ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Agenda
Tuesday, February 26, 2019
10:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.
SCI III Room 100

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND INFORMATION
   • Trustee visits: Larry Norton visits on February 27 and Trustee Romey Sabalius visits on April 23, 2019
   • President Zelezny Senate Report on April 4th 10:05 – 10:30
   • April 30 Executive Committee meeting from 11:30-12:30 to meet with President Zelezny

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   February 12, 2019 Minutes

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

5. CONTINUED ITEMS
   a. AS Log (handout)
      i. AAC (M. Danforth)
      ii. AS&SS (E. Correa)
      iii. BPC (B. Street)
      iv. FAC (M. Rush)
   b. Financial and strategic planning transparency and faculty participation
   c. Starting new programs - possible referral to AAC
   d. Workload - What constitutes workload?
      i. Data: current student, faculty, SFR, etc.
      ii. Administrative (when assigned time is awarded)
      iii. Schools have different workloads based on different criteria
      iv. What constitutes a one WTU release?
      v. Is release time consistent?
      vi. Timeline for grant writing and approval
      vii. Committee load
   e. Hiring Procedures
   f. Time Block Schedule update
   g. Faculty Honorary Doctorate Committee process (possible FAC referral)
   h. Sustainability position

6. NEW DISCUSSION ITEMS
a. Leadership Academy
b. Financial Aid moved to BAS
c. GRASP and AARC
d. Searches
   i. Proposed members Search - AVP for Enrollment Management (see previous handout)
e. Development of a Continuous Enrollment Course (see previous handout)
f. Immediate Reinstatement After Academic Disqualification (see previous handout)
g. BC/CSUB Partnership
h. GE Task Force Final Report (handout 1-16 pages) (Pages 17-23 contains lists of members and references.)
i. Academic Calendar: Scheduling Spring Break

7. **AGENDA ITEMS FOR SENATE MEETING MARCH 7, 2019** (Time Certain 11:00 a.m.)
   Announcements
   Consent Agenda
   New Business
   Old Business
   RES 181909 Faculty Award Process – Handbook Change * Second Reading

8. **COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR**

* Changes to the University Handbook
ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Minutes
Tuesday, February 12, 2019
10:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.
SCI III Room 100

Members: D. Boschini (Chair), A. Hegde (Vice Chair), J. Millar, J. Tarjan, M. Rush, E. Correa, B. Street, M. Danforth, V. Harper (Alt.)

Visitor: D. Schecter

1) CALL TO ORDER
   D. Boschini called the meeting to order.

2) ANNOUNCEMENTS AND INFORMATION
   • V. Harper is off campus today.
   • April 30 Executive Committee is an extended meeting with President Zelezny, 11:30-12:30
   • President Zelezny’s Senate report scheduled for February 21 and April 4th 10:05 – 10:30
   • Andrew Maiorano, General Counsel, will be attending the Senate meeting on February 21.
   • Trustee Larry Norton visits on February 27 and Trustee Romey Sabalius visits on April 23
   • OWL meeting, February 14, 2019, noon to 1:00 p.m. features President Zelezny.
   • Celebrate CSU will not be taking place this year due to the need to recalibrate the showcase
     of the departments.
   • The Jazz Festival will not occur while there is thinking about who the new lead would be and
     who is responsible for the budget. Since the Jazz Festival has been a venue where scholarships
     were awarded, what other venue will award the scholarships. Part of the communication
     piece is informing the community why these annual events are not occurring.
   • The Rowdy Cart Race will still occur the last Saturday in April.

3) APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   The January 29, 2019 Minutes were approved by email.

4) APPROVAL OF AGENDA
   D. Boschini suggested to add Gen Faculty Meeting debriefing, and the review of IRB’s
   recommendation as items for New Discussion. E. Correa moved to approve modified agenda.
   J. Tarjan seconded. Approved.

5) CONTINUED ITEMS
   a) AS Log (handout)
i) AAC (M. Danforth) Reference the discussion at Senate about the catalog copy. The proposal is to move from a two-year catalog to a one-year catalog. The impact on faculty would be an increased workload. D. Boschini stated that the DCLC would foresee departments’ volume and types of catalog changes, and workload. If DCLC expresses deep concern, then perhaps FAC will take it up.

ii) AS&SS (E. Correa) (deferred and embedded in discussions)

iii) BPC (B. Street) There will be a brief report to the Senate on the modifications to the Academic Calendar that has been processed since approval of RES 181907.

iv) FAC (M. Rush) The DLC discussion revealed that there needs to be a mission or policy statement about how we decide whether course goes on-line or hybrid. Currently, the view of DLC is a “how to” committee, and not a “why”. D. Boschini replied that whether a course goes online is a stand-alone curriculum issue. M. Danforth shared that within NSME, the request to do a mode change would go through the school Curriculum Committee (CC). M. Rush replied that that is not written anywhere. FAC thought of it as an academic issue. M. Danforth – AAC sees interdisciplinary courses that have multiple curriculum committees’ need to answer to it. If NSME wants to change from on-line to hybrid class, or face-to-face to hybrid – all those mode requests had to go through the CCs. That would relate to the course change form, at Academic Operations and we’re not aware of what’s happening campus-wide. That would be the policy issue. A. Hegde asked why would there be a policy for approval if a department knows the discipline and decides this would work best – as online, hybrid, or other? M. Rush replied that the committee wants to give it back to the faculty and not to individuals. For example, a department chair says, rather than dropping the class, the faculty member teaches the course on line. Is that convenience for scheduling? There hasn’t been any pedagogical discussion. There are protections to consider. D. Boschini stated that FAC raised a good point. Perhaps the purpose of FAC’s review whether to add DLC to the Handbook is whether DLC has control over what can and can’t be online. Yet, that’s not DLC’s purview. It goes to the CC process and Academic Operations. D. Boschini asked M. Danforth about when she looks at catalog copy and process, in terms of CC policy and procedures – where does the information comes from? M. Danforth replied that currently the only consideration is whether the CC approval occurs and what the work order will be. It’s a mode (PeopleSoft) issue indicating whether it’s a face-to-face, hybrid, or online course, not a catalog issue. NSME had a friendly agreement that departments wouldn’t change things online unless their CC reviewed it and made sure that the pedagogy lined up for having it online. D. Boschini said that this is a question for CCs. Many do not know their school CC policies and procedures. M. Danforth suggested that in the Resolution, clarify who operates at which phases and the timeline, so chairs don’t get a request for catalog copy past deadline. M. Danforth will talk to L. Zuzarte about mode changes. M. Danforth will look into whether there is just a need clarity and communication – or if there are policies and procedures that are lacking and need to be addressed. She will talk to the Associate Deans because they are the ones who are typically in charge of the CCs. D. Boschini requested that CC policies and procedures to be added to next EC Agenda, NEW DISCUSSION, and for M. Danforth to report back her findings.
b) Financial and strategic planning transparency – B. Street reported that the Strategic Budget Planning committee is meeting February 14. The meeting will break out into focus groups on priorities. He reached out to V. Harper and T. Davis on what are the best practices and what are the monetary components. V. Martin messaged that the Capital Campaign group is developing procedures. A consultant group has been asked to help. At some level the Capital Campaign and the Strategic Planning will merge.

c) Starting new programs - possible referral to AAC

d) Workload - What constitutes workload? (deferred and embedded in discussions)
   i) Data: current student, faculty, SFR, etc.
   ii) Administrative (when assigned time is awarded)
   iii) Schools have different workloads based on different criteria
   iv) What constitutes a one WTU release?
   v) Is release time consistent?
   vi) Timeline for grant writing and approval
   vii) Committee load

e) Hiring Procedures (deferred and embedded in discussions)
f) Time Block Schedule update
g) Faculty Honorary Doctorate Committee process (possible FAC referral)

6) NEW DISCUSSION ITEMS
   a) Leadership Academy (deferred)
   b) Financial Aid moved to BAS (deferred)
   c) GRASP and AARC (deferred)
   d) Searches (deferred)
      i) Proposed members Search - AVP for Enrollment Management (handout)
   e) Development of a Continuous Enrollment Course (see previous handout) (deferred)
   f) Immediate Reinstatement After Academic Disqualification (handout) (deferred)
   g) Faculty Meeting debriefing Follow-up on Gen Faculty
      i) The non-tenured faculty appreciated the comments about hiring, classroom size, equipment, course sections, etc. The meeting dynamics lacked TT who can speak about the issues without risk. There was support on a suggestion to hold a meeting of TT faculty and a request that they make comments on general faculty’s behalf to make a difference to the folks coming up.
      ii) An attendee made the point of how many people give up because things don’t change, and then they become demoralized. There was general agreement on that item.
      iii) Motivation requires more than just, this is wrong and this needs to be fixed. It required 1) a thank you for what you are doing 2) yes, we have issues that need to be addressed 3) still be polite and respectful that people are doing the best they can.
      iv) What are the high-impact practices that the President has allocated funds toward? What are we not doing? What are we doing that needs improvement?
      v) There will be a windfall of money from the state coming into the campuses. CSUB needs to fight for its share. Now is the time to think of our hiring needs for the next five years.
Ask for more TT lines, lower classroom size, and improve tenure density. Capacity has come after the student growth. Instead, use data to plan ahead.

v) High Impact Practices have already been identified and discussed within University Council. V. Harper is charged with looking at them. One is Block Scheduling. As with other things, there’s little evidence of faculty input. At the end of the day, the administration can identify high impact practices based on literature, data on a national level, etc. However, case remedies are not appropriate here. Faculty members teaching the classes know the students and what works and what doesn’t. It’s important to have faculty provide input on what resources are needed to implement faculty’s solution. According to the President’s opinion, we are no longer a Rural University. No matter how we may be classified, the TT has to be higher than the CSU system because the institution doesn’t have the talent individuals to teach as adjuncts like other “metro” areas. There are qualified lecturers, however insufficient. We can’t be compared to the system.

vi) Consider having Faculty retreats whereby people got to know each other and the talent. What makes Joel Haney a rich faculty member? Getting faculty together is great for morale.

vii) Block scheduling – How are the decision made on which departments participates?

viii) If one’s department isn’t chosen, there may be way of developing cohort in the department to resemble block scheduling. The department has majors and can work with advising to instruct students to “enroll here”.

ix) It was suggested that University Week include presentations from people involved in the classroom to provide teaching tips from TLC and GECo. Hold a nice faculty social to set the tone. Signal the fact that faculty is important.

x) V. Harper’s power point identified some changes in TLC. The TLC is moving toward bringing more focus on the teaching.

xi) Many concerns were expressed without providing solutions. It’s a path that’s unhealthy. There has been progress in some areas. Even when the communication is going well, people don’t see it. For example L. Sakamoto received the CA Music Educators Assoc. (CMEA) award for Kern County. The CMEA members were there. We need to communicate more about the positive things faculty are doing.

xii) The term “High Impact Practices” was introduced during the creation of the semester curriculum. It was about teaching; what we do in the classroom. Faculty understand the term as about what faculty can do in the classroom. The term has since evolved into a catch-all to describe anything that someone may be doing to help. Block-scheduling is a part of the High Impact Practices. EC’s recommendation to the Administration is to 1) communicate what are the three classroom high impact practices, and 2) specifically how much money was spent on those from the money that was intended for the new faculty hires.

xiii) Until we acknowledge we have growth issues and that the resources aren’t meeting the growth of students, the band aid solution will continue. Why did it take meeting between V. Harper and Dean Madden to get one more work station for the computer lab? Why didn’t those resources appear last summer so plans could have been made for the AY? There were ten students on the waitlist and now there are nine that couldn’t get in because the
workstations weren't there. Some faculty aren't speaking up to get what's needed for the students and the internal and external data are not being used to predict needs. Are there priorities, or do you have to catch people at the right time?

xiv) The last couple weeks feel like a set-back in shared governance. The comments made at General Faculty Meeting shows that the situation is not anywhere near where it needs to be. Doing best we can isn't good enough because there is a standard bar yet to be reached. Based on the proposed funding to CSU, Brian Street recommended 22-25 TT to V. Harper, and T. Davis. The money goes to Academic Affairs first, and then other areas. In the last decade, it seems as if it's been the other way around.

xv) A. Hegde said the reason it looks like two steps forward and three steps back is because we don't operate as if we're still a small campus, and some operate as if we are a large campus. The band aid resources appear to be going to the people who speak the loudest – whether the request is warranted. One could talk about the need for faculty lines at the department level, at the school level, and at the university level. Suppose the Deans are told they get the lines; they decide what the priority is. If I'm not the vocal person with the Dean's office, I get left behind. Hopefully, V. Harper will be using data to make decisions. Hearing from other faculty, it appears that we start with outcome and then look to see if the process supports it. When faculty is told you have a chain of command and you can't speak, it doesn't make for shared governance. The President said, on many occasions, she listens to the students. With the tutoring money, that's exactly what happened. Enough students got her attention that the deficiency was rectified. M. Danforth's workstation appeared because she was vocal. The faculty majority is unhappy but don't say anything because they feel that it's business as usual. It's the Senate's work to follow the process and hold people accountable.

xvi) E. Correa received notification from IT today that the online SOCIs have a glitch. Apparently, there was an on-line SOCI pilot this winter. There is a problem getting the online SOCIs to people and their departments. IT wasn't aware that chairs needed to see SOCIs so they just sent the SOCIs to the instructors. IT wants to make a decision on the online SOCI pilot, but they haven't talked to sufficient number of people about it. It's another case of IT moving forward (like BB, and Canvas LSM) before there's been faculty input. M. Danforth said that the NSME rep on ITC received the same slivers of info on BB auto-enroll. E. Correa said that when the IT reps came to AS&SS, their interpretation of the committee's responses was that it as an OK for IT go ahead with the changes. She said, absolutely not, this is just the first level response. Next, IT has to go before the Senate. M. Danforth said the movement from OneDrive to Box occurred without discussion of how to move files over, whether OneDrive is going to go away, whether files stored on SharePoint going away, etc.

xvii) Student success means multiple things. Two priorities were suggested: 1) The need to balance things when we discuss student success; how fast and how many students get through and progress to graduation along with preparation for lifetime success. 2) Make the case that smaller classes are important for reaching all the student-success indicators. The classes were designed for 30 students. The difference is felt in classes of 45 and 60.
Student success is related to more TT faculty and reduced classroom size. Faculty are being asked to take students above cap and agree to taking on students for Independent Studies. It’s a chronic problem. The tactic to getting students out this semester is increasing class size and pressuring instructors to do Independent Studies without compensation. Years ago, the campus tried to get rid of Independent Studies by making the hurdles higher. Now departments are inundated with requests from students who are being told to ask their instructors for Independent Studies. That came from the Provost’s office. D. Boschini sees that this is going to be a union issue. There seems to be an increase interest from the Graduation Initiative to have student finish and then while the semester is underway, when classes and workloads have already been set, instructors are pressured to sign in the box for voluntary overload, thus do it without compensation. When it happens, it’s awkward, because we are then influencing others where to decide to spend money at faculty’s expense. Will faculty have an additional conversation with the dean every time they say “yes” to Independent Study? Are the Deans being told to say “yes” to more money? Are they going to be given more money? It becomes a big compensation question. The easiest solution is to have faculty sign for voluntary work at the last minute, agreeing that they will not be compensated for the extra workload. At that point, the Independent Studies are not that valuable. It does take some work. If we do want to give faculty the units, next year (even though we’re not supposed to be carrying them over) the buzz is that it’s destined for the Union. D. Schecter is working on updating the form and developing language to make sure everyone understands that they are not being pressured to volunteer. We don’t want a grievance on it. No wink and nod to do this class, and it’s to help these students. J. Millar got the impression that the extra load is what was going to happen to get the 415 students [on CSUB’s GI Task Force Pilot] to graduate. D. Schecter acknowledged that the university will lose on a grievance like that. The Provost’s office has been going in the direction of eliminating voluntary instruction. Everyone needs to either be compensated for those units or have an agreement as to what is going to happen with their total units per year. D. Boschini said there are TT being told they shouldn’t be overloading, and in some cases they want to, and don’t feel they can do overloads, they are told not to do overloads – so there are work arounds involving the Chair as the evaluator. It’s not good nor is it sustainable and people are going to start filing.

The pressure to do Independent Studies is not coming from the deans. It’s from the Fall 15 cohort initiative. Where people are being asked to do Independent studies in this summer, they need to be compensated for sticking around summer for helping the students.

A. Hegde said there are variations of Independent Study. For example, Ag Business program has an internship requirement. The department can’t run it as a regular class. It’s an independent study. All that’s expected of the student is to do a reflective paper on their experience and have a meeting with their instructor. That doesn’t warrant extra units. Only those Independent Studies related to a class should have unit(s). There should be a different code for internship. D. Boschini, as chair of a department with a relatively low SFR, she sees that if we’re trying to make sure that classes are 30 vs 60 students, the voluntary
Independent Study will make the SFR decrease. D. Schecter said that Independent Studies are being tracked separately. D. Boschini said if we try to calculate workload per department that is doing a lot of Independent Study, it would not be an accurate reflection.

xx) EC will be pushing more for solutions and how the solutions will be communicated to those faculty who should be involved. We don’t want to negate IT’s efforts where they are trying to reach out to more people, albeit we’ve identified that IT is reaching out to the wrong people, at the wrong time. The request is that IT and other initiators-of-change ask the Academic Senate Chair who they need to ask questions of before making changes.

xxi) Reassign the sixth new faculty position slated for sustainability to a new counselor hire and ask for the five additional faculty hires that were allocated.

h) Institutional Review Board (IRB) re-appointment. By unanimous vote, the EC approved C. Livingston for re-appointment to the IRB to serve as a Nonscientific Member on the Board.

7) AGENDA ITEMS FOR SENATE MEETING FEBRUARY 21, 2019 (Time Certain 11:00 a.m.)

   Announcements
   President Zelezny Senate Report (Time Certain) 10:05 – 10:20
   Consent Agenda
   New Business
   Old Business
   RES 181905 Ombudsperson Role in Dispute Resolution* Second Reading

8) COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR

   * Changes to the University Handbook
**Academic Affairs Committee: Melissa Danforth/Chair, meets 10:00am in SCI III Rm 328 Research Room**

**Dates:** Sept 6, Sept 20, Oct 4, Oct 18, Nov 1, Nov 15, Dec 6, Jan 31, Feb 14, Feb 29, Mar 14, Mar 28, Apr 11, May 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Approved by Senate</th>
<th>Sent to President</th>
<th>Approved by President</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08/29/18</td>
<td>2018-2019 Referral 02 Change of Membership on AAC and Change in Bylaws</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>AAC Memo to Senate – AAC discussed and decided that since AVP of AP represents AA, the Director of AP need not be an ex-officio on AAC. No update to By-Laws needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/06/18</td>
<td>2018-2019 Referral 03 GITF Hold Proposal</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>AAC’s feedback was incorporated into the proposal document.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/2/18</td>
<td>2018-2019 Referral 07 Interdisciplinary Studies Department Formation Proposal</td>
<td>Pending feedback</td>
<td>AAC, BPC Pending feedback from advocates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/2/18</td>
<td>2018-2019 Referral 08 Instructor Initiated Drop Policy</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>RES 181903 Instructor Initiated Drop Policy</td>
<td>1/24/19</td>
<td>2/1/19</td>
<td>2/8/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/15/18</td>
<td>2018-2019 Referral 14 Catalog, Degree Audit, and Schedule Builder Technology and Process Integration</td>
<td>Viewing process flows</td>
<td>Viewing process flows of the annual vs. every two years, workload and implications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Academic Support and Student Services: Elaine Correa/Chair, meets 10:00am in BPA 134

**Dates:** Sept 6, Sept 20, Oct 4, Oct 18, Nov 1, Nov 15, Dec 6, Jan 31, Feb 14, Feb 29, Mar 14, Mar 28, Apr 11, May 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Approved by Senate</th>
<th>Sent to President</th>
<th>Approved by President</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/2/18</td>
<td>2018-2019 Referral 05 Canvas Pilot</td>
<td>Processing</td>
<td>Recommendations made. Response received.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/2/18</td>
<td>2018-2019 Referral 06 Distributed Learning Committee</td>
<td>Referred to FAC</td>
<td>No further action from AS&amp;SS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/8/18</td>
<td>2018-2019 Referral 11 Textbook Ordering Process</td>
<td>Pending discussion</td>
<td>Pending discussion of the financial viability before the committee can make recommendations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Budget and Planning Committee: Brian Street/Chair, meets 10:00am in Student Health Center, Conference Room (HCCR)

**Dates:** Sept 6, Sept 20, Oct 4, Oct 18, Nov 1, Nov 15, Dec 6, Jan 31, Feb 14, Feb 29, Mar 14, Mar 28, Apr 11, May 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Approved by Senate</th>
<th>Sent to President</th>
<th>Approved by President</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/2/18</td>
<td>2018-2019 Referral 07 Interdisciplinary Studies Department Formation Proposal</td>
<td>Pending others</td>
<td>AAC, BPC Pending feedback from advocates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/2/18</td>
<td>2018-2019 Referral 09 University Hour</td>
<td>Pending others</td>
<td>BPC Pending classroom utilization data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Faculty Affairs Committee: Maureen Rush/Chair, meets 10:00am in SCI III Rm 235 Math Library**

**Dates:** Sept 6, Sept 20, Oct 4, Oct 18, Nov 1, Nov 15, Dec 6, Jan 31, Feb 14, Feb 29, Mar 14, Mar 28, Apr 11, May 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Approved by Senate</th>
<th>Sent to President</th>
<th>Approved by President</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08/28/18</td>
<td>2018-2019 Referral 01 Faculty on Sabbatical Serving on RTP Review Committee</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>RES 181902 Faculty on Sabbatical Serving on RTP Review Committee Second Reading 10/11/18</td>
<td>10/11/18</td>
<td>10/19/18</td>
<td>10/23/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/2/18</td>
<td>2018-2019 Referral 04 Ombudsperson</td>
<td></td>
<td>RES 181905 Role of Ombudsperson in Dispute Resolution</td>
<td>02/21/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/13/18</td>
<td>2018-2019 Faculty Award Process – Handbook Change</td>
<td></td>
<td>RES 181909 Faculty Award Process – Handbook Change First Reading 2/21/19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/2/18</td>
<td>2018-2019 Referral 06 Distributed Learning Committee</td>
<td>Processing</td>
<td>Referral moved from AS&amp;SS to FAC on 10/30/18. DLC is being codified and recommendations forthcoming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/4/18</td>
<td>2018-2019 Referral 15_University Council Membership Addition-Library Representative – Handbook Change (105.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>RES 181910 University Council – Addition Library Member</td>
<td>02/21/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GENERAL EDUCATION TASK FORCE REPORT
Recommendations for GE Review and Reform

CONTEXT FOR GENERAL EDUCATION REVIEW

A robust General Education (GE) program is an invaluable component of a baccalaureate degree offered by the California State University (CSU) system. The CSU seeks to ensure undergraduate students succeed in meeting their academic goals by providing an environment where education writ large, lifelong learning, and civic engagement can flourish when the depth of each student’s chosen major is combined with the breadth of the GE program.

This is clearly articulated in a description of the General Education program at one particular campus, although others have similar statements:

“One of the principles on which a modern university rests is the assumption that there is an important difference between learning to make a living and building the foundation for a life. While the first goal is important, the second is fundamental.

In focusing on the students’ development as whole or “educated” people, a university distinguishes itself from a trade school. The goal of a university education is not simply the acquisition and application of knowledge, but the creation of people who firmly grasp the worth of clear thinking and know how to do it; who understand and appreciate the differences between peoples and cultures as well as their similarities; who have a sense of history and social forces; who can express thought clearly and have quantitative ability; who know something about the arts as well as how to enjoy them; who can talk and think intelligently about the physical and life sciences, the humanities, and literature; and, above all, who have the desire and capability for learning. This goal is why a university degree is so highly valued by individuals, employers, and the community at large.” (http://catalog.csus.edu/colleges/academic-affairs/general-education/)

BACKGROUND FOR GE REVIEW AND REFORM IN THE CSU

Arising from mounting concerns about the erosion of confidence in the value of higher education, higher costs of education borne increasingly by students, attenuated times to degree completion, and low persistence rates, many institutions and systems of higher education have taken on comprehensive reform of their GE programs. A unifying motive for such reform has been a conclusion that GE programs have stagnated while the diversity of students, education, workplace skills and needs, and technology have, by sharp contrast, changed dramatically.

Nationwide and in California, there is increasing pressure to reform GE. These pressures come from State legislators, community stakeholders, foundations and other non-profit groups, boards of trustees, university administrators, faculty and students. Although these
stakeholders have legitimate interests in general education, the review and reform (while collaborating with such stakeholders) must be led and implemented by faculty. Faculty are the experts in both disciplinary thinking and the pedagogical practices required for student learning to occur. Reform must be squarely situated in the enfranchisement of faculty to enact it.

Regardless of any external pressures to review and reform GE, it is time for the CSU to engage in its own review of the system’s GE requirements. The most recent effort to revise GE occurred in 2008 (“Give Students a Compass”), resulting in the requirements that GE be both assessed as a program in and of itself and developed in a manner consistent with the American Association of Colleges and University’s Liberal Education for America’s Promise, or LEAP outcomes. However, the basic structure of CSU GE requirements has remained largely unmodified for several decades. Society, the demographics of our students, pedagogy, content and curriculum in many disciplinary fields, all have changed; therefore, it is incumbent on the faculty to lead efforts to revise general education in the CSU system.

The CSU also has been subject to mandates affecting graduation requirements beyond GE instituted by the CSU Board of Trustees in Title 5 education code (e.g., the American Institutions/American History requirement, and the upper-division writing assessment requirement, or GWAR). In addition, individual CSU campuses have implemented campus-based requirements to graduate above and beyond the CSU-wide GE, statutory and Board requirements. Taken together, such graduation requirements situated as extramural to the GE program create the perception that non-major degree requirements are piecemeal rather than integrated, and undermine the ability to assess them all holistically consistent with the LEAP outcomes.

Aside from the foregoing imperatives suggesting the need for review and reform, Graduation Initiative 2025, with its core intent to eliminate administrative and academic barriers to student success and to eliminate equity gaps, has provided additional incentive to undertake a comprehensive review of the CSU’s GE and related requirements.

THE ACADEMIC SENATE CSU TASK FORCE

The Academic Senate of the CSU (ASCSU), with the concurrence of the CSU Chancellor’s Office, established a GE Task Force, which held its first meeting in March 2017. The Task Force was comprised of several members of the CSU faculty, two CSU students, a staff member from the CSU Office of the Chancellor, and one faculty representative from each of our sister institutions, the University of California and the California Community Colleges. Two members of the Board of Trustees also participated on the Task Force because of their interest in the subject matter, however they did not officially represent the Board.
GE TASK FORCE GUIDING PRINCIPLES

One of the first aims of the Task Force was to establish principles to underpin its review of the GE program in the CSU. These principles were used to evaluate the status quo as well as to form the basis for recommendations for change. Throughout the work, each member tried always to keep students at the forefront of any discussion featuring one overarching goal: educating students with the skills, abilities and dispositions needed for success. Accordingly, the Task Force agreed on the following principles underpinning a recommended GE program:

1. The GE program must indeed be a CSU systemwide program, with internal coherence and consistency, and with its goals and relationship to other aspects of higher education understandable to students, faculty, and external stakeholders alike (e.g., legislators, taxpayers, and employers).

2. The GE program must align readily with the curricula offered by the California Community Colleges and, when possible, the University of California, so that transfer among these sister institutions is in no way impeded and, ideally, enhanced.

3. The GE program should meet all three goals of higher education, i.e., familiarization with “ways of knowing,” proficiency with fundamental skills, and enhancement of the dispositions of an engaged citizenry.

4. The GE program should contain clear learning outcomes and be reviewable and subject to assessment and alteration where and as needed.

5. The GE program, in particular, campus course offerings, should allow for appropriate campus autonomy within the systemwide GE program to express the uniqueness and strengths of each campus without hampering student transfer.

6. The GE program should be coherent, easy to navigate, and consistently provide high quality learning experiences for all CSU students.

7. The GE program should lead to persistence to degree completion and increased confidence in the students’ ability to succeed in college.

8. The GE program should be delivered in a context relevant to students (e.g., by encouraging campus-driven “themes” and “pathways” that link and provide multiple angles of view on a topic of significance).

9. The GE program and related graduation requirements should be properly proportionate to the number of required units for the entire undergraduate curriculum.
10. The GE program should consist of the highest-quality educational experiences and high-impact practices: encouraging multi-disciplinary efforts, establishing student-student and student-faculty interaction, amplifying the creativity and energy of faculty, instilling curiosity in students, and enhancing their joy of learning.

With these principles in mind, the Task Force has developed the following conceptual framework/model for general education in the CSU, proposed a structure for unit allocation, and provided examples of what the model might look like when operationalized on a campus.
A Conceptual Framework for General Education in the CSU

PURPOSE

The purpose of the conceptual framework (model) is to describe how the General Education (GE) curriculum can provide meaningful, impactful learning experiences as students move through their academic programs in the CSU. The GE curriculum at each CSU campus should engage students in the practices and habits of mind which exist across multiple disciplines using high-impact, learner-centered pedagogies that scaffold the knowledge and skills students are expected to demonstrate. The curriculum also should provide students with opportunities to develop stewardship/leadership/advocacy around the values that distinguish each CSU campus. Learning outcomes for GE programs should articulate these multiple dimensions accordingly.

A visualization of the conceptual framework for General Education in the CSU, illustrating the multidimensionality and integrative intentionality of the GE program. At the core are the Essential (foundational) Skills that are taught, then reinforced and scaffolded throughout the GE curriculum. Surrounding the core are Disciplinary Perspectives (ways of knowing), Cross-cutting Values (institutional priorities), and Integrative Experiences (learner-centered, multidimensional experiences which contextualize the GE program), all of which tie together and make coherent the courses students take to complete their GE programs.
THE FRAMEWORK

**Essential Skills** make up the nucleus of GE and serve as the foundation of a college education and lifelong learning. Traditionally considered the “Golden Four” of basic skills requirements as described in [EO 1100-Revised](#) and part of the WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC) core competencies, these skills must be learned, practiced, bolstered, and threaded throughout the curriculum. Information literacy, another WSCUC core competency not listed here as a stand-alone requirement, should also be integrated throughout GE and the major. The Essential Skills include:

- Quantitative Reasoning
- Written Communication
- Oral Communication
- Critical Thinking

**Disciplinary Perspectives** include the core concepts, habits of mind, methods of inquiry, and ways of understanding that are specific to each distinct discipline. Considered the “breadth of knowledge” areas, these courses provide students with insight into the traditions of a discipline, while also providing robust opportunities to practice and to develop further the Essential Skills using the traditions of a discipline. Campuses may choose to thematically link or infuse a Cross-cutting Value with a Disciplinary Perspective within a GE pathway or minor. The Disciplinary Perspectives include:

- Arts
- Humanities
- Life Science
- Physical Science
- Social Science

**Cross-cutting Values** are broad, multifaceted dimensions that reflect the mission/priorities of the CSU and the distinctive institutional values of each campus. The term “cross-cutting” reflects the ways in which the issues and concepts inherent within these values overlap with each other, transcend lock-step categorization, and may be addressed from multiple viewpoints and disciplinary perspectives. The broad grouping of Cross-cutting Values is intended to challenge campuses to identify/define the dimensions and develop GE pathways/minors and associated learning outcomes that encompass their institutional values. The Cross-cutting Values include three broad categories:
• Diversity and Social Justice, which may include cultural competency, equity, equality, human rights, and issues of diversity in all of its forms (e.g., race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, age, ability, etc.).
• Democracy in the U.S., which may include American and California government and history.
• Global Awareness and Civic Engagement, which may include global issues of environmental, social, political, cultural, economic, and ethical importance, as well as the ways in which students may act as advocates, stewards, and activists to effect change and solve problems at the local, state, regional, national or global levels.

**Integrative Experiences.** These are the pedagogical strategies, evidence-based practices, and learner-centered experiences that are embedded within and connect the Essential Skills, Disciplinary Perspectives, and Cross-cutting Values throughout the GE program. These experiences serve as the means of scaffolding learning in GE as students progress from lower- to upper-division coursework and may be centered on a specific problem or theme. These experiences help to contextualize and provide coherence/intentionality to the GE program. These upper-division courses may involve or be a part of learning communities, research experiences, service learning, collaborative learning, problem- or theme-based learning, hands-on learning, study abroad, capstone courses, and/or signature experiences that reflect the identity of each campus.

**GE LEARNING OUTCOMES**

It is not appropriate for the CSU to dictate what the specific learning outcomes should be for each Essential Skill, Disciplinary Perspective, Cross-cutting Value, and Integrative Experience. However, all GE learning outcomes should draw extensively on the Essential Skills, as these are the skills that students use to demonstrate their learning. Learning outcomes (specific indicators of learning) for each dimension should be articulated by campuses and speak to the unique priorities and demographics of the campus. The explicit articulation of GE learning outcomes is needed for programmatic assessment of GE and for the clear communication of the purpose, goals, and expectations of GE to the students and campus community.
PROPOSED STRUCTURE AND UNIT ALLOCATION

CSU GE BREADTH REQUIREMENTS = 42 SEMESTER UNITS

**Essential Skills** (12 semester units), 3 semester units in each of the following subareas:

- Written Communication
- Oral Communication
- Critical Thinking
- Quantitative Reasoning

**Disciplinary Perspectives** (15 semester units), 3 semester units in each of the following subareas:

- Arts
- Humanities
- Life Science
- Physical Science
- Social Science

**Cross-cutting Values** (9 semester units), 3 semester units in each of the following subareas:

- Diversity and Social Justice
- Democracy in the U.S.
- Global Awareness and Civic Engagement

**Integrative Experiences** (6 semester units), only at the upper-division level

These courses should be anchored to lower-division GE; optimally within a specific pathway, GE minor, or GE certificate program; and cannot be double counted with the major.
GOALS AND RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSED CHANGES IN GE REQUIREMENTS

PRIMARY GOALS

In adherence to its guiding principles, the Task Force operated under the following assumptions and goals regarding the subject area distributions and unit totals outlined above.

1. **Decrease the total number of units** devoted to GE in the undergraduate degree program to 42 semester units. Reducing the total number of units required in GE will align the CSU with several other institutions of higher learning, offer high-unit major programs some “breathing room,” facilitate additional Associate’s Degree for Transfer (ADT) pathways, and encourage persistence, graduation, and closure of equity gaps.

2. **Eliminate the practice of “double counting”** of courses, which complicates students’ ability to navigate GE curricula. In addition to being highly dependent on reliable advising, double- and triple-counting, particularly with courses in the major, cuts against the conceptual logic of general education sought by the Task Force. In other words, when students simply take a class because it fulfills multiple requirements, GE becomes a box-checking exercise rather than an intentional, coherent experience.

3. **Minimize the number of non-major requirements outside of GE** by incorporating them into the GE program. These include requirements such as American Institutions and diversity/cultural competency. Other campus-based graduation requirements such as coursework in languages other than English also can—and should—be accommodated within the GE program. The Task Force believes these worthwhile requirements deserve explicit inclusion in GE curricula. Moreover, because they are completely consistent with the tenets of the conceptual model of general education offered by the Task Force, their inclusion makes the model even more compelling. It has been our abiding goal to bring coherence, logic and intentionality to the set of non-major requirements which constitute a baccalaureate education, so we consider extra graduation requirements to be antithetical to that goal.

4. **Leverage upper-division GE** as the way in which students synthesize their learning and demonstrate mastery of the skills, disciplinary knowledge, and values embedded throughout the program; as the way in which the intentionality, coherence, and objectives of the GE program are realized; and as the way in which a campus may emphasize its signature values. Upper-division GE offers more complex and integrative learning, which is easily made available through the integrated packages of GE pathways, minors, certificates, capstones, and signature coursework. The majority of Task Force members consider integrated upper-division GE courses to be vital to the integrity of the proposed GE program.

RATIONALE

The following rationale underpins each of the categories in the conceptual model offered by the Task Force.
The Essential Skills serve as the anchor to which all other GE courses are attached. These are the skills that are drawn upon to demonstrate achievement of learning outcomes and should therefore be reinforced in every GE course.

Consistent with (a) recommendations made in the Quantitative Reasoning Task Force Report, (b) campus feedback offered to the Chancellor’s Office on possible changes to EO 1100, and (c) a request by the Chancellor’s Office to consider relocating the current Area B4 (Quantitative Reasoning) requirement to an area featuring other foundational requirements (currently Areas A1, A2 and A3), the model situates Quantitative Reasoning with the other Essential Skills of Oral and Written Communication and Critical Thinking, bringing the total number to 12 semester units.

The Disciplinary Perspectives of Arts, Humanities, Life Science, Physical Science, and Social Science are highlighted in the proposed structure. These disciplinary contexts offer exploration into unique ways of knowing in each discipline, and preserve the hallmark of breadth in the GE program. Each Disciplinary Perspective is allocated 3 units at the lower-division level, bringing the total number of semester units to 15 for this area in the proposed model, although those considering these recommendations should resolve the issue of assigning laboratory units in Life Science and/or Physical Science.

The Cross-cutting Values area of the conceptual model affords the opportunity for campuses to highlight their institutional values and the CSU’s commitment to them. Collectively, these values are made visible through GE and serve as curricular anchor points for other GE areas, thereby lending credence to the overall logic of the GE program. Each Cross-cutting Value is allocated 3 units at the lower-division level, bringing the total number of semester units to 9 in the proposed model.

With regard to the first broad category featured in the model as a Cross-cutting Value, “Diversity and Social Justice,” the Task Force discovered during its work that all 23 campuses in the CSU have some requirement focused on diversity/cultural competency and/or social justice. Some campuses include the requirement in GE, while others identify it as a graduation requirement outside of the GE program. The Task Force was clear and unanimous in its conclusion that coursework featuring cultural
awareness and social justice should be articulated as a core, Cross-cutting Value in the CSU, and included within GE.

Another area made visible by the proposed structure is “Democracy in the U.S.” The Task Force acknowledges the Trustees’ requirement to ensure that all CSU graduates “acquire knowledge and skills that will help them to comprehend the workings of American democracy and of the society in which they live to enable them to contribute to that society as responsible and constructive citizens” (Title 5, section 40404). This requirement is called ‘American Institutions,’ and Title 5 is silent on the number of units to be devoted to this endeavor. Currently, most campuses require 6 semester units in the area, and some campuses include these units within their GE program, while others do not. In addition, campuses variously “double count” such coursework. The Task Force deemed it appropriate that this Cross-cutting Value be integrated into the GE program as a 3-unit core value that contributes to the intentionality and coherence of the GE package rather than a stand-alone, supervenient graduation requirement.

Finally, the Task Force acknowledged the importance of “Global Awareness and Civic Engagement” by situating it as a Cross-cutting Value in the CSU. This area highlights the imperative to expose students to issues occurring in the world around them. As borders between nations become less distinct and ecosystems are increasingly threatened, the CSU must prepare students for our international, multicultural society and encourage them to be stewards of change, working to find solutions to global problems. As a Cross-cutting Value, this area asks students to consider, across a broad range of subjects, how their engagement in local, regional, statewide, national and/or international affairs impacts society and the environment.

The Integrative Experiences area of the proposed model is envisioned to promote the main objectives of providing breadth, depth, intentionality, and campus autonomy to the GE program. It transforms the current requirement of 9 semester of upper-division GE (UDGE) disbursed evenly across breadth Areas B, C, and D into a proposed 6 semester units of UDGE, which are not necessarily tied to a specific discipline but are deeply connected to and built upon GE work in the Essential Skills, Disciplinary Perspectives, and Cross-cutting Values. The Task Force believes that Integrative Experiences courses should be the realization of the intentionality and coherence of the GE program for each campus.

With regard to breadth, the majority of Task Force members consider an UDGE requirement in the CSU compelling as a “best practice” and a signature feature of sound GE pedagogy, but two issues gave us pause. The first is whether 9 semester units is a “magic number” which should be preserved, and the second is the distribution of those units solely in Areas B, C and D. While on the face of it, distribution in those three areas seems to promote breadth, isolation of those three areas, to the exclusion of the other two as possibilities, creates
an artificial and limiting standard. The Task Force reasoned that breadth could be achieved by letting campuses determine disbursement, as long as these units were not situated in a student’s major, and as long as they do not “double count” with other GE or graduation requirements. Breadth is implicated in these two issues because of the student’s exposure to upper-division coursework outside of the major, and because of the dedicated objective that these units serve, which is to foster the synthesis of learning experiences across the broad swath of courses included in a GE pathway or minor.

With regard to depth and intentionality, most members of the Task Force were enthusiastic about the prospect that these units can be strategically deployed as the culmination of a graduated, scaffolded, and coherent set of integrative learning experiences while promoting deeper inquiry beyond a student’s major. Furthermore, the more complex and sophisticated integrative learning that UDGE offers is best made available through the integrated packages of pathways, certificates, GE minors, capstones, and signature courses.

The potential for interdisciplinary pathway minors, certificates, badges, capstones or other means of showcasing the ways in which the students’ General Education experience promotes Integrative Experiences is exciting. Thus, the Task Force recommends providing maximum latitude to campuses within the confines of a system policy which defines the goals of Integrative Experiences but does not prescribe how to achieve them. Such decisions are properly the province of campus faculty, in consideration of institutional goals and autonomy. Therefore, the Task Force intentionally offers no recommendations on issues such as course sequencing, course content, student learning outcomes, and other operational strategies or approaches. Instead, the model simply features the means to pursue such pedagogical opportunities, using evidence-based practices and learner-centered approaches.

The Task Force wishes to emphasize the importance of Integrative Experiences in programmatic assessment of GE. Just as is required of programs in each major, the GE program itself must be assessed holistically. Moreover, the assessment of GE programs must provide evidence of the development of learning in all the elements of the GE program. It is difficult to provide that evidence without a robust and full upper-division element, which is why a majority of the Task Force members recommends 6 semester units at the upper-division level. Mastery of the more complex, synthesizing content in two upper-division Integrative Experiences courses can be assessed by way of signature assignments designed to exhibit that mastery.

The Task Force also notes that reciprocity of upper-division GE must be preserved. In other words, matriculated students who complete upper-division GE units at one CSU campus and then transfer to another cannot be required to repeat upper-division GE units at their receiving campus. However, because of the purpose, importance, and uniqueness of UDGE Integrative Experiences courses in a student’s GE program, the Task Force discourages the practice of allowing additional UDGE units to satisfy lower-division GE requirements.
OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

In sum, the unit totals and subject area distributions discussed above afford the opportunity for students to see why they are doing what they are doing as they proceed through their GE program. Student perceptions of the purpose and value of their GE courses hopefully will shift from a checklist of disparate categories of courses needed for the diploma to a meaningful learning journey that empowers them to become independent thinkers and educated citizens of the global community, able to transform their learning into meaningful action. Not only does the proposed model offer an overall logic to GE requirements, but it also offers milestones, which will help students mark their progress. For instance, a student member of the Task Force expressed that it was motivational to be able to say, “I’ve learned my Essential Skills, now I’m ready to use these skills in my Disciplinary Perspectives and other GE courses.” This sense of logic and coherence to the GE program is a driving force behind the recommendations of the Task Force.

As another consideration, it should be noted that the unit total and distribution recommendations described herein do not change GE certification for transfer students. In other words, a transfer student would be “GE certified” with 36 units in Essential Skills, Cross-cutting Values, and Disciplinary Perspectives coursework just as occurs now, and when they transfer to a CSU campus, they still would need to complete 6 additional semester units in upper-division GE. The unit distributions and unit totals are consistent with IGETC, with Title 5, and with SB 1440 (the Star Act).

A third consideration relates to what might be colloquially called “carve outs” in the proposed model to capture graduation requirements such as American Institutions, diversity/equity/race/ethnicity (e.g., Ethnic Studies courses), second English composition, and languages other than English requirements. Since these requirements are entirely consistent with the aims of general education, and since articulating them within the conceptual model embeds them even more intentionally in the student’s experience, the Task Force encourages that specific attention be paid to the ways in which such courses are integrated into the GE program.

With regard to Integrative Experiences, a fourth consideration is whether upper division courses should be included at all in the CSU general education program. While the majority of Task Force members strongly supported them as vital to the integrity of the GE program because they synthesize and make transparent what it seeks to accomplish, the minority view should be acknowledged: the Task Force could not identify another higher education institution with this requirement; it adds units to the general education program; it was established at a time when we had fewer transfer students; and finally, upper-division GE has been in place for decades, and yet these courses do not appear to have accomplished what the conceptual model asks of them, i.e., the intentional scaffolding of learning from introduction to development to mastery. On balance, the majority deems upper-division GE critical to
assessing the development of learning in the GE program, and to demonstrating the seriousness with which the CSU views GE learning, as well as the importance it has in a student’s undergraduate career.

A fifth consideration regarding the proposed model is that it neither requires nor prevents a course or series of courses dedicated to a First-Year Experience. As with many facets of its recommendations, the Task Force considered such an approach to be in the purview of a specific campus and its faculty. However, the Task Force noted that such courses may be included in the GE program via lower-division GE requirements, such as in the Essential Skills, Disciplinary Perspectives, or Cross-cutting Values areas. The majority of Task Force members support a First-Year Experience program as a high-impact practice that holds particular value and meaning for student populations in the CSU.

Finally, the Task Force discussed on several occasions that the present funding model might encourage departments to offer GE courses in an effort to generate FTES and the resulting resources that extend from student enrollment. In addition to noting that campuses should be “held harmless” during a transition period while any changes in the GE program take place, the Task Force briefly discussed the prospect that the CSU might fund GE courses at the university level, which would be particularly beneficial for courses in the Integrative Experiences area. Removing financial incentives based on student enrollment numbers might result in a greater focus on the best pedagogical strategies and curriculum design to maximize student learning rather than on how to maximize student enrollment in a particular course.

**POTENTIAL CATEGORIES OF GE PATHWAYS**

The Task Force recognizes the CSU campuses that have already made great strides in providing students a coherent and intentional GE program under the existing Executive Orders (e.g., Chico State’s [Pathways in General Education](https://www.csuchico.edu/undergraduate/curriculum/GE/GEMinorPathway.html)). The Task Force has been inspired by these efforts as well as other GE reforms across the nation (e.g., Virginia Tech’s [Pathways to General Education](https://www.vt.edu/undergraduate/curriculum/GE/GEMinorPathway.html)). The following illustrates how the proposed CSU GE model may be packaged into three broad categories of pathway options for students. A shared theme, problem, or issue, relevant to a Cross-cutting Value, links GE courses within these pathways.

I. **GE Minor Pathway**

- Best option for students beginning their programs as first-time freshmen.
- Includes a minimum of 18 semester units (6 courses):
  - one Essential Skills course (3 units), e.g., in the Critical Thinking category
  - one Disciplinary Perspectives course (3 units), e.g., social and economic sustainability, art and social justice
  - two Cross-cutting Values courses (6 units), and
  - two Interdisciplinary Experiences courses (6 units), one of which serves as a capstone experience.
- Facilitates the creation of freshman learning communities or First-Year Experience programs organized around a problem/issue highlighted by a Cross-cutting Value.
- Examples provided below illustrate the subareas from which courses may be selected to fulfill the 18-unit (6 course) GE minor; students would still complete courses in all other GE areas to meet the 42-unit requirement.

### Example 1. GE Minor in Sustainability for a STEM major

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essential Skills</th>
<th>Disciplinary Perspectives</th>
<th>Cross-cutting Values</th>
<th>Integrative Experiences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written Communication</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>Diversity and Social Justice</td>
<td>UDGE Sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communication</td>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>Democracy in the U.S.</td>
<td>UDGE Sustainability Capstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>Life Science</td>
<td>Global Awareness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative Reasoning</td>
<td>Physical Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Example 2. GE Minor in Social Justice for a social science major

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essential Skills</th>
<th>Disciplinary Perspectives</th>
<th>Cross-cutting Values</th>
<th>Integrative Experiences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written Communication</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>Diversity and Social Justice</td>
<td>UDGE Social Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communication</td>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>Democracy in the U.S.</td>
<td>UDGE Social Justice Capstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>Life Science</td>
<td>Global Awareness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative Reasoning</td>
<td>Physical Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### II. GE Certificate or Special Programs Pathway

- Best option for transfer students or students opting into a pathway after completing most to all of their lower-division GE coursework, particularly in the Essential Skills and Disciplinary Perspectives areas.
- Includes a minimum of 9 semester units from at least one Cross-cutting Values course (3 units) and two Integrative Experiences courses (6 units), with one Integrative course serving as a capstone.
- Facilitates learning communities/cohorts, including student equity support organizations established for transfer students of color (e.g., CSU East Bay’s Sankofa Scholars, GANAS, and TAPASS).

### III. Traditional GE Program—the traditional distribution model

- Students select from all available GE courses that fulfill each GE area.
This report is the culmination of nearly two years of dedicated work by the General Education Task Force. The document seeks to provide a solid starting point for discussion and reflection and is offered up for wide dissemination, discussion, and ultimately, shared governance-based recommendations to further enhance all CSU students’ baccalaureate education. It is vital that students learn within a robust, dynamic general education environment in programs centered on coherent, intentional student learning. The liberal education provided by GE is a liberating education.

Curriculum planning, development and revision are led by the faculty; therefore, the ASCSU is the appropriate body to lead the next phase of GE reform, consonant with the principles and practices of shared governance. Wide, full consultation and consideration of this report is now needed, so the ASCSU is strongly urged to champion and lead the next phase of this important process. Initially, Task Force members anticipated they could help marshal those efforts and, after casting a wide consultative net, make changes to these recommendations prior to encouraging their implementation. However, in the wake of the most recent revisions to Executive Order 1100, the work of the Task Force intentionally slowed, in order to take stock of how those revisions affected both campus programs and systemwide conversations. In the wake of this report, important conversations will be many, varied, and appropriately situated in shared governance contexts both on campuses and systemwide.

The Task Force suggests that among groups the ASCSU consult with are the following: standing committees of the ASCSU; the Chancellor’s General Education Advisory Committee (GEAC); campus senates; campus GE committee chairs and/or directors of GE programs; other interest groups relevant to GE; the Academic Senates of the California Community Colleges and the University of California; and the California State Students Association.

Task Force members have appreciated the opportunity to consider the ways in which the California State University system can craft a GE program that best serves the needs of students on each campus. Naturally, members of the Task Force are willing to answer any clarifying questions that come to the ASCSU as the work continues, and wish the ASCSU well as the process moves forward.

Respectfully submitted,

Members of the General Education Task Force