Faculty Meeting regarding Proposed changes to G.E.
April 7, 2003
Notes

It was announced by CIC Chair Warriner that a discussion on Blackboard will soon be available for additional comments and feedback from the general faculty. CIC has been working on the GE Review for 18 months. This is not a finished document, but we hope to complete it this year.

Faculty present discussed the following items at length:

1. To recommend that the first year clusters remain and be linked to skills courses; discontinue clusters for the second year and, instead, students can choose from a list of (lower division) courses – that may or may not be linked. Each cluster would include three courses in Science, Social Science or Humanities, or one course from each of these three fields.

?? All 3 courses for first year are in one area. Perhaps we could offer a mix of 1 science, 1 social science, and 1 Humanities as well (for un-declared majors).

?? Disagree. Critical to start in on major courses right away. Ability to get to major hampered; 5 year major in some areas if that were the case.

?? Lower-division should be specified.

?? Could be mixed in other ways, 2 Humanities and 1 Social Science, for example, but this might cause advising problems.

?? Students often don’t know which area courses are in. These could be designated with an initial in the catalog N,S,H.

?? Suggestion to change wording from frosh/soph to 1st year/2nd year.

?? Remediation often dictates when one can start on the major

?? Good to offer different kinds of clusters, a good variety, a need for cross-discipline. We have a mixed cluster now but it only counts as social sci. It shouldn’t be that difficult. 9 classes are required, 3 in each area.

?? Would students be able to finish as quickly with no soph clusters? Would the resource funds supporting the soph clusters be given to the frosh clusters?

?? Not realistic to believe in these budget-lean years that more money would be available to frosh clusters.

?? Classes such as PSY 1000 are useful in many majors. Getting it out of the clusters and taught in soph year as a large lecture means that it can be taught as it has been and be more valuable to students than in the clusters. That means that frosh classes can be more interdisciplinary. Now they aren’t.

?? Transfer students have a pattern to follow to fill in their needs. If they have few units, they may choose to join the cluster program.

?? GE Coordinator does not agree with discontinuing soph more clusters; Also stated that some clusters are brilliantly integrated; some are not, except in title. Many are in the middle; should keep the program going as-is so students have a broad base outside their majors.
b. To recommend that for the first-year cluster, 2 sections in at least two disciplines be offered and scheduled at the same time per quarter; a well-planned structure which integrates 3 disciplines, taught one each quarter, may waive the requirement for the rich formula.

?? If being interdisciplinary is so important, then should be required to meet all together.
?? Classes could have the option to meet separately one day/week and together the other class day.
?? If it can be waived, then why have the requirement? Pushes chairs to set it up.

c. To recommend the removal of GS1013, General Education Activities III, and add one unit (for a total of two) to LIBY 1010, Fundamentals of Information Literacy.

?? Keep the extra unit for liberal studies; Needs it; General Studies has never been loved even before clusters. 1013 is needed for Service Learning component, gather assessment date, career exploration, follow-up survey...no other way to gather it.
?? It is poorly integrated; Not skills– based; Students are stuck with a theme for an entire year; More content in G.S. instead of additional skills
?? Fall, 1011; Spring 1012
?? Students would get no support in winter. Also students would prefer Spring off instead of winter.
?? G.S. instructors are very helpful to students and students need it. They provide support for content courses. Has had the opportunity to conduct focus groups and has heard feedback.
?? Content has become more focused; classes are different; perhaps switch order or allow student to challenge the course.
?? Proposal is for reducing, not eliminating GS.
?? 1013 gives students the opportunity to check out major and explore before they decide; it is especially important to undeclared students.
?? Scheduling was big complaint; GS comments (pro/con) depended on the instructor
?? Frosh cannot decide their career path from 1013
?? Library course is a lot of work for one unit.

d. To recommend that all clusters show high collaboration and be supported by such things as: workshops for instructional faculty with stipend and meals, administrative and clerical support, enhanced teaching units, and promotion-tenure-retention credit.

?? Liberal Arts Education as a University, is important; Needs to be supported.
?? Concerned with isolating it with regard to promo tenure process; questions how to give extra credit to cluster program – as what, in place of committee work?
?? Creating, not taking off the shelf; takes a lot of time
?? Should get resources to function well, but so should all majors; looks terrible to support with meals in budget crisis.
?? Why is teaching the clusters more meritorious than working on a capstone course or the major?
?? Untenured faculty feel they are at disadvantage toward tenure if they teach in clusters.
Part-time faculty rotated into clusters has less integration now; weakest faculty because they do not feel that the University honors teacher in clusters; whereas in past, 80% full-time faculty were in clusters as opposed to current, 50% full-time faculty in clusters.

It was noted that proposed changes are similar to Contra Costa Campus; endangers their tenure ability; no recognition; comment, that it does take extra work and we should recognize and honor this work.

Statement that there is a shortage of full-time faculty and often departments need what they have in higher level classes, not that they are bailing out; we do not have enough full-time faculty and we should require that this be changed.

2. To create a committee to write a GE mission statement by April 15, 2003. This committee shall consist of two members form each of the four Colleges of the University, one representative of the Library, one staff member who is also a GE advisor, one student appointed by Associated Students, and GE Director. At least one member must also be a member of CIC.

Compliments were given to the committee on this topic; Mission and outcomes should come first.

Outsider review thought Mission and outcomes should come first too; from a collegial perspective

It was stated that this issue is not from a collegial perspective; if faculty could develop a mission statement, why not develop outcomes?

3. To recommend that after the mission statement is formed, to create a new committee to write learning outcomes for the three areas of Humanities, Social Sciences, and Science by the first day of fall 2003 or sooner. The membership of the committee shall be: two members from instructional faculty of each of three areas and G.E. Director.

It was stated that a broader representation of faculty is needed regarding item three (3).

GE Mission should be university wide; Science, Social Science, Humanities for outcomes; not intended to be colleges - that these areas are different.

No balance if only two from each college; choose at lest three (3) from each college

Stated that it is not appropriate to have two members from each college when one college has mostly graduate students.

Many faculty can contribute; should not be so specific to exclude others

Outcomes can be uniting or very divisive; broadening membership to the entire university to determine outcomes.

Two (2) or more from each area and at least one from each school might work. Faculty could determine as to which area they are.

4. To request that the lower and upper division General Education application of all areas (B,C,D,F, and G) be reviewed by the GE Subcommittee, the CIC, and the Academic Senate.

It was requested to add upper division
5. To recommend that upper division G.E. requirements in areas C, D & E (Humanities, Social Sciences, & Capstone) be replaced with upper division area B, C, and D (Sciences, Humanities, and Social Sciences) courses.

?? It was stated that students need more science, as in general, students have poor quantitative Science skills; hand in hand advanced writing is also needed when analyzing things.
?? Support for upper division course, but not at the expense of Capstone; not impressed with executive order; Value of Capstone, proposal is sound; Can deal with it in an integrated way after students have learned HSS, etc.; would like to add Science and keep Capstone;
?? Urge performance art be included; Social Science, critical thinking not included; Info literacy and critical thinking.
?? It was stated that we are the only CSU to not have an upper division science requirement.
?? Advanced writing is important, however Science is more important for non-science students at a student level that lacks understanding; do not add writing
?? It was noted that only 4 of the 40 Capstone courses are from the college of Science and questioned whether this is practical.
?? College of Science is enthusiastic for level Upper Division Science; we have the classes and students apply since they do not have a lot of prerequisites.
?? CSUH has some Upper Division Science classes; will enthusiastically create more.
?? Will make April 15th a deadline for the Mission Statement; some faculty may work over the summer to develop outcomes and assessments.

[end]