortunately, I see no easy way around it. If major advisors could be assured of the accuracy of the DAR (Degree Audit Report), and if all departments could ensure that their faculty fully understood GE requirements, it might be possible to leave advising in faculty hands. Unfortunately, the DAR is not always accurate and GE is complicated. The current system is most likely to ensure that students get accurate information.

The Reviewer called for the GE subcommittee to take on GE assessment. The subcommittee has proposed that all GE courses will be reviewed once every five years beginning in 2018 and according to the provisions of 13-14 CIC 4 - Renewal of General Education Classes.

Faculty:

The reviewer associated a number of other problems with the “ownership” question: the relatively small number of tenured and tenure-track faculty who teach GE courses, the offering of courses that double count for the major and GE (presumably too easy for majors or too hard for GE students), and the status of the GS faculty (lecturers and TAs). He suggested
reconsideration of the former Senior Director’s role, so that she became a Dean or AVP, overseeing not only the GS courses, but also advising and other student success initiatives. Since that time, the Senior Director retired, and a Dean of Undergraduate Studies is going to be hired. It remains to be seen whether this reorganization will result in the focused and coordinated effort of rebranding GE the Reviewer hoped for, nor is it entirely clear how the new appointment will help students understand at last the importance of GE courses in their education. The Reviewer suggests that the new dean would work with the deans of other colleges to help faculty understand GE’s aims.

The relationship between academic departments and GE is a difficult one and varies with the departments. Some departments depend on GE to support their enrollment, and their courses are frequently taught by tenured or tenure-track faculty members; others have plenty of enrollment without GE. Lecturers may teach a lot of GE courses, but not all of them are new or inexperienced. Some departments do well at informing their instructors about their GE responsibilities; others do little. I would like to see expanded support for faculty teaching GE. Starting last year, for example, we had monetary support for faculty teaching in the freshman clusters so that they could integrate their courses and make the cluster theme explicit. Unfortunately, not every department participated, even with the incentive.

The GS faculty who teach the freshmen seminars are now in a department of which I am chair, but their situation is definitely anomalous. Most of them are Graduate TAs, but we also have a half-dozen entitled lecturers. There is no tenure-track, and some of them do feel marginalized by what they consider inequitable treatment. The lecturers are important, because they provide continuity in the GS curriculum; they often advise the TAs, who normally teach only a year or two before going on to other things. While some of the TAs are natural-born teachers, for most it’s a steep learning curve. Since freshmen are a particularly vulnerable population, who have a great deal of adjusting to do in their first year here, I’d prefer to see them taught by experienced teachers. New TAs receive three days of training before the Fall quarter begins, but that is not always adequate preparation for the things they face in a classroom full of 18-year-olds. There are, however, certain benefits to using TAs: they often relate well to freshmen because they are nearer to them in age, and they gain valuable teaching experience for themselves.

Curriculum and Assessment:

The Reviewer’s major concern was connecting upper-division GE course with each other, and he praised themed programs like GANAS for making the connections. At the same time, he noted that upper-division GE offered students one last chance to explore areas of interest outside their majors. He distinguished between the needs of freshmen and transfer students, suggesting that the latter might benefit most from themed GE offerings.

Learning communities that link courses across two or more disciplines are a recognized example of a HIP. Scheduling them, as the Reviewer noted, would be a logistical challenge. The above-mentioned overlays currently being discussed by the GE subcommittee may offer a reasonable compromise: where courses in different disciplines share a common theme—e.g. Sustainability—upper-division GE will seem more integrated and purposeful, and they will work better to reinforce our institutional goals.

Incorporating GE outcomes with the major’s content and skills can be an issue for departments that are GE-dependent for enrollment. I agree with the Reviewer that professional
development opportunities should be made available as soon as the GE SLOs are approved. Some of the course redesign workshops held over the summer, while not specific to the GE program, already have provided some support for this process.

**Freshman Learning Communities:**

The Reviewer praised the Freshman Learning Communities (clusters), but indicated that more data is needed to assess their effectiveness. He suggested a year-end report on cluster integration activities, examples of annotated syllabi, faculty feedback on their experience, and retention and graduation data for freshmen. While the Five-Year Review does offer data on second-year retention rates, it would be useful to know whether those rates were higher in clusters where the faculty devoted more time and resources to cluster integration. It would also be useful to know if there was any impact on graduate rates. The same sort of inquiry should be applied to the Peer Mentor (PM) program. The Reviewer pointed to the obvious benefit of the PM program to the PMs themselves, but it would be useful to know whether incoming freshmen also received benefits. One could conceivably compare the retention rates, GPAs, and/or graduation rates of sections that had a peer mentor with those that did not.

**GE after the first year:**

One of the most interesting of the Reviewer’s recommendations was the development of a Sophomore-Year Experience (SYE). He rightly points to data that suggest that retention rates “plummet” between the second and third year. Although most of our work has been focused on the revision of the PLOs, there has been a little discussion in the GE subcommittee about sophomores. Since the clusters will need to be somehow redesigned to fit a semester schedule, the members of GE subcommittee should consider the challenges of the sophomore year in their discussion. There may be some way to carry over the benefits of the cluster system into at least the first term of students’ second year, so long as it can be done without imposing additional GE unit requirements.
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Attached is a copy of Executive Order No. 1065 relating to California State University General Education Breadth (CSU GE Breadth) requirements. This executive order supersedes Executive Order 1033 and incorporates Title 5 changes adopted by the Board of Trustees at the July 12, 2011 meeting. The changes specify that students seeking a baccalaureate degree in postbaccalaureate standing shall not be required to complete additional general education courses as a requirement for graduation.

In accordance with policy of the California State University, the campus president has the responsibility for implementing executive orders where applicable and for maintaining the campus repository and index for all executive orders.

If you have questions regarding this executive order, please contact the Office of Academic Programs and Policy at (562) 951-4722.

CBR/clm

Attachments

c: Dr. James Postma, Chair, Academic Senate CSU
Provosts/Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs
Associate Provosts/Associate Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs
Articulation Officers
Deans of Undergraduate Studies
Directors of Admission and Records
Directors of General Education
Executive Staff, Office of the Chancellor
Executive Order: 1065

Effective Date: September 16, 2011

Supersedes: Executive Order No. 1033

Title: CSU General Education Breadth Requirements

This executive order is issued pursuant to Title 5, California Code of Regulations, Sections 40402.1, 40403, 40405, 40405.1, 40405.2, 40405.4, and 40508, and the Standing Orders of the Board of Trustees, Section II(a).

This executive order is intended to establish a common understanding of the minimum requirements for CSU General Education Breadth and to provide for the certification of coursework completed by transfer students at regionally accredited institutions. Reciprocity among the CSU campuses for full and subject-area completion of lower-division General Education Breadth Requirements is also addressed in this executive order.

This document also addresses:

- Applicability of the policy (Article 1, page 1),
- Pathways to fulfillment of general education requirements (Article 2, page 2),
- Premises of CSU General Education Breadth (Article 3, page 5),
- Distribution of General Education Breadth units (Article 4, page 7),
- Transfer and articulation (Article 5, page 9),
- Implementation and governance (Article 6, page 17).

Article 1. Applicability

1.1 Prior to Completion of CSU Lower-Division General Education Requirements
The requirements, policies, and procedures adopted pursuant to this executive order shall apply to students enrolling in fall 2008 and subsequent terms who have not previously been enrolled continuously at a campus of the CSU or the
California Community Colleges and who have not satisfied lower-division general education requirements according to the provisions of Title 5 Sections 40405.2 or 40405.3.

1.2 Subsequent to Completion of Entire CSU General Education Requirements
Subsequent to initial completion of all CSU general education requirements (at the lower and upper divisions), a student may not be required to satisfy further exclusively general education requirements associated with an additional major program or baccalaureate degree.

Article 2. Fulfilling General Education Requirements in the CSU

2.1 Pathways
Policies adopted by the Board of Trustees in July 1991 provide three pathways for undergraduate students to fulfill CSU general education requirements:

1. CSU General Education Breadth
   Fulfillment of CSU General Education Breadth Requirements (Title 5, Section 40405.1), including the completion of an upper-division requirement consisting of a minimum of nine semester units or twelve quarter units at the CSU campus granting the baccalaureate degree; or

2. Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC)
   Completion of the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) (Title 5, Section 40405.2), as certified by a California community college, plus a minimum of nine upper-division semester units or twelve upper-division quarter units at the CSU campus granting the baccalaureate degree; or

3. University of California (UC) Campus Lower-Division
   Completion of lower-division general education requirements of a University of California campus (Title 5, Section 40405.3), as certified by that campus, plus a minimum of nine upper-division semester units or twelve upper-division quarter units at the CSU campus granting the baccalaureate degree. Implementation of this alternative is contingent on development of a formal agreement between the California State University and the University of California.
2.2 Minimum Requirements

2.2.1 General Education Requirements
Every baccalaureate candidate who has not completed either the IGETC or UC-campus pathway specified in Article 2 shall complete the CSU General Education Breadth requirements described in Article 4, Subsections A through E, totaling a minimum of 48 semester units or 72 quarter units.

2.2.2 Minimum Grades
Each CSU campus shall establish the minimum grades for satisfactory completion of CSU General Education Breadth courses.

2.2.3 Upper-Division Requirement
At least nine of these semester units or twelve of these quarter units must be upper-division level, taken no sooner than the term in which upper-division status (completion of 60 semester units or 90 quarter units) is attained.

2.2.4 Residency Requirement
Campuses may require that at least nine of the 48 semester units or twelve of the 72 quarter units shall be earned at the campus granting the degree. In all cases, students shall meet the residency requirements specified in Title 5 Section 40403.

2.2.5 Exceptions
Exceptions to the foregoing requirements may be authorized only under the following circumstances:

a. In the case of an individual student, the campus may grant a partial waiver of one or more of the particular requirements of Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations, Section 40405.1, to avoid demonstrable hardship, such as the need to extend the time required for completion of the degree in the case of a senior-level transfer student.

b. In the case of high-unit professional major degree programs, the chancellor may grant exceptions to one or more requirements for students completing the particular program. Such exception must be approved at the campus level prior to initiating a request to the Chancellor’s Office. A full academic justification shall be submitted to the executive vice chancellor and chief academic officer, Academic Affairs, who shall submit his or her
recommendation and the campus recommendation (along with all relevant documents) to the chancellor.

c. A student who has been admitted to a baccalaureate degree program is exempt from additional general education requirements if:

(i) The student has previously earned a baccalaureate or higher degree from an institution accredited by a regional accrediting association; or

(ii) The student has completed equivalent academic preparation, as determined by the appropriate campus authority.

d. Each campus is authorized to make reasonable adjustments in the number of units assigned to any of the five required distribution areas (A through E) if campus requirements and CSU GE-Breadth distribution requirements unduly exceed any of the minimum GE Breadth credit requirements. However, in such cases, the total number of general education units required shall not be fewer than 48 semester units or 72 quarter units. (No campus is required to adjust normal course credit configurations for the sole purpose of meeting the requirements specified herein.)

2.2.6 Double Counting

2.2.6.1 General Education, Major, and Other Requirements

Through a process of campus-wide curriculum review and approval, campuses may permit the “double counting” of courses for General Education Breadth with major requirements and prerequisites only after giving careful consideration to the impact of such actions on general education programs.

2.2.6.2 General Education and US History, Constitution, and American Ideals Statutory Requirement

CSU campuses may permit up to six semester units or eight quarter units taken to meet the United States History, Constitution, and American Ideals Requirement (Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations, Section 40404) to be credited toward also satisfying General Education Breadth Requirements.
Article 3. Premises of CSU General Education Breadth

3.1 Background

CSU General Education Breadth requirements have been designed to complement the major program and electives completed by each baccalaureate candidate, to assure that graduates have made noteworthy progress toward becoming truly educated persons.

These requirements are designed to provide the knowledge, skills, experiences, and perspectives that will enable CSU students to expand their capacities to take part in a wide range of human interests and activities; to confront personal, cultural, moral, and social problems that are an inevitable part of human life; and to cultivate both the requisite skills and enthusiasm for lifelong learning. Faculty are encouraged to assist students in making connections among disciplines to achieve coherence in the undergraduate educational experience.

Courses approved for GE Breadth should be responsive to the need for students to have developed knowledge of, or skills related to, quantitative reasoning, information literacy, intellectual inquiry, global awareness and understanding, human diversity, civic engagement, communication competence, ethical decision-making, environmental systems, technology, lifelong learning and self-development, and physical and emotional health throughout a lifetime.

3.2 CSU Student Learning Outcomes

Each CSU campus shall define its GE student learning outcomes, to fit within the framework of the four “Essential Learning Outcomes” drawn from the Liberal Education and American Promise (LEAP) campaign, an initiative of the Association of American Colleges and Universities.

LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes Framework

- Knowledge of Human Cultures and the Physical and Natural World
- Intellectual and Practical Skills
- Personal and Social Responsibility
- Integrative Learning

Within the LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes framework, campuses may identify more specific outcomes, such as students’ ability to:
- think clearly and logically;
- demonstrate information competency—finding and examining information critically;
• carry out effective oral communication;
• write effectively;
• apply quantitative reasoning concepts and skills to solve problems;
• make informed, ethical decisions;
• understand and apply the scientific method;
• apply learning from study abroad experiences to general education areas;
• utilize technology in pursuit of intellectual growth and efficacious human interaction;
• demonstrate understanding of human beings as physiological and psychological organisms;
• demonstrate understanding of the physical world in which they live and the life forms with which they share the global environment;
• demonstrate knowledge of cultural endeavors and legacies of world civilizations;
• demonstrate understanding of how human societies have developed and now function;
• apply socially responsive knowledge and skills to issues confronting local or global communities;
• demonstrate life skills such as financial literacy;
• understand and apply the principles, methodologies, value systems, ethics, and thought processes employed in human inquiry;
• engage in lifelong learning and self-development; and
• integrate and apply the insights gained from general education courses.

3.3 Entry-Level Learning Skills

3.3.1 Minimum Competency
Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations, Section 40402.1, provides that each student admitted to the California State University is expected to possess basic competence in the English language and mathematical computation to a degree that may reasonably be expected of entering college students.

3.3.2 Remediation
Students admitted who cannot demonstrate such basic competence should be identified as quickly as possible and be required to take steps to overcome those deficiencies. Any coursework completed primarily for this purpose shall not be applicable to the baccalaureate degree.
Article 4  Subject Area Distribution

Instruction approved to fulfill the following subject-area distribution requirements should recognize the contributions to knowledge and civilization that have been made by members of diverse cultural groups and by women as well as men.

Area A  English Language Communication and Critical Thinking
Minimum 9 semester units or 12 quarter units
-one course in each subarea

A1 Oral Communication  (3 semester units or 4 quarter units)
A2 Written Communication  (3 semester units or 4 quarter units)
A3 Critical Thinking  (3 semester units or 4 quarter units)

A minimum of nine semester units or twelve quarter units in communication in the English language, to include both oral communication (subarea A1) and written communication (subarea A2), and in critical thinking (Area A3), to include consideration of common fallacies in reasoning.

Students taking courses in fulfillment of subareas A1 and A2 will develop knowledge and understanding of the form, content, context, and effectiveness of communication. Students will develop proficiency in oral and written communication in English, examining communication from the rhetorical perspective and practicing reasoning and advocacy, organization, and accuracy. Students will practice the discovery, critical evaluation, and reporting of information, as well as reading, writing, and listening effectively. Coursework must include active participation and practice in both written communication and oral communication in English.

In critical thinking (subarea A3) courses, students will understand logic and its relation to language; elementary inductive and deductive processes, including an understanding of the formal and informal fallacies of language and thought; and the ability to distinguish matters of fact from issues of judgment or opinion. In A3 courses, students will develop the abilities to analyze, criticize, and advocate ideas; to reason inductively and deductively; and to reach well-supported factual or judgmental conclusions.

Area B  Scientific Inquiry and Quantitative Reasoning
Minimum of 12 semester units or 18 quarter units
-one course each in subareas B1, B2, and B4, plus laboratory activity related to one of the completed science courses

B1 Physical Science  (3 semester units or 4 quarter units)
B2 Life Science  (3 semester units or 4 quarter units)
B3 Laboratory Activity associated with a course taken to satisfy either B1 or B2
B4 Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning  (3 semester units or 4 quarter units)
A minimum of twelve semester units or eighteen quarter units to include inquiry into the physical universe and its life forms, with some immediate participation in a related laboratory activity, and into mathematical concepts and quantitative reasoning and their applications.

In subareas B1-B3, students develop knowledge of scientific theories, concepts, and data about both living and non-living systems. Students will achieve an understanding and appreciation of scientific principles and the scientific method, as well as the potential limits of scientific endeavors and the value systems and ethics associated with human inquiry. The nature and extent of laboratory experience is to be determined by each campus through its established curricular procedures.

Courses in subarea B4 shall have an explicit intermediate algebra prerequisite, and students shall develop skills and understanding beyond the level of intermediate algebra. Students will not just practice computational skills, but will be able to explain and apply basic mathematical concepts and will be able to solve problems through quantitative reasoning.

Area C  Arts and Humanities
Minimum of 12 semester units or 18 quarter units
-at least one course completed in each of these two subareas:

C1       Arts:  Arts, Cinema, Dance, Music, Theater
C2       Humanities:  Literature, Philosophy, Languages Other than English

A minimum of twelve semester units or eighteen quarter units among the arts, literature, philosophy and foreign languages. Across the disciplines in their Area C coursework, students will cultivate intellect, imagination, sensibility and sensitivity. Students will respond subjectively as well as objectively to aesthetic experiences and will develop an understanding of the integrity of both emotional and intellectual responses. Students will cultivate and refine their affective, cognitive, and physical faculties through studying great works of the human imagination. Activities may include participation in individual aesthetic, creative experiences; however Area C excludes courses that exclusively emphasize skills development.

In their intellectual and subjective considerations, students will develop a better understanding of the interrelationship between the self and the creative arts and of the humanities in a variety of cultures.

Students may take courses in languages other than English in partial fulfillment of this requirement if the courses do not focus solely on skills acquisition but also contain a substantial cultural component. This may include literature, among other content.
Coursework taken in fulfillment of this requirement must include a reasonable
distribution among the subareas specified, as opposed to restricting the entire number of
units required to a single subarea.

**Area D  Social Sciences**
**Minimum of 12 semester units or 18 quarter units**

A minimum of twelve semester units or eighteen quarter units dealing with human social,
political, and economic institutions and behavior and their historical background.

Students learn from courses in multiple Area D disciplines that human social, political
and economic institutions and behavior are inextricably interwoven. Through fulfillment
of the Area D requirement, students will develop an understanding of problems and
issues from the respective disciplinary perspectives and will examine issues in their
contemporary as well as historical settings and in a variety of cultural contexts. Students
will explore the principles, methodologies, value systems and ethics employed in social
scientific inquiry. Courses that emphasize skills development and professional
preparation are excluded from Area D. Coursework taken in fulfillment of this
requirement must include a reasonable distribution among the subareas specified, as
opposed to restricting the entire number of units required to a single subarea.

**Area E  Lifelong Learning and Self-Development**
**Minimum of 3 semester units or 4 quarter units**

A minimum of three semester units or four quarter units in study designed to equip
learners for lifelong understanding and development of themselves as integrated
physiological, social, and psychological beings.

Student learning in this area shall include selective consideration of content such as
human behavior, sexuality, nutrition, physical and mental health, stress management,
financial literacy, social relationships and relationships with the environment, as well as
implications of death and dying and avenues for lifelong learning. Physical activity may
be included, provided that it is an integral part of the study elements described herein.

**Article 5. Transfer and Articulation**

This article pertains to regionally accredited non-CSU institutions that certify transfer
students’ fulfillment of CSU General Education Breadth requirements.
5.1 Premises of General Education Breadth Transfer and Certification

a. It is the joint responsibility of the public segments of higher education to ensure that students are able to transfer without unreasonable loss of credit or time.

b. The faculty of an institution granting the baccalaureate degree have primary responsibility for maintaining the integrity of the degree program and determining when requirements have been met.

c. There shall ordinarily be a high degree of reciprocity among regionally accredited institutions unless there are specific indications that such reciprocity is not appropriate.

5.2 Conditions for Participation in CSU General Education Breadth Certification

Any institution that is accredited by a recognized regional accrediting association and that offers the BA or BS degree or the first two years of such degree programs may participate in General Education Breadth certification if it agrees to the following provisions:

a. The participating institution shall designate a liaison representative who shall participate in various orientation activities and provide other institutional staff with pertinent information.

b. The participating institution shall identify for certification purposes those courses or examinations that fulfill the objectives set forth in Article 3 of this executive order and such additional objectives as may be promulgated by the chancellor of the California State University.

1. The courses and examinations identified should be planned and organized to enable students to acquire abilities, knowledge, understanding, and appreciation as interrelated elements, not as isolated fragments.

2. Interdisciplinary courses or integrated sets of courses that meet multiple objectives of the CSU General Education Breadth requirements may be appropriate components of general education.

3. Credit units of an interdisciplinary course or integrated set of courses may be distributed among different areas of general education, as appropriate.
c. The CSU Office of the Chancellor, Division of Academic Affairs, shall maintain a list of participating institutions’ courses and examinations that have been identified and accepted for certification purposes.

1. Each entry in the list shall include specification of the area or areas and objectives to which the course or examination relates and the number of units associated with each area or objective. (See Attachment A.)

2. The list shall be updated annually. Each participating institution shall transmit annually to the CSU Office of the Chancellor, Division of Academic Affairs, any proposed changes to its portion of the list. If a course is to be added or if the specification of areas and objectives for a course is to be modified, the participating institution shall include in its submission the approved course outline. If a course is part of an integrated set of courses, the submission shall identify the set and describe how the course complements the others in the set.

3. A copy of the list shall be made available in printed or electronic form to any CSU campus or participating institution. Participating institutions are free to share their course outlines and communications from the CSU about those course outlines with other participating institutions.

4. The participating institution shall be responsible for reviewing periodically its portion of the list to assure that entries continue to be appropriate and to reflect current knowledge in the field. It is also responsible for re-approving entries that are found to have remained appropriate and for directing to the subcommittee of the Chancellor’s General Education Advisory Committee any questions such updating of the courses may have raised as to their congruence with CSU General Education Breadth areas and objectives.

5. The participating institution shall report certification for individual students in a format to be specified.

5.3 Certification Requirements

5.3.1 Definition
General education “certification” shall indicate that a participating institution has verified that a transfer student has met CSU lower-division requirements. CSU campuses shall accept participating institutions’ full certification or subject-area certification, as defined below.
5.3.2 Full Certification

5.3.2.1 Fulfillment of Lower-Division Requirements
Students admitted to a CSU campus with full certification shall not be held to any additional lower-division general education requirements.

5.3.2.2 Additional Lower-Division Graduation Requirements
Full certification does not exempt students from unmet lower-division graduation requirements that may exist outside of the general education program of the campus awarding the degree.

5.3.2.3 Qualification for Full Certification
To qualify for full certification, a student must satisfactorily complete no fewer than 39 lower-division semester units or 58 lower-division quarter units of instruction appropriate to meet the objectives of Articles 3 (Premises) and 4 (Distribution Areas). Community college certification does not guarantee that all CSU campus admission requirements have been met. The units must be distributed as follows below (except as specified in Subsection 5.3.4 below):

a. In Area A, no fewer than 9 semester units (12-15 quarter units), including instruction in oral communication, written communication, and critical thinking.

b. In Area B, no fewer than 9 semester units (12-15 quarter units), including instruction in physical science and life science, at least one part of which must include a laboratory component, and mathematics/quantitative reasoning.

c. In Area C, no fewer than 9 semester units (12-15 quarter units), with at least one course in the arts and one in the humanities (see Attachment A).

d. In Area D, no fewer than 9 semester units (12-15 quarter units), with courses taken in at least two disciplines (see Attachment A).
e. In Area E, no fewer than 3 semester units (4-5 quarter units).

5.3.3 Subject-Area (Partial) Certification

5.3.3.1 Fulfillment of Lower-Division Requirements by Area
Students admitted to a CSU campus with subject-area certification may not be held to any additional lower-division general education coursework in the subject areas certified.

5.3.3.2 Certification Limits on Credits that Exceed Minimum Subject-Area Requirements
For subject-area certification, campuses are not required to certify credits that exceed the minimum number of units required for the five Subject Areas—A through E.

5.3.3.3 Additional Lower-Division Graduation Requirements
Subject-area certification does not exempt students from completing unmet lower-division graduation requirements that may exist outside of the general education requirements at the campus awarding the degree.

5.3.3.4 Qualification for Subject-Area Certification
To qualify for subject-area certification, a student must satisfactorily complete instruction appropriate to meet the objectives of one or more subsections of Article 4 (Subject-Area Distribution). Except as specified in Subsection 5.3.4, the units must be distributed as follows:

a. For Area A, no fewer than 9 semester units (12-15 quarter units), including instruction in oral communication, written communication, and critical thinking. A single course may not be certified as meeting more than one subarea for any given student.

b. For Area B, no fewer than 9 semester units (12-15 quarter units), including instruction in mathematics/quantitative reasoning and physical science and life science, at least one part of which must include a laboratory component. A single course may not be certified as meeting more than one subarea for any given student, except for laboratory components incorporated into a physical or life science course.
c. For Area C, no fewer than 9 semester units (12-15 quarter units), with at least one course in the arts and one in the humanities (see Attachment A).

d. For Area D, no fewer than 9 semester units (12-15 quarter units), with courses taken in at least two disciplines (see Attachment A).

e. For Area E, no fewer than 3 semester units (4-5 quarter units).

5.3.4 Exceptions to Certification Requirements
At the discretion of the campus, exceptions to the requirements for full certification and subject-area certification (as specified above) may be made for programs in which instruction is integrated into a set of courses or into interdisciplinary courses designed to meet multiple objectives. Interdisciplinary courses in this case would be expected to be offered at an appropriately greater number of units.

5.4 Certification of Courses and Examinations

5.4.1 Qualification for Certification
A participating institution may certify completion of courses or examinations taken at other eligible institutions, provided that all such courses and examinations would be identified for certification purposes by the institution offering them.

5.4.2 If so identified, those courses and examinations shall contribute to qualification of a student for either full certification or subject-area certification, as appropriate.

5.4.3 California Community Colleges may include non-CSU upper-division courses in certification of lower-division CSU General Education Breadth or Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum.

5.5 Limitations of Certification

5.5.1 Restriction to General Education Requirements
Neither full certification nor subject-area certification exempts students from unmet lower-division graduation requirements that may exist outside of the general education program of the campus awarding the degree.
5.5.2 Maximum Number of Credits Allowed

5.5.2.1 Limit on Certification on Total General Education Units
A participating institution shall not certify a student for more than 39 semester units or the quarter equivalent. If more than one participating institution certifies a student, the CSU campus granting the degree is not required to accept certification for more than 39 semester units or the quarter equivalent.

5.5.2.2 Limit on Certification of Units in Areas B through D
A participating institution shall not certify a student for more than 30 semester units (45 quarter units) total in subject areas B through D combined. If more than one participating institution certifies a student, the CSU campus granting the degree is not required to accept certification for more than 30 semester units (45 quarter units) total in subject areas B through D combined.

5.5.2.3 Limit on Requirements After Transfer
Upon transfer, no student shall be required to complete more units in General Education Breadth than the difference between the number certified in accordance with this executive order and the total units in General Education Breadth required by the campus granting the degree.

5.5.2.4 Restrictions on Certification of Upper-Division Courses
Baccalaureate-granting institutions certifying a student for units earned in upper-division courses or examinations may provide certification only for those units that were completed during or after the term in which the student achieved upper-division status (i.e., earned a total of at least 60 semester units or 90 quarter units).

5.6 General Education Reciprocity Among CSU Campuses

5.6.1 Full Lower-Division Reciprocity
a. Full lower-division reciprocity is the process through which all lower-division general education requirements that one CSU campus has
designated as having been satisfactorily and entirely completed shall be accepted as fulfilling all lower-division general education requirements of the CSU campus granting the baccalaureate degree—without regard to differences that may exist between the GE requirements of two campuses.

b. A course or examination is to be regarded as satisfactorily completed if the student’s performance meets the minimum standards for full acceptance toward satisfying a requirement as set by the campus at which the course or examination was taken.

c. For the purposes of this section, completion of lower-division general education requirements is equivalent to qualification for full certification, as defined in Article 5 above.

5.6.2 Reciprocity as Fulfillment of Full Lower-Division General Education Requirements

Transfer students admitted with documentation of full lower-division general education program completion at another CSU campus shall not be held to any additional lower-division general education requirements by the campus awarding the degree.

5.6.3 Reciprocity for Subject-Area General Education Requirements

5.6.3.1 Definition

a. Subject-area lower-division reciprocity is the process through which lower-division general education subject-area requirements designated by CSU campuses as having been satisfactorily completed shall be recognized as fulfilling the corresponding subject-area general education requirements of the CSU campus granting the baccalaureate degree—without regard to differences that may exist in the configuration of the two programs or in the content of the subject area.

b. Students seeking to transfer under the provisions of this section shall be responsible for requesting verification that lower-division general education program or subject-area requirements have been met. Upon the request of a currently or formerly enrolled student, the CSU campus from which the student seeks to transfer shall determine the extent to which that student has satisfactorily completed the lower-division general education requirements in each
subject area, and shall provide official documentation of such completion.

c. For the purposes of this section, completion of lower-division general education subject-area requirements is equivalent to qualification for subject-area certification, as defined above.

d. Transfer students admitted with documentation of completion of one or more general education subject areas at another CSU campus may not be held to any additional lower-division general education requirements in that subject area by the campus awarding the degree.

5.6.4 Reciprocity Limitations
The provisions of Article 5.6 do not exempt students from unmet lower-division graduation requirements of the CSU campus awarding the degree or from lower-division courses required by individual baccalaureate majors at the CSU campus awarding the degree.

Article 6 Implementation and Governance

6.1 General Education Advisory Committee
A systemwide Chancellor’s General Education Advisory Committee is hereby established. While it is important that the membership of this committee be broadly based, it shall in largest part be drawn from the instructional faculty of the California State University.

At minimum, the membership shall also include Chancellor’s Office staff, one California Community College instructional faculty member, one CSU campus academic affairs administrator, and one articulation officer from the CSU system and one from the California Community College system. Each member of the committee shall have an equal vote.

The chancellor or the executive vice chancellor and chief academic officer may from time to time request that the committee address and provide advice on other issues related to the development and well-being of California State University General Education Breadth policy and programs.

The responsibilities of this committee shall be as follows:

a. To review and propose any necessary revisions in the objectives, requirements, and implementation of CSU General Education Breadth policy to ensure high-quality general education.
b. To continue to study general education policies and practices inside and outside the system and, as appropriate, to stimulate intersegmental discussion of the development of general education curricula.

c. To review the implications of CSU General Education Breadth policy for students transferring to the CSU and for the institutions from which they transfer, and to propose any necessary adjustments to pertinent policies and practices so that students may be better served in their educational pursuits and achievement of the baccalaureate degree.

d. To report as appropriate to the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees.

6.2 Campus Responsibility

6.2.1 Development and Revision of Campus Requirements
Campus faculty have primary responsibility for developing and revising the institution’s particular general education program. Within the CSU General Education Breadth distribution framework, each CSU campus is to establish its own requirements and exercise creativity in identifying courses, disciplines, and learning outcomes. In undertaking this task, careful attention should be given to the following:

a. Assuring that General Education Breadth requirements are planned and organized so that their objectives are perceived by students as interrelated elements, not as isolated fragments.

b. Considering the organization of approved courses so that students may choose from among a variety of “cores” or “themes,” each with an underlying unifying rationale.

c. Periodically reviewing approved courses to ensure that they remain responsive to the essential learning outcomes framework identified in Section 3.2.

d. Using evidence of student attainment of learning outcomes to inform the ongoing design of General Education curriculum and instruction.

e. Considering the possibility of incorporating integrative courses, especially at the upper-division level, that feature the interrelationships among disciplines and traditional general education categories.
f. Providing for reasonable ordering of requirements so that, for example, courses focusing on learning skills will be completed relatively early and those emphasizing integrative experiences will be completed relatively later.

g. Developing programs that are responsive to educational goals and student needs, rather than programs based on traditional titles of academic disciplines and organizational units.

h. Considering possibilities for innovative teaching and learning, including activity as well as observation in all general education coursework.

6.2.2 General Education Breadth Requirements and the Development of New Baccalaureate Degrees

The development of new baccalaureate programs shall include consideration of how the degree requirements will incorporate at least the minimum required general education distribution credits, the major program requirements, and other graduation requirements. Justifications must be provided to the Office of the Chancellor for any program extending the baccalaureate credit requirement beyond 120 units (Title 5, Section 40508).

6.2.3 Campus Standing General Education Committee

The effectiveness of a General Education Breadth program is dependent upon the adequacy of curricular supervision, its internal integrity and its overall fiscal and academic support. Toward this end, each campus shall have a broadly representative standing committee, a majority of which shall be instructional faculty, and which shall also include student membership, to provide for appropriate oversight and to make appropriate recommendations concerning the implementation, conduct and evaluation of these requirements.

6.2.4 General Education Academic Advising

Each campus shall provide for systematic, readily available academic advising specifically oriented to general education as one means of achieving greater cohesiveness in student choices of course offerings to fulfill these requirements.
6.2.5 **General Education Review and Assessment**
Each campus shall provide for regular periodic reviews of general education program policies and practices in a manner comparable to those of major programs, including evaluation by an external reviewer. The review should include an assessment of general education student learning outcomes (as designed by campuses in consonance with but not constrained by the objectives stated in Article 3.2 of this executive order).

Charles B. Reed, Chancellor

Dated: September 16, 2011
Attachment A
Transfer Student Requirements for Lower-Division Certification of
CSU General Education Breadth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area A</th>
<th>English Language Communication and Critical Thinking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>References: Article 4-A, Article 5.3.2.3-A, Article 5.3.3.4-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A minimum of 9 semester units or 12-15 quarter units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-one course in each subarea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oral Communication.......................................................A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Written Communication...................................................A2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Critical Thinking.......................................................A3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area B</th>
<th>Scientific Inquiry and Quantitative Reasoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>References: Article 4-B, Article 5.3.2.3-B, Article 5.3.3.4-B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A minimum of 9 semester units or 12-15 quarter units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-one course in subareas B1, B2, and B4, plus laboratory activity related to one of the completed science courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical Science........................................................B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Life Science..............................................................B2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Laboratory Activity.....................................................B3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>associated with the course taken to satisfy either B1 or B2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning.........................B4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area C</th>
<th>Arts and Humanities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>References: Sections Article 4-C, Article 5.3.2.3-C, Article 5.3.3.4-C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A minimum of 9 semester units or 12-15 quarter units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-at least one course in each subarea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts (Art, Cinema, Dance, Music, Theater)..........................C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Humanities (Literature, Philosophy, Languages Other than English)..........C2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area D</th>
<th>Social Sciences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>References: Article 4-D Article 5.3.2.3-D Article 5.3.3.4-D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A minimum of 9 semester units or 12-15 quarter units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-courses to be taken in more than one subarea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anthropology and Archeology............................................D1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economics.................................................................D2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethnic Studies*..........................................................D3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender Studies*..........................................................D4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geography.................................................................D5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>History*................................................................D6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interdisciplinary Social or Behavioral Science........................D7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political Science, Government, and Legal Institutions.................D8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychology.................................................................D9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sociology and Criminology..............................................D0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Ethnic Studies, Gender Studies, or history courses emphasizing artistic or humanistic perspectives may be categorized in Area C.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area E</th>
<th>Lifelong Understanding and Self-Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>References: Article 4-E Article 5.3.2.3-E Article 5.3.3.4-E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 semester units or 4-5 quarter units required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX

B
Closing the Loop on Assessment of Critical Thinking
CSUEB ILO Assessment Team: Process & Findings

Sally Murphy
Senior Director, Undergraduate Studies & General Education
California State University, East Bay
The California State University East Bay Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) express a shared, campus-wide articulation of expectations for all degree recipients. Graduates of CSUEB will be able to:

- think critically and creatively and apply analytical and quantitative reasoning to address complex challenges and everyday problems;
- communicate ideas, perspectives, and values clearly and persuasively while listening openly to others;
- apply knowledge of diversity and multicultural competencies to promote equity and social justice in our communities;
- work collaboratively and respectfully as members and leaders of diverse teams and communities;
- act responsibly and sustainably at local, national, and global levels;
- demonstrate expertise and integration of ideas, methods, theory and practice in a specialized discipline of study.
2013-14 Critical Thinking Competency

- 2013: Pilot of new rubric to assess first-year critical thinking outcomes
- 2013-14: One year pilot with 19 faculty teaching upper-division GE and/or upper-division courses in the major with a critical thinking learning outcome (using Blackboard Outcomes electronic learning assessment platform)
- 2014: Current pilots with College of Business and College of Education & Allied Studies assessing upper division work using CT rubric
Iterative Collaborative Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explanation of issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Evidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context, assumptions, and alternative viewpoints</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement of position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions, implications, and consequences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Explanation of issues**

1. Clearly and concisely explain issues/problems in focus.
2. Clearly, logically, and succinctly explain issues/problems for full understanding.
3. Clearly and concisely explain issues/problems to be evaluated.
4. Issue/problems to be evaluated critically are identified, clearly, logically, and described adequately, providing all relevant background information necessary for full understanding.

**Quality of Evidence**

1. Provides information from appropriate source(s) to develop a comprehensive analysis or synthesis.
2. Provides information from appropriate source(s) for an adequate analysis or synthesis.
3. Provides little information from appropriate source(s) for analysis or synthesis.

**Context, assumptions, and alternative viewpoints**

1. Thoroughly analyzes strengths and weaknesses of one’s own and others’ assumptions; carefully evaluates context and alternative viewpoints.
2. Analyzes strengths and weaknesses of one’s own and others’ assumptions; evaluates context and alternative viewpoints.
3. Minimally evaluates strengths and weaknesses of one’s own and others’ assumptions; does not evaluate context and alternative viewpoints.

**Statement of position**

1. Clearly states position.
2. States position. Position unclear.
3. Position not stated.

**Conclusions, implications, and consequences**

1. Conclusions, implications, and consequences flow from student’s analysis.
2. Conclusions, implications, and consequences flow from student’s analysis.
3. Conclusions, implications, and consequences do not flow from student’s analysis.
Results

Freshman

- 2.16
- Rubric revisions

Upper Division

- 2.65 GE, 2.74 Other
- Faculty recommendations
CT Rubric Evaluation Results for GE Assignments

**Explanation of issues**
- **Strongest**: Possible - 4.00, Actual - 3.04
- **Weakest**: Possible - 4.00, Actual - 2.64

**Quality of Evidence**
- Possible - 4.00, Actual - 2.68

**Context, assumptions, and alternative viewpoints**
- Possible - 4.00, Actual - 2.97

**Statement of Position**
- Possible - 4.00, Actual - 2.67

**Conclusions, implications, and consequences**
- Possible - 4.00, Actual - 2.6
CT Evaluations Results for Non-GE Assignments

- **Explanation of issues**: Possible - 4.00, Actual - 2.90
- **Quality of Evidence**: Possible - 4.00, Actual - 2.72
- **Context, assumptions, and alternative viewpoints**: Possible - 4.00, Actual - 2.43
- **Statement of Position**: Possible - 4.00, Actual - 3.09
- **Conclusions, implications, and consequences**: Possible - 4.00, Actual - 2.57

Average Score per Criteria
Findings

Importance of:

- Curriculum mapping
- Involving faculty in all steps of the process
- Familiarizing faculty with the rubric before creating the assignment
- Designing well-crafted assignments
- Sharing rubric with students – impacts student learning and quality of assignments produced

About the Process:

- Electronic learning assessment process + ongoing support + collaboration helped make assessment process engaging and relevant to faculty; faculty spread the word
- Enhanced teaching and learning
- Faculty collaboration experienced as faculty development; appreciated learning about critical thinking across disciplines
- Mixed results about applicability of one rubric across disciplines
Closing the Loop on Findings

Next Steps:

- Report findings to all faculty
- Faculty meet to discuss curriculum
- Faculty development /reference tools for assignment design
- Further revision of rubric for specific disciplines
Closing the Loop on Assessment of Critical Thinking
CSUEB ILO Assessment Team: Process & Findings

Sally Murphy
Senior Director, Undergraduate Studies & General Education
California State University, East Bay
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GE Program SLOs</th>
<th>CSUEB ILOs</th>
<th>Communication: reading, writing, quantitative reasoning, critical thinking &amp; speaking</th>
<th>Problem-solving skills while working well with others</th>
<th>Information literacy</th>
<th>Connected and integrated learning</th>
<th>Respect for and understanding of issues of cultural, racial, ethnic, sexual orientation, and gender diversity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Think critically and creatively & apply analytical and quantitative reasoning to address complex problems | | A3: Crit Thkg (I)  
B4: Math/Stat/Fin (I)  
C1: fine arts (creative thinking)  
GE C4, D4 (D) | GS (I)  
UDGE B6, C4, D4 (D) | Library 1210 (I) | Cluster as a whole; GS specifically measures (I) |
| Communicate ideas, perspectives & values clearly & persuasively while listening openly to others | | COMM 1000 (I)  
ENGL 1001 (and remedial) (I)  
GS (I), A3 course  
UD C4 critical thinking and oral & written comm;  
B6: quantitative reasoning and science literacy | UDGE C4, D4 (D) | Cluster writing assignments  
G3 Library Info Lit (I)  
UDGE C4, D4 (D) | Clusters (I) |
<p>| Apply knowledge of diversity and multicultural competencies to promote quality and social justice | | GS (I), Viewing Diversity, Bodies @ Play, Spirituality (I) | CGW courses | GS, Viewing Diversity, Bodies @ Play, Spirituality, Asian Pacific Islander and | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Course/Program</th>
<th>SLOs</th>
<th>CSUEB ILOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work collaboratively and respectfully as members and leaders of diverse teams and communities</td>
<td>GS (I, D), COMM, ENGL</td>
<td>GS 1011, 1012, 1013 (I, D)</td>
<td>Bodies, API</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act responsibly and sustainably at local, national, &amp; global levels</td>
<td>Earth Crisis!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate expertise and integration of ideas, methods, theory, &amp; practice in a specialized discipline of study</td>
<td>Earth Crisis!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE Program SLOs</td>
<td>Communication: reading, writing, quantitative reasoning, critical thinking &amp; speaking</td>
<td>Problem-solving skills and working well with others</td>
<td>Respect for and understanding of issues of cultural, racial, ethnic, sexual orientation, and gender diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSUEB ILOs</td>
<td>Communication: reading, writing, quantitative reasoning, critical thinking &amp; speaking</td>
<td>Problem-solving skills and working well with others</td>
<td>Respect for and understanding of issues of cultural, racial, ethnic, sexual orientation, and gender diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(I) = Introduced (D) = Developed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
General Education Subcommittee Assessment Plan Policy
2012-2017

History:
12-13 CIC 6

The GE Subcommittee designed the following policy for assessing GE learning outcomes over a several year period, and submits it for review and approval.

The plan focuses on authentic, meaningful assessment and gathering substantive data using both direct and indirect measures of student learning. These data will be used by the GE Subcommittee to recommend improvements and confirm successful practices for a prioritized set of outcomes. The plan includes significant learning and collaboration opportunities for faculty members, including lecturers, staff members and students.

The GE Assessment Plan includes:
1. Alignment of GE SLOs with Liberal Education and America’s Promise outcomes and Institutional Learning Outcomes to provide a complete context for GE Assessment;
2. Policy commitments for GE assessment;
3. Timeframe for GE assessment;
4. GE Subcommittee and faculty responsibilities for GE assessment, and recommendations for 2013/2014.

ALIGNING GE SLOs FOR GE ASSESSMENT AT CSUEB

The GE Subcommittee has the responsibility of aligning CSUEB GE Student Learning Outcomes with the LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes and with the emerging CSUEB Institutional Learning Outcomes.

LEAP: In September 2011, the CSU Office of the Chancellor issued Executive Order No. 1065 addressing University General Education requirements. Section 3.2 of the document states: “Each CSU campus shall define its GE student learning outcomes to fit within the framework of the four “Essential Learning Outcomes” drawn from the Liberal Education and American Promise (LEAP) campaign, an initiative of the Association of Colleges and Universities.

LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes Framework
- Knowledge of Human Cultures and the Physical and Natural World
- Intellectual and Practical Skills
- Personal and Social Responsibility
- Integrative Learning
CSUEB ILOs: In spring, 2012, the Institutional Learning Outcomes were submitted to the Academic Senate and adopted for the University. The GE Subcommittee will align CSUEB’s General Education SLOs with the LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes and with CSUEB’s Institutional Learning Outcomes.

GE ASSESSMENT POLICY COMMITMENTS

1. All General Education assessment activities will assure anonymity of faculty participants and protect confidentiality of student data collected through Student Learning Outcomes assessment.

2. The GE Subcommittee will collect and report assessment results to CIC, the Academic Senate and the colleges. The GE Subcommittee will work collaboratively with Institutional Research to incorporate GE assessment results in the Data Warehouse (when available), and to develop appropriate analyses and reporting to programs for use in both GE And department five year reviews for the Committee Academic Planning and Review.

3. Each year, a sample of GE courses will be selected for assessment. The GE Subcommittee will provide program administrators and faculty with a proposed assessment schedule before the quarter in which assessment is to be completed.

4. The GE subcommittee will work to develop time frames, processes, and assessment tools in concert with assessment efforts in the colleges. The GE subcommittee will carry primary responsibility for developing assessment plans, reviewing and modifying SLOs*, piloting and revising direct and indirect assessment methods (e.g., rubrics, focus groups), reviewing and interpreting assessment results, and making recommendations for closing the loop. GE faculty will retain primary responsibility for implementing classroom assessment methods and collecting assessment data from students work.

*Any changes in GE student learning outcomes (SLOs) will be submitted to CIC and the Academic Senate for approval.

TIMEFRAME FOR GE ASSESSMENT

The GE Subcommittee proposes an assessment plan for 2012 through 2017 that identifies who will be involved, the learning outcomes to be addressed, the assessment methods to apply, and steps for closing the loop. The proposed Five Year Plan for addressing the learning outcomes included in GE**:

- 2012-2013: Critical and Creative Thinking and Information Literacy
- 2013-2014: Quantitative Reasoning, one SLO in Science, Humanities and Social Science (to be determined)
GE Assessment Plan for 2012-2013

- 2014-2015: Written and Oral Communication, another SLO in Science, Humanities and Social Science (to be determined)
- 2015-2016: Cultural Groups and Women, and specific diversity SLOs in Humanities and Social Science (to be determined)
- 2016-2017: Checking Where We Are and Closing the Loop

**the order of the major skill areas will be determined by a CSU agreement among the campuses to collectively focus on the major skill areas.**

**GE SUBCOMMITTEE AND GE FACULTY RESPONSIBILITIES FOR GE ASSESSMENT**

Members for the GE Subcommittee will be responsible for the identification and refinement of assessment policies, procedures and tools as well as the identification and scheduling of specific Student Learning Outcomes to be assessed in each calendar year (e.g., one SLO each in Science, Humanities and Social Science). The GE Subcommittee will be involved in working with GE Faculty to test rubrics and calibrate assessment processes.
Specific responsibilities for assessment work are outlined below Fall 2012 – Summer 2013:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GE Assessment Plan</th>
<th>AY 2012-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Fall Quarter 2012** | - GE Assessment Plan submitted to Senate  
- Review and revise existing GE SLOs to better align with LEAP Outcomes and CSUEB ILOs  
- Develop plan for organizing assessment process, including direct and indirect assessment  
- Select courses for inclusion of Critical Thinking assessment  
- Develop plans for effective use of indirect measures such as student surveys (ESS/CSEQ), interviews, and focus groups. |
| **Winter Quarter 2013** | - GE Director has all freshmen complete the Entering Student Survey; 100 freshmen complete the Collegiate Learning Assessment  
- Identified GE Faculty to assess Critical Thinking using rubrics  
- Submit assessment results to the GE Director  
- Meet with interested GE Faculty to review results and brainstorm developments in GE learning and assessment  
- Identified GE Faculty to assess Critical Thinking using rubrics  
- Submit assessment results to the GE Director  
- Meet with interested GE Faculty to review results and brainstorm developments in GE learning and assessment |
| **Spring Quarter 2013** | - GE Faculty to participate in discussion of GE assessment results  
- GE Faculty requested to collect samples of student work for summer assessment  
- GE Faculty to participate in discussion of GE assessment results  
- GE Faculty requested to collect samples of student work for summer assessment |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summer Quarter 2013</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Select group of GE Subcommittee members, GE Faculty, and GE Director to pilot use of assessment rubrics and revise as necessary with student work collected in spring.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Develop recommendations for GE Subcommittee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>