

SACRAMENTO STATE GENERAL EDUCATION PROGRAM SELF-STUDY

December 2006

General Education/Graduation Policies Requirements Committee 2006/2007 Membership

| <u>Name</u> | <u>Department</u> |
|----------------------|--------------------|
| Sue Cote | Criminal Justice |
| *Janet Hecsh | Teacher Education |
| Vivian Llamas-Green | Admissions/Records |
| Richard Marens | CBA |
| Noelle McCurley | Academic Advising |
| Joan Neide | KHS |
| Reza Peigahi | Library |
| Anne-Louise Radimsky | Computer Science |
| Tony Sheppard | RLS |
| Chris Taylor | Astr/Physics |
| David Zeanah | Anthropology |
| *Chair | |

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| 1) Introduction..... | 1 |
| 2) Changes Since the Last Program Review | 1 |
| 3) Program's Articulation with Campus Baccalaureate Learning Goals | 15 |
| 4) Program's Articulation with CSU System Executive Orders | 15 |
| 5) Program's Coherence, Clarity and Simplicity | 24 |
| 6) Number of Units in Program..... | 26 |
| 7) Is There a Unique Upper-Division Experience?..... | 26 |
| 8) Does the Program Advantage Transfer Students or Native Students? | 26 |
| 9) Is There Reasonable Overlap with Major and Minor Requirements? | 27 |
| 10) Conclusion | 27 |

1) Introduction

The structure and content of this self-study was dictated by the Faculty Senate-approved charge developed by the 2005-2006 General Education/Graduation Requirements Policy Committee (GE/GRPC).¹ The self-study is in two parts. The first (sections 2 & 3) is essentially a description of the changes that have occurred in the GE program since the last program review in 2000-2001. The responses to the questions are based on an examination of numerous documents (see Bibliography), including Faculty Senate records, as well as interviews with Drs. Richard Kornweibel (Former member and chair of the GE/GRPC), Tom Griffith (Interim Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs) and Beth Merrit-Miller (Director, Academic Advising Center & Director, Career Center), and with Mr. Emiliano Diaz (Director, Outreach, Admissions & Records). The questions in the second part of the self-study guidelines (sections 4 – 9) required some understanding of the history of the GE program on campus, which necessitated research in the university's archives. The entire document was discussed and edited collaboratively with the 2006-2007 GE/GRPC².

It is worth noting that in the process of establishing or recording the historical timeline, with the various discrete events that have occurred along the way, this document is limited in the same way as any similar attempt at recording institutional histories would be. In the case of the Senate and its committees, for example, archives are generally clearer in terms of reasons and arguments in favor of policies that were passed than for those that failed, as the original policy documents often provide insight into the proposals whereas the counter-arguments are more often in the form of unrecorded debate at the time of consideration. Naturally, such debates and their content are remembered differently by those involved and it is beyond the scope of this document to attempt to record all such accounts.

2) Changes Since the Last Program Review

a) Administrative Changes

The Faculty Senate approved the 2001 General Education Review Team's (GERT) second recommendation that a full-time MPP Director of General Education should be appointed. In fall 2001 the Senate directed the GE Impact Study Workgroup (GEISW) to produce a position description for the GE Director. The resulting position and its description were approved by the Senate in May 2002 (see Table 1)³. The university assigned the position the rank of Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies; the position was advertised in May 2005 and filled in August, 2005 by the former Faculty Coordinator of GE, Dr. Greg Wheeler.

b) Policy Changes

i) Those in response to the last program review

The 2001 GERT made five recommendations (#3-6, 13) for changes to GE Policy, with the aims of simplifying GE as well as providing some structure at the upper-division level (Table 1). Only one of these recommendations, replacing the Advanced Studies requirement with an Intensive Writing requirement (Rec. #5), was carried and approved by the Faculty Senate and went into effect in the 1992-93 and subsequent GE Pattern. Three others were defeated in the Faculty Senate. These were: (1) to divide the GE Program into two parts, a 39-unit lower-division segment and a nine-unit upper-division segment (Rec. #3); (2) to incorporate the supplementary graduation requirements (second-semester writing requirement and the foreign

language requirement) into GE (Rec. # 6); and (3) requiring students to complete at least 33 (or 30) units of their lower-division GE requirements, including Area A plus Area B4 mathematics, before enrolling in upper-division GE coursework (Rec. #13). The last of the GE program policy recommendations, that the nine-unit upper-division segment would require students to take three units from each of the following three themes: 1) Social Issues of the 21st Century, 2) Arts, Humanities and Society, and 3) Science, Technology and Society (Rec. #4) was rendered moot when Rec. #3 was defeated. Nevertheless, the Senate directed the GE Impact Review Workgroup to prepare a proposal and implementation plan that would restructure the "9 unit upper-division General Education Requirement" to be an "Advanced General Education Package". The Workgroup did that and in spring 2003, the GE Faculty Coordinator put out a call to the deans and department chairs soliciting proposals relating to the upper-division segment, but none were received. This summarizes policy changes as a direct response to the 2001 GERT recommendations.

ii) Other policy changes since the last program review

While some of the recommendations of the 2001 program review committee were not immediately enacted, the underlying concerns that led to the recommendations remained and shaped subsequent policy development. Additional policy changes include those governing GE outcomes assessment and fulfillment of the supplementary foreign language requirement. Policy changes affecting second-semester composition graduation requirements and facilitating graduation are covered in the section below dealing with Sacramento State's response to the Coded Memorandum AA-2005-21.

(1) GE outcomes assessment and its governing policies and procedures

Following the procedures given in *Policies Pertaining to the General Education Program and Course/Proficiency Requirements for Graduation with the Baccalaureate Degree* (1991), a cycle of periodic area review of GE courses was begun in 1994, with a review of the Race and Ethnicity in American Society graduation requirement. The review of sub-areas B1 and B2 took three years, sub-area B2 completed in spring 1997 and sub-area B1 completed in spring 1999. The review of Advanced Study courses was scheduled for 1998, but was postponed because the GE program review was about to begin. During fall 1999 and spring 2000, a set of Baccalaureate Learning Goals was prepared by the Faculty Senate Working Group on University Learning Goals.⁴ In spring 2000 the GEP/GRC forwarded a proposal for a GE assessment process to the Senate. The proposal called for a GE Assessment Coordinator. Also, the GEP/GRC outlined procedures to establish GE learning goals, student learning outcomes and assessment plans (General Education Committee, 2000: 31).

Table 1. Recommendations of 2001 GE Program Review.

| Recommendation | Senate Actions | Outcome | Date |
|--|------------------------------|----------|-------------------------|
| #1. Establish GE Reform Implementation Group | FS 02-16B/Ex., FS 02-16C/Ex. | Carried | 4-Apr-02 ^{5,6} |
| #2. A full-time MPP Director of GE should be appointed | FS 02-37/Ex.; to GEISW | Carried | 9-May-02 ⁷ |
| #3. Divide the GE Program into two parts, a 39-unit lower-division segment and a 9-unit upper-division segment | FS 02-71/Ex. | Defeated | 21-Nov-02 ⁸ |
| #4. The 9-unit upper-division segment would require students to take 3 units from three thematic packages | FS 02-74/Ex.; to GEISW | Carried | 21-Nov-02 ⁹ |
| #5. Replace the advanced studies requirement with a 5,000 word writing intensive requirement | FS 02-73/Ex. | Carried | 21-Nov-02 ¹⁰ |

| | | | |
|--|------------------------------|----------|-------------------------|
| #6. The current second-semester writing requirement be incorporated into Area A3b and the Foreign Language Requirement be incorporated into lower-division Area C or the Requirement be eliminated and incorporated as an elective into Area C | FS 02-67A/Ex., FS 02-68A/Ex. | Defeated | 7-Nov-02 ¹¹ |
| #7. Course certification: grounded in redesigned course approval and review procedures that are based on clearly articulated objectives, assessment outcomes, and course design criteria | | | |
| #8. Relating to faculty rewards, responsibilities and resources | FS 02-16F/Ex.; to FPC | Carried | 4-Apr-02 ¹² |
| #9. The next review of GE will be conducted six years from the implementation of this report's recommendations, and that such a review be grounded in assessment results as well as the certification process called for in this report | FS 02-16E/Ex.; to GEP/GRC | Carried | 11-Apr-02 ¹³ |
| #10. FPC incorporates into the annual new faculty orientation a presentation on the GE Program's goals and objectives that stresses the importance of GE on this campus | FS 02-16F/Ex | Carried | 4-Apr-02 ¹⁴ |
| #11. The philosophy of General Education at CSUS be rearticulated in a concise statement written in easily understood language and that such a statement be incorporated into all materials distributed about GE | FS 02-16E/Ex.; to GEP/GRC | Carried | 11-Apr-02 ¹⁵ |
| #12. CSUS and community colleges make every effort to advise potential transfers that it is in their best interests to fulfill code requirements as part of their 39-unit transfer package, or else they will have to take additional coursework above and beyond the upper-division GE requirements at CSUS | FS 02-16D/Ex. | Carried | 4-Apr-02 ¹⁶ |
| #13. Students must complete at least 33 (or 30) units of their lower-division GE requirements, including Area A plus Area B4 mathematics, before enrolling in upper-division GE coursework. | FS 02-72/Ex. | Defeated | 21-Nov-02 ¹⁷ |
| #14. The university work toward the goal of providing evaluations for transfer students by the end of their first semester at CSUS | FS 02-16D/Ex. | Carried | 4-Apr-02 ¹⁸ |

In 2000-2001, Area B course syllabi were reviewed, as summarized in a plan approved in March 2002 (Table 2) (Attachment B, Faculty Senate Agenda, April 11, 2002).¹⁹ In the fall, syllabi were examined by the General Education Course Review Subcommittee (GECRSC) and those deemed noncompliant with area criteria were recommended to the GEP/GRC for removal. In the spring, a course outcomes questionnaire, developed by the GEP/GRC was administered to all Area B classes, the results of which were shared with the Area faculty. The questionnaire was deemed not very helpful and was not used again. At the same time (fall 2000 – spring 2002), following the procedures outlined by the GEP/GRC, a set of outcomes for each GE Area was being developed by the GE Area Coordinator Task Force convened by the Faculty Coordinator of Assessment (the position had been requested in spring 2000 by the GEP/GRC). It is reported that “faculty were widely consulted to encourage ownership and acceptance of draft outcomes. Pilot studies were conducted in each area to test the assessment of area outcomes” (2004 Campus Accountability Report, pg. 1).²⁰

Table 2. Senate Actions about Assessment Policies

| Assessment | Senate Actions | Outcome | Date |
|------------|----------------|---------|------|
|------------|----------------|---------|------|

| | | | |
|--|-----------------------|---------|-------------------------|
| General Education Assessment - Policies and Procedures | FS 02-22/GEP/GRC, Ex. | Carried | 25-Mar-02 ²¹ |
| General Education Assessment, Policy and Procedures, Revision Of | FS 04-28/GE/GRPC, Ex. | Carried | 13-May-04 ²² |
| Undergraduate Learning Expectations, Resolution On | FS 02-29/CPC, Ex. | Carried | 2-May-02 ²³ |

In 2001-2002, during the fall semester, Area C courses had their syllabi evaluated as to whether they were meeting GE area criteria (Table 3). Because of the disappointment surrounding the course outcomes assessment for Area B classes, a different plan was implemented during the spring. Departments with courses in Area C were asked to assess the outcomes in their courses. “Departments were also asked to develop an assessment tool and inform the GE Coordinator of their intention to supply the results of their assessment to the GEP/GRC and to provide a description of the strategy. The GE Course Review committee will review the strategies and results.” (Attachment B, Faculty Senate Agenda April 11, 2002 Background)²⁴. Most departments did something, but it was not rigorously reported or studied. The failure of this policy led to the current policy implemented in May 2004. The Race and Ethnicity in American Society supervenient requirement was also assessed in fall 2001 and found to be meeting its learning goals (referred to in a Memo, March 28, 2005, from Dr. Carrigan to GEP/GRC).

In spring 2002, the GEP/GRC recommended and the Faculty Senate approved two sets of learning goals or outcomes: 1) the Baccalaureate Learning Goals prepared by the Faculty Senate Working Group on University Learning Goals during fall 1999 and spring 2000, which are to be used in developing assessment strategies for the major and non-major graduation requirements; and, 2) the GE Area and graduation requirements learning outcomes prepared by the GE Area Coordinator Task Force over two academic years, 2000-2001 and 2001-2002, to be used to develop assessment strategies for non-major graduation requirements²⁵. Also in spring 2002, the Faculty Senate approved a set of policies and procedures for GE assessment to be implemented the next year (Tables 2 & 3), but action was later deferred pending a thorough study of the implications by Academic Affairs.

During academic years 2002-2003 and 2003-2004, departments submitted syllabi each fall for review by the GECRSC and the Faculty Coordinator worked with departments to develop successful assessment plans. During spring 2004 the GE assessment policies and procedures were revised (Table 2) (Attachment C, Faculty Senate Agenda, May 13, 2004)²⁶. Beginning in academic year 2004-2005, the fall semester expectations were: 1) assessment plans to be approved by the GE/GRPC; 2) a Campus Assessment Consultant to preview the plans and make recommendations to the GE/GRPC; and, 3) the GE/GRPC will serve as an appeal panel if there are any disputes between departments and the consultant. The major expectation for the spring semester was the injunction that departments maintain yearly records of their assessment results.

Table 3. Summary of GE Assessment Actions and Faculty Senate Actions since the Last Program Review.

| Year | GE Area Reviewed | GE Assessment Actions | | Faculty Senate Actions |
|-----------|------------------|---|--|--|
| | | Fall Semester | Spring Semester | |
| 2000-2001 | B | GE CRSC reviews syllabi and compared to original course proposal | GEP/GRC developed and administered a course outcomes questionnaire to all Area B classes | Senate approved creation of a task force to develop learning outcomes for GE Area criteria; the Faculty Coordinator of Assessment convened a GE Area Coordinator Task Force |
| 2001-2002 | C | GE CRSC reviews syllabi | GE Area coordinators helping faculty identify strategies to assess area outcomes; Area faculty are to describe how they are assessing outcomes and to develop an assessment tool | GE Assessment Policies and Procedures approved, but action was deferred until Academic Affairs could consider the implications of the policies and procedures |
| 2002-2003 | D | GE CRSC reviews syllabi | Course assessment plans submitted to Faculty Coordinator for approval | |
| 2003-2004 | E | GE CRSC reviews syllabi | Course assessment plans submitted to Faculty Coordinator for approval | GE Assessment Policies and Procedures revised; As part of program reviews, programs prepare a GE Assessment Summary Report; summary reports will be reviewed every five years by Area Interest Groups made up of faculty from departments teaching in the area |
| 2004-2005 | A | Course assessment plans and syllabi submitted; learning outcomes must be on syllabus; GE CRSC reviews syllabi | Campus Assessment Consultant & Director of GE preview plans and make recommendations to the GE/GRPC; Programs maintain yearly records of assessment data | |
| 2005-2006 | B | | | |
| 2006-2007 | C | | | |

While the format is not mandated, sample reporting forms are provided to departments (2004 Campus Accountability Report, pg. 1).²⁷ Further, the program review process was deemed the best venue for reporting the accumulated assessment data and a set of questions was developed to direct a program's reporting²⁸. Because this directive did not make it into the Program Review Guidelines until 2006, programs under review in 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 did not include such a report in their self-studies. Beginning in 2006-2007, however, aggregate GE assessment data and analysis are expected to be included in those documents. The GE Director will summarize data from all departments in various GE areas and the GEP/GRPC will draw conclusions and make suggestions based on the data. As reported in the Campus Accountability Report, the assessment process has raised awareness of and involvement in the GE Program.

In fall 2004, the outcomes of the Race & Ethnicity in American Society supervenient requirement was again evaluated, using a survey instrument. The analysis of the responses showed that this requirement continues to meet its learning goals (Memo, March 28, 2005, from Professor Carrigan to GEP/GRC).

(2) Foreign Language Graduation Requirement

Prior to the 1992 and subsequent GE pattern, foreign language skills courses were available as options within either Basic Subjects or in variously named groups that included the arts and humanities; as of fall 1983, with the adoption of the CSU System GE pattern, the group was Area C. The 1989 GE program review committee recommended removing foreign language skills courses from Area C. It suggested that perhaps foreign language coursework could be required as an exit requirement only for students who do not satisfy the foreign languages admissions requirement, which was/is two years of high school instruction in one language (Table 4; General Education Review Team, 1989: 21-22; General Education Committee, 2000: 23). Sacramento State's native students will have met the admissions requirement, but many transfer students who would not have met the admissions requirement as freshmen may have to make it up, which could add a considerable number of units to their load.

The Academic Senate followed the recommendation to remove the introductory-level foreign language courses from the GE pattern. However, it then required foreign language proficiency as an additional university graduation requirement for all students, not only for those who did not meet the admissions requirement (i.e., some transfer students). Since its inception in fall 1992, students could meet this graduation requirement either before enrollment to Sacramento State or after enrollment (Table 4).

Fall 1992 - Spring 2004. Students had four options for meeting the graduation requirement before enrollment (Table 4). Two options involved coursework, one at the high school level and the other at the college level: they could take a fourth year of successful (minimum grade of C) high school foreign language classes or they could complete three semesters of a foreign language at a community college or university. The third option was/is to have completed secondary school where the language of instruction was not English and the fourth involved passing an Advanced Placement exam while in high school.

If students must meet the graduation requirement after enrollment, they had several options. They could complete college-level coursework or test out. Regarding the former, a student

Table 4. Foreign Language Proficiency Requirements since Fall 1992 and Subsequent Changes

| When Met | 1992/94 - 2002/04 | 2004/06 - 2006/08 |
|--------------------------|--|--|
| Before Enrollment | <p>Completed 4th year of high school foreign language w/ a grade of "C" or better; or</p> <p>Completed secondary school where language of instruction was not English; or</p> <p>Advanced Placement Foreign Language Examination scores of 3, 4 or 5; or</p> <p>Completion of three semesters of a foreign language at a community college or university w/ a grade of "C" or better; or</p> <p>Completion of a CAN 8-level foreign language course at any participating community college or university, with a grade of "C-" or better; or</p> <p>Completion of a minimum of two years in high school foreign language with a grade of "C" or better and completion of the first year (two semesters or the equivalent) of a second foreign language at a community college or university, with a grade of "C-" or better.</p> | <p>Completed 3rd year of high school foreign language w/ a grade of "C-" or better; or</p> <p>Completed secondary school where language of instruction was not English; or</p> <p>Advanced Placement Foreign Language Examination scores of 3, 4 or 5; or</p> <p>Completion of two semesters of a foreign language at a community college or university with a grade of "C-" or better (i.e., equivalent of admissions requirement).</p> |
| After Enrollment | <p>Passing intermediate-level tests in two of four skills: reading, writing, listening and speaking. One of the tests passed must be in reading or writing; or</p> <p>Passing an advanced-level proficiency test in reading; or</p> <p>Completing the first year (two semesters - 1A and 1B or the equivalent) of a second foreign language at the college level, with grades of "C-" or better, if the student already completed a minimum of two years of foreign language in high school with a grade of "C" or better; or</p> <p>Completing the 3rd semester or equivalent (2A) of a college-level language (or ASL) course with a grade of "C-" or better.</p> | <p>Passing intermediate-level tests in two of four skills: reading, writing, listening and speaking. One of the tests passed must be in reading or writing; or</p> <p>Passing an advanced-level proficiency test in reading; or</p> <p>Completing the 2nd semester or equivalent (1B) of a college-level language (or ASL) course with a grade of "C-" or better.</p> |

needed to successfully complete a third semester or equivalent (2A) of college-level course work with a grade of “C-” or better. If a student chose the testing option, s/he either had to pass intermediate-level proficiency tests in one pair of competencies, each of which had to include either reading or writing (reading/listening, writing/listening, reading/writing, reading/speaking and writing/speaking) or pass an advanced-level proficiency test in reading. An attempt was made by the Faculty Senate in 2003-04 to ease the testing component, in order to allow one of the pairs of skills to not include reading or writing (reading/writing, listening/speaking, reading/speaking, and writing/listening), but it was ultimately disapproved (Table 5).

The General Education Committee (2000: 23) states that few entering students (native and transfer) met the graduation requirement at admission. Because of this, the General Education Review Team 2000-01 was concerned that the supplementary graduation requirements were a problem, especially for transfer students who may have thought that they had completed all their graduation requirements. The committee recommended, therefore, that the foreign language graduation requirement either be returned to lower-division GE Area C or removed as a graduation requirement. This recommendation met with resistance. Concerns remained, nevertheless, about how Sacramento State’s supplementary graduation requirements were keeping students from graduating in a timely manner. As a consequence, during 2003-2004, the Faculty Senate made a number of changes to improve the situation for students (Table 5). These changes include the development of Foreign Language Learning Goals and improvements on how this graduation requirement can be met. The learning goals facilitate the development of courses to meet the graduation requirement as well as the course approval and assessment processes. The improvements included changing the criteria for meeting the graduation requirement before enrollment and after enrollment (Table 4).

Fall 2004 – Present. For students meeting the requirement before enrollment, the number of years of successful high school foreign language was reduced from four to three and the minimum grade requirement for the third year was changed from “C” to “C-“. If students took a foreign language at a community college or other university before enrolling, then the number of required semesters was reduced from three to two and the minimum grade requirement for the second semester is listed as “C-“. If the requirement had to be met after enrollment at Sacramento State, then the required semester was changed from a third semester or equivalent (2A) to the second or equivalent (1B).

While foreign language skills courses are excluded from the GE program, some intermediate-level language courses that have significant cultural components to them have been allowed in Area C. The 1989 General Education Review Team recommended creating a “further studies” sub-area (C4), which was approved and now accommodates intermediate-level language courses.

Table 5. Senate Actions about the Foreign Language Requirement

| Policies about GE | Senate Actions | Outcome | Date |
|---|------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|
| Foreign Language Graduation Requirement, Learning Goals | FS 03-39/GEP/GRC, Ex. | Carried | 16-Nov-03 ²⁹ |
| Foreign Language Graduation Requirement: Meeting the Requirement Before Enrolling at CSUS | FS 04-18B/Flr. | Carried | 25-Mar-04 ³⁰ |
| Motion to Recommit - Foreign Language Graduation Requirement | FS 04-18C/Flr. | Carried | 25-Mar-04 ³¹ |
| Foreign Language Graduation Requirement | FS 04-18D/GEP/GRC, Ex. | Carried | 30-Apr-04 ³² |

c) Assessment Changes

Following the recommendations of the last two program reviews, the university committed funding to support an element of a “culture of evidence”: assessment. The university dedicated 12 units of assigned time per year to support a GE faculty consultant. During AY 2000-01 and 2001-02, Dr. Ann Haffer from Nursing filled that role by serving as the Faculty Coordinator of Assessment; she convened the GE Area Coordinator Task Force to develop a set of learning outcomes for each GE Area, which were approved in spring 2002.

With the learning outcomes in place, in fall 2002 the university began a five year program to implement the requirement of assessment plans for all courses in GE. Thus, the role of the GE faculty consultant changed to one of working with departmental faculty to develop course-specific student learning outcomes for their GE courses and to assist them in their development of assessment plans. Dr. Leah Vande Berg from Communication Studies first served as the Faculty Assessment Consultant for two and one-half academic years beginning in fall 2002 and Dr. Catherine Gabor from the English Department now fills the position (spring 2005-present).

Beginning in fall 2002 and on an annual basis, one GE area was the focus for assessment plan development. The first was courses in Area D; the last, Area C, will have plans in place by the end of AY 2006-07 (Table 3). Table 6 gives the number of plans in place by GE Area. Since fall 2002, there has been the development of a number of websites that facilitate the production of assessment plans. This development culminated during summer 2006 with the putting in place an easily accessed, nine-step guide for faculty to use in developing and using assessment plans.³⁴

Table 6. Number of Courses with Assessment Plans by GE Area

| GE Area | N |
|--|----------|
| A Basic Subjects | 14 |
| B The Physical Universe and Its Life Forms | 58 |
| C The Arts and Humanities* | 179 |
| D The Individual and Society | 123 |
| E Understanding Personal Development | 83 |
| Total | 457 |

*Will have plans by end of AY 06/07

Fall 2003 saw the publication of the first GE Newsletter, which is an outreach effort by the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies and the Office of Academic Affairs. Each term an issue is published with articles highlighting recent accomplishments by faculty and students in GE classes, introducing new GE administrative appointments, discussing the importance of GE or the assessment process etc. The newsletter brings to the attention of the entire faculty the centrality of GE in the university’s mission, whether the faculty member is involved in GE or not. As such, more faculty members should be informed and involved in the continued re-evaluation of the Sacramento State GE program.

d) Advising Changes

Two departments in Student Affairs share the responsibility for GE Advising: Outreach, Admissions & Records and Academic Advising. Outreach, Admissions & Records has a multitude of charges; those that affect the GE program include advising prospective students regarding Sacramento State's admission requirements and evaluating transfer courses and for enrolled students certifying completion of degree requirements. It also maintains Sacramento State's formal partnerships with regional high schools and California Community Colleges.³⁵ Academic Advising is responsible for freshmen and transfer orientation for prospective students and for giving advice about GE and other graduation requirements to enrolled students.

Outreach, Admissions & Records (OAR) has undergone some structural changes in the past few years that are helpful for transfer students. One includes involving some staff members who are responsible for transfer credit evaluations in the transfer admissions process, where their knowledge can be immediately put to use. This is helping in speeding the process up. Since the last program review, OAR was not getting transfer credit evaluations done by the end of a transfer's first term at Sac State. However, as a consequence of changes among the evaluations staff, Sacramento State met its charge (to evaluate transfer credits during the first term of a transfer's enrollment) for the first time in spring 2006 and expects to accomplish the same during fall 2006. This is a very important accomplishment as transfer students must know what non-major graduation requirements they have to complete before enrolling for subsequent terms, if they wish to avoid acquiring unnecessary units and delaying their time to graduation. This accomplishment is in large part due to the leadership of the new Vice President of Student Affairs and the management skills of the Director of Admissions and Records.

An "enrollment funnel" established in OAR delegates different responsibilities to three entities that manage first-time freshmen, transfer evaluation, and graduation evaluations. The transfer evaluation component has not only sped up course evaluations, but also does considerable amounts of outreach to Sacramento State's top feeder institutions, where the staff also works with prospective students in evaluating their courses for transfer.

The sophisticated web presence of OAR is likely as helpful to students as it was in writing this document. Further, the very proactive aspects of OAR's outreach are likely to have significant consequences for attracting and assisting prospective students. For instance, the department has been using the latest technology (e.g., flash email) in communicating with prospective students.

During and since the last self-study, in 1999-2000, OAR made a concerted effort to go after local students. As a consequence, the percentage of Sacramento State's student body that is made up of upper-division transfers has fallen from 70% before fall 2003 to 55% in fall 2006. This trend, if one may call it that, suggests that Sacramento State is getting close to the upper-division to lower-division ratio of 60:40 envisioned in the Master Plan. Very likely this ratio also represents the activities of the Enrollment Management Group.³⁶

As stated above, the Department of Academic Advising is responsible for freshmen and transfer orientation for prospective students and for giving advice about GE and other graduation requirements to enrolled students. Since the last program review, there have been two major changes in the department: one affecting enrolled students and the other prospective students.

In 2003, a new process was instituted to provide for students who were disqualified from continuing on probation and, therefore, subsequently dismissed. Prior to 2003, disqualified students would meet with individual advisors, where their pleas could theoretically affect the decision made by an advisor about dismissing or reinstating them. It is now a committee, not an individual, who makes decisions about disqualified students. Further, the student no longer makes a personal appearance, but instead must prepare a packet of materials that the committee considers. If the committee decides to not reinstate a student, it provides the student with a plan to assist them in their progress toward reinstatement. If the committee does reinstate a student then a different plan is provided, which is more restrictive and developmental than had previously been the case. The department has found this new developmental process more effective in providing what it considers best for students.

The second change is that freshmen orientation is mandatory and no longer optional. This was begun during summer 2006. The new process is the result of the Vice President of Student Affairs wanting a more comprehensive freshmen advising system and it involves three phases. The first takes place in the summer during the mandatory orientation program, when students are introduced to the many programs in the university and when they are advised on what courses to take in the fall and enrolled in them. This past summer of 2006 the Academic Advising staff met with 2600 freshmen in twice the number of orientation sessions than had been the case prior to the increase in freshmen class size, alluded to above (12 sessions compared with 6).

The second phase, beginning in the middle of the fall term, is a follow up on the freshmen. In these sessions the advisors introduce a career-oriented perspective (what can one do with such-and-such a major) as well as assisting the students in selecting courses for the following semester. Academic departments were approached before this new process began in order to avoid duplicating what departments may already have on hand and the response was very positive. All students in learning communities and freshmen seminars (about 1000 students in total) have peer mentors who can have such discussions with the freshmen; students in special programs, about 500 all together in Child Development, Liberal Studies, EOP, Ed Equity etc., have advisors specific to those programs. Thus, the number of freshmen to follow up on in fall 2006 is over 1000. It is expected that in the spring there will be some back-filling taking place (seeing freshmen not seen in the fall). It is also likely that peer mentors will be hired to assist in this.

The third phase of the process will take place in spring 2007, beginning in February. It is expected that more than 2200 students will be advised during this phase. With data on student performance from the fall semester in hand, it is expected that advising will involve rich, valuable conversations, long-range academic planning and where necessary, intervention. Students will be advised about what to register for in their third semester, on the possibility of attending class during the summer, about reaching out to advisors in potential major departments and further career exploration.

During summer 2007, the Academic Advising staff will reflect on their (and student) experiences with the new process and based on this will develop a formal assessment instrument with which to measure student outcomes.

Another recent change that has occurred since the last self-study is that it is more difficult to recruit faculty advisors to the Advising Center. It is thought that one reason for this is the large proportion of new faculty to the university, the priorities of which lie elsewhere. Additionally, there are few rewards (aside from three units assigned time per term for four terms) to attract faculty to work at the Advising Center. Nevertheless, the faculty that does work in Academic Advising is fully engaged in the process.

e) Response to the CSU Board of Trustees Coded Memo AA-2005-21

A Task Force on Facilitating Graduation was established in fall 2005 to respond to the Coded Memo AA-2005-21 about improving student progress to the baccalaureate degree. The task force developed and implemented 36 action plans in response to 19 of the 22 recommendations made by the Chancellor's Office (Appendix A provides a summary of these). Of the 22 recommendations, five pertain to non-major graduation requirements. Eight of the task force's responses deal with those five recommendations and can be considered under the topics of facilitating a timely graduation and the second-semester composition graduation requirement.

i) Facilitating a timely graduation

One action plan that responded to both the first and second recommendations was to investigate the overlap of GE and the major to see if useful efficiencies could be found (Table 7). The GE/GRPC investigated it and in spring 2006 proposed to the Senate a policy that goes some way toward simplifying our GE program. The policy clearly articulates the allowed overlap of nine units [lower-division and/or upper-division] between GE and the major (Table 8). This policy change was in addition to one made in spring 2004 that allowed the complete overlap of GE and the minor. The more recent change, especially, should facilitate "the desirable prospect of integrating GE and major advising...for most faculty" (FS 06-83C/GEP/GRPC/Ex).³⁷

A second action plan in response to the second recommendation was the statement of principles for GE and graduation requirements revision (Table 7). These were initially articulated at the Senate Retreat at the beginning of fall 2005, formalized in the response to the Coded Memorandum sent to the Chancellor's Office in December 2005, and presented to the Faculty Senate, where it was carried in spring 2006 (Table 8). Indeed, these principles comprise the charge guiding this Self-Study and program review.

The fourth recommendation of the Coded Memo is a charge to strengthen support for both GE and life/career goal clarification for lower-division students. The report identified eleven actions that already demonstrate a campus commitment to supporting GE (and life/career goal) clarification, including the establishment of lower-division transfer patterns for the 29 most popular majors.

Three action plans were envisaged that involve GE: one involving freshmen, one affecting transfers and the third dealing with faculty advising. The first requires freshmen advising that integrates GE with major advising and career exploration. The second was to develop memorandums of understanding (MOUs) with additional feeder colleges. Three MOUs have been added since the summer of 2005 and Associate Dean Wheeler is working on three more. Additionally, in November 2006 there was a conference of GE advisors from eight regional community colleges. The third action plan was to share outcomes of five Faculty Senate Advising Grants with the campus in spring 2006. One of the action plans in response to the sixth

recommendation also involves developing links between the GE advisors and major advisors (Table 7).

Table 7. Responses to Non-Major Graduation Requirement-Related Recommendations of the CSU Board of Trustees Coded Memo AA-2005-21.

| Recommendations | Action Taken in Fall 2005 | Potential Changes/Courses of Action |
|--|--|--|
| 1) Reduction of Required Units in Programs Leading to the BA Degree | | Both GE and major programs asked to examine unit requirements to determine where double counting units or decreasing them might be possible. |
| 2) Selective Reduction of Campus Graduation Requirements | Over past decade significantly improved program management supervision of graduation requirements. Based on the outcomes of the Faculty Senate fall retreat, four action plans were proposed and are under discussion in the GE/GRC. Since fall 2005, several (which, #4 as part of Self-study Guidelines) of the proposals were approved. | Four action plans of which three involve GE: 2) invite high unit majors to either overlap major and grad requirements or replace grad requirements w/ major courses; 3) investigate policies on overlap etc. to see if useful efficiencies can be found; 4) propose a statement of principles for GE and grad requirements revision. |
| 4) Strengthen Support for both GE and Life/Career Goal Clarification for LD Students | Eleven actions were identified that demonstrate a campus commitment to supporting both GE and life/career goal clarification | Seven plans of which three involve GE: 1) require freshmen advising that integrates GE with major and career exploration; 3) develop MOUs with additional feeder colleges; 7) share outcomes of five Faculty Senate Advising Grants with campus in spring 2006. |
| 6) Choice of Degree Major at a Reasonable, Early Juncture | Conducted an analysis of attempted units by native and transfer students to determine nature of problem at Sac State. Based on the analysis, developed ten action plans. | Ten actions sent to Academic Senate committees of which one is relevant to GE: 10) develop links between department major advisors and GE advisors in Academic Advising Center. |
| 11) Adoption of Strategies for Student Success and Learning Support | | Five action plans including one affecting graduation requirements: 2) the University Reading and Writing Committee reviews entire writing program to look for efficient, effective ways to help students meet the writing learning objectives and reports back in spring 2006. |

While not mentioned in the Response to the Coded Memo, the GEP/GRPC nevertheless recommended to the Senate an additional policy change that will facilitate timely graduation (Table 8). This policy is two-fold. The first broadens the definition of GE Area C Further Studies to parallel the Area B Further Studies. As with Area B Further Studies, which allows fulfillment by taking classes in either Area B5 or Areas B1, B2 or B4, the Area C4 Further Studies requirement can be fulfilled by taking a course in that category or a second course from Areas C1, C2 or C3. Inexplicably, the policy had been that a further course from Area C1 had been excluded as fulfilling Area C4, which, as the 2005-2006 GEP/GRC states, was inconsistent with the university's goals related to diversity and global education.

The second part of the policy change to facilitate timely graduation involves removing the course restriction that "no more than two courses may be taken from the same subject designation" in Areas C and D1a. This change offers students greater flexibility and should reduce the number of GE courses taken erroneously. "The recommendation would also resolve the inequity

between native students who are limited by this policy and transfer students who, not being informed of the restrictions, do not have it applied to courses taken prior to their enrollment here” (FS 06-83/GEP/GRPC/Ex.).

Table 8. Senate Actions about Changes to GE to Facilitate Time to Graduation

| Policies about GE | Senate Actions | Outcome | Date |
|--|------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|
| GE - Overlapping GE and Minor Units | FS 04-17/GEP/GRC, Ex | Carried | 11-Mar-04 ³⁸ |
| General Education, Changes to Policy - Overlapping Units | FS 06-83C/GEP/GRPC/Ex. | Carried | 20-Apr-06 ³⁹ |
| General Education Program Review | FS 06-93/GEP/GRPC/Ex. | Carried | 20-Apr-06 ⁴⁰ |
| General Education, Changes to Policy (Areas C & D1a) | FS 06-83/GEP/GRPC/Ex. | Carried | 23-Mar-06 ⁴¹ |

The eleventh Coded Memo recommendation is to adopt strategies for student success and learning support. One action plan grew out of the eleventh recommendation. It was to review the entire writing program to look for efficient, effective ways to help students meet the writing learning objectives.

ii) Second-semester composition graduation requirement

The 1989 General Education Review Team recommended adding a second, consecutive English composition course to GE Area A. The Senate took this recommendation under consultation with the English Department about its placement (in GE or as a supplementary requirement). Since fall 1992 a second semester of composition has been a supplementary graduation requirement.

As with the supplementary foreign language requirement, the 2000-01 General Education Review Team was concerned that the second semester of composition was a problem for transfer students. As a result, the committee recommended that the second-semester writing graduation requirement be subsumed into GE Area A3; this met with resistance in fall 2002 (Table 1). However, as with the foreign language requirement, the faculty is sensitive to the needs of transfer students (as well as tax payers) in facilitating graduation by removing as many obstacles as possible. Thus, in spring 2003 the Faculty Senate’s Executive Committee asked the GEP/GRC to look into the rejected recommendation as well as the GE Report Implementation/Impact Working Group’s recommendations on second-semester composition.

During fall 2003 and spring 2004, the GE/GRPC consulted with Dr. Amy Heckathorn, Coordinator of the English Department's Writing Program, and returned to the Senate in May 2004 with a recommendation for a rationale and set of learning goals for a second-semester composition course. The recommendation, however, was sent back to the Academic Policies Committee for more discussion (Table 9).

Table 9. Senate Actions about Changes to the Second-Semester Composition Graduation Requirement

| Policies about GE | Senate Actions | Outcome | Date |
|--|------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|
| Motion to Recommit Second-Semester Composition Graduation Requirement, Learning Goals | FS 04-27A/GE/GRPC, Flr | Carried | 13-May-04 ⁴² |
| Motion to Divide FS 06-90, Comprehensive Writing Proposal | FS 06-90A/Flr. | Carried | 27-Apr-06 ⁴³ |
| Comprehensive Writing Proposal | FS 06-90/GEP/GRPC | Carried | 27-Apr-06 ⁴⁴ |
| Motion to Refer FS 06-90, Comprehensive Writing Proposal, Recommendation #4 (Upper-division) | FS 06-90B/Flr. | Carried | 27-Apr-06 ⁴⁵ |

A year later, in fall 2005, the Subcommittee for Writing and Reading was charged with reviewing the Comprehensive Writing Program policies. It returned to the Senate in spring 2006 with a report that contained ten outcomes for the Program as well as nine recommendations: five for the lower-division program and four for the upper-division program (Table 10). All were carried by the Senate but for the fourth recommendation for the upper-division program, which caused some consternation among the faculty, and was referred back to the Faculty Senate's Executive Committee for further consideration (Table 9). It is worth noting that this fourth recommendation also was made in the report by the General Education Committee (2000: 59) as was it in the External Consultant Report (2001: 14). The tightening of course sequence and other recommendations that will positively impact student morale should go far toward facilitating timely graduation rates.

Table 10. Subcommittee for Writing and Reading Recommendations to the Faculty Senate

| | |
|----------------|--|
| Lower-division | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lower EPT cut scores so as to reduce remediation and improve preparatory writing sequence; provide more group tutorials 2. Require completion of first-year composition requirement by beginning of junior status else hold on registration when complete 74 units 3. Create or choose a cross-disciplinary writing book that could be used university-wide and required in composition courses 4. Improve sequencing by requiring second-semester composition before GVAR 5. Revise course description and goals of ENGL20/20M so has "writing-in-the-disciplines" focus |
| Upper-division | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That a WI course, rather than the WPE, satisfy GVAR 2. The WPE serve as a challenge exam for 109W/109M 3. Create 3X course, a group writing tutorial, as third placement option for WPE 4. The WI requirement be revised to a Writing-in-the-Discipline requirement |

3) Program's Articulation with Campus Baccalaureate Learning Goals

Sacramento State's graduation requirements (including GE) are directly articulated with the formal baccalaureate learning goals. During AY 1999/2000, the Faculty Senate Working Group on University Learning Goals proposed a set of Baccalaureate Learning Goals that were carried by the Academic Senate in spring 2002. The working group proposed six different goals: 1) competence in the disciplines; 2) analysis and problem solving; 3) communication; 4) information competence; 5) cultural legacies; and 6) values and pluralism. Each goal is accompanied by a definition and specific expectations for students to demonstrate (and thus is amenable to assessing student learning outcomes). In the GE Learning Goals Matrix all the GE sub-areas have been directly linked with the baccalaureate learning goals that they satisfy.⁴⁶ The foreign language graduation requirement clearly fulfills the fourth specific expectation under communication of being able to communicate in a language other than English. The second semester of composition and the intensive writing graduation requirements clearly fulfill the remaining communication learning expectations.

4) Program's Articulation with CSU System Executive Orders

Three executive orders (E.O. 405, E.O. 595, and E.O. 665) govern the content and structure of the undergraduate non-major graduation requirements in the CSU system.

a) E.O. 405

Executive Order 405 (effective fall 1982) governs some content by establishing guidelines for the administration of Title 5, California Administrative Code, Section 40404. It prescribes the minimum subject matter to be covered in the graduation requirements in U.S. History, Constitution and American Ideals. These graduation requirements are often referred to as “code courses”. These code courses are not part of the General Education-Breadth Requirements in the CSU, but they can be included (E.O. 595: Section V). The purpose of the courses is to ensure that CSU graduates understand how American democracy works so that they are able to constructively function in it. To this end they study American government and American history.

Sacramento State’s GE program is in complete compliance with E.O. 405. We have taken the prerogative of including the code courses in our GE program, in sub-area D3. Students can currently choose from three government courses, one lower-division and two upper, and from nine history courses, one lower-division and eight upper.

In the last program review, part of the design of its 3rd recommendation, to split the GE program into a 39-unit lower-division and a 9-unit upper-division package, was that the code courses should be lower-division. Therefore, the 12th recommendation was that the “CSUS and community colleges make every effort to advise potential transfers that it is in their best interests to fulfill code requirements as part of their 39-unit transfer package, or else they will have to take additional coursework above and beyond the upper-division GE requirements at CSUS” (General Education Review Team 2000-01: 29). The necessity for this recommendation was contingent on the passage of the 3rd recommendation, and as this was not carried by the Senate, the 12th was also unnecessary. Furthermore, the failure of the recommendation meant that the ten upper-division courses that satisfy the code requirements are still offered and are necessary. Perusal of the class schedule for AY 2005-06 shows that while upper-division classes were offered for the code requirements, the majority of sections were still lower-division (Table 11).

Table 11. Number of Sections Offered for Code Courses in AY 2005-06

| | F05 | S06 |
|----------|-----|-----|
| GOVT 1 | 21 | 19 |
| GOVT 113 | 1 | 2 |
| GOVT 150 | 8 | 7 |
| HIST 3 | 0 | 1 |
| HIST 17A | 12 | 10 |
| HIST 17B | 10 | 11 |
| HIST 159 | 1 | 0 |
| HIST 161 | 1 | 1 |
| HIST 162 | 3 | 4 |
| HIST 167 | 2 | 2 |
| HIST 177 | 1 | 0 |
| HIST 182 | 1 | 1 |

b) E.O. 595

Executive Order 595 (effective January 1993) governs content and structure by establishing guidelines for the administration of Title 5, California Code of Regulations, Sections 40402.1, 40405, 40405.1, and 40405.4. It establishes “*a common understanding about CSU General Education-Breadth Requirements.*” *The purpose of the General Education-Breadth Requirements is that “taken with the major depth program and electives presented by each baccalaureate candidate, they will assure that graduates have made noteworthy progress toward becoming truly educated persons”* (Section III). Executive Order 595 comprises nine sections, the content of which is summarized below.

Section I describes the three ways that students can meet general education-breadth requirements:

1. *“Fulfillment of CSU General Education-Breadth Requirements (Title 5, Section 40405.1), including a minimum of nine semester units ... at the CSU campus granting the baccalaureate degree.*
2. *Completion of the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (Title 5, Section 40405.2), as certified by a California community college, plus a minimum of nine upper-division semester units...at the CSU campus granting the baccalaureate degree.*
3. *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...at the CSU campus granting the baccalaureate degree.”*

Section II describes the responsibilities of individual campuses.

A. *“The faculty of a CSU campus has primary responsibility for developing and revising the institution’s particular General Education-Breadth program. Trustee policy describes broad areas of inquiry, which may be viewed from various disciplinary and interdisciplinary perspectives. Within the framework provided, each CSU campus is to establish its own requirements and exercise its creativity in identifying courses and disciplines to be included within its General Education-Breadth program. In undertaking this task, participants should give careful attention to the following:*

1. *Assuring that General Education-Breadth Requirements are planned and organized so that their objectives are perceived as interrelated elements, not as isolated fragments.*
2. *Considering the organization of approved courses into a variety of “cores” or “themes,” each with an underlying unifying rationale, among which students may choose.*
3. *Evaluating all courses approved as meeting current General Education-Breadth Requirements to determine which continue to meet the objectives and particular requirements contained herein.*
4. *Considering development of new courses as they may be necessary to meet the objectives and particular requirements contained herein.*
5. *Considering the possibility of incorporating integrative courses, especially at the upper-division level, which feature the interrelationships among disciplines within and across traditional general education categories.*

6. *Providing for reasonable ordering of requirements so that, for example, courses focusing on learning skills will be completed relatively early and integrative experiences, relatively later.*
 7. *Developing programs that are responsive to educational goals and student needs, rather than programs based on traditional titles of academic disciplines and organizational units.*
 8. *Considering possibilities for activity as well as observation in all program subdivisions.*
- B. *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...to provide for appropriate oversight and to make appropriate recommendations concerning the implementation, conduct and evaluation of these requirements.*
- C. *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.*
- D. *Each campus shall provide for regular periodic reviews of general education policies and practices in a manner comparable to those of major programs. The review should include an off-campus component.”*

Section III (Title 5, Section 40405; effective 1981-82) gives the system-wide objectives of the General Education – Breadth Requirements. These include:

- A. the basic skills (“*will have achieved the ability to think clearly and logically, to find information and examine it critically, to communicate orally and in writing, and to reason quantitatively*”)
- B. the types of knowledge (“*will have acquired appreciable knowledge about their own bodies and minds, about how human society has developed and how it now functions, about the physical world in which they live, about the other forms of life with which they share that world, and about the cultural endeavors and legacies of their civilizations*”)
- C. their significance (“*will have come to an understanding and appreciation of the principles, methodologies, value systems, and thought processes employed in human enquiries.*”)

The concluding paragraph of this section states: “*The intent is that the General Education – Breadth Requirements be planned and organized in such a manner that students will acquire the abilities, knowledge, understanding, and appreciation suggested as interrelated elements and not as isolated fragments.*” (emphasis added)

Section IV (Title 5, Section 40402.1; effective 1981-82) describes the entry-level learning skills in English and mathematics that students should have when they are admitted to the CSU and the consequences if students do not possess those skills (i.e., remediation; units taken in remediation are not applicable to the BA).

Section V (Title 5, Section 40405.1; effective 1981-82) gives the distribution of general education-breadth units:

- A. a minimum of 9 semester units in Area A
- B. a minimum of 12 semester units in Area B
- C. a minimum of 12 semester units in Area C
- D. a minimum of 12 semester units in Area D
- E. a minimum of 3 semester units in Area E

This section also states that:

1. at least nine units must be earned at the campus granting the degree
2. nine of the units must be upper-division
3. the nine upper-division semester units cannot be taken before achieving junior status, i.e., completion of 60 semester units
4. campuses may permit “double counting” for General Education-Breadth Requirements and major requirements
5. up to six semester units taken to meet the code requirements may be credited toward satisfying the General Education-Breadth Requirements.

Section VI (Title 5, Section 40405.4; effective 1991-92) gives reasons for authorizing exemptions to one or more general education requirements for individual students and for high-unit programs.

Section VII describes the composition and responsibilities of a system-wide advisory committee on general education.

Section VIII describes the certification by regionally accredited institutions of transfer students’ fulfillment of 39-units of CSU lower-division General Education-Breadth Requirements.

Section IX describes provisions for lower-division general education reciprocity among CSU campuses and does not prohibit reciprocity for upper-division courses.

Sacramento State’s GE program is in compliance with E.O. 595, as has been confirmed in prior review cycles and by the Chancellor’s Office. However, there remains some debate among some faculty as to whether we should go beyond simple compliance in responding to certain wording in E.O. 595 that some interpret as being inconsistent with current practices, most notably in the area of interrelating components of the program (see Table 12).

Table 12. Select Sections of E.O. 595

| | |
|----------------|--|
| Section II.A.1 | "Assuring that <u>General Education-Breadth Requirements are planned and organized</u> so that their objectives are perceived as <u>interrelated elements, not as isolated fragments.</u> " |
| Section II.A.5 | "Considering the possibility of incorporating integrative courses, especially at the upper-division level, which feature the interrelationships among disciplines within and across traditional general education categories." |
| Section II.A.6 | Providing for reasonable ordering of requirements so that, for example, courses focusing on learning skills will be completed relatively early and integrative experiences, relatively later. |
| Section II.A.7 | "Developing programs that are responsive to educational goals and student needs, rather than programs based on traditional titles of academic disciplines and organizational units." |

| | |
|-------------|---|
| Section III | “The intent is that the <u>General Education–Breadth Requirements be planned and organized</u> in such a manner that students will acquire the abilities, knowledge, understanding, and appreciation suggested <u>as interrelated elements and not as isolated fragments.</u> ” |
| Section V | Concerning the distribution of general education-breadth units: 9-12-12-12-3 and class status for upper-division units |

Section II.A.5 suggests integrative or interdisciplinary courses to be part of the GE program. According to Craft (1987), the first GE program (1953-1969) on campus emphasized interdisciplinary courses, much as in the spirit of Section II.A.5 and John Dewey’s conception of how general education should be structured (as described in Miller 1988).⁴⁷ This emphasis was short-lived, however, purportedly because faculty objected to being told by a committee what to teach in their courses (Craft, 1987).⁴⁸ Thus, Craft reported, the lower-division GE courses became more and more discipline-based, preparing students for upper-division courses in the major.

The 1989 program review team recommended the development of interdisciplinary core courses in Areas B, C and D at the lower-division level. Along the same lines, the 2001 program review team recommended that an “Advanced GE package shall consist of three upper-division units in each of ... three areas (broadly designed)...Every effort should be made to ... encourage interdisciplinary or intradisciplinary approaches, specifically by linking courses” (General Education Review Team 2000-01: 16; Rec. 4). The faculty Senate did consider the development of such a package and a call was put to the faculty for such courses, but as reported above (Section 1.b.i) there was no response.

It makes sense to consider how well our program meets the expectations of Section V, concerning the distribution of units in the GE areas and class status for taking upper-division GE courses, before continuing discussion of Section II.A. This is because there had been considerable dialogue in the 2005-2006 GE/GRPC on the ambiguities in E.O. 595, specifically regarding (1) the areas of GE from which upper-division units are taken, (2) whether there should be a separation of lower-division courses from upper-division, and (3) whether the upper-division GE courses must be done in residence. Discussion of Section V also sets the stage for meaningful discussion of the rest of Section II.

It is not explicitly stated in E.O. 595 that the nine upper-division units to be taken at a CSU campus should be in Areas B, C, and D, but it would be easy to draw that conclusion given the differences between the transfer requirements and the degree requirements in those areas. However, such a conclusion is not supported by the evidence seen in the transfer student body at Sacramento State, very few of which actually need one class in each of those areas (pers. comm., OAR staff). It also does not address the native student population at all, given that the GE program for them is a seamless whole with no arbitrary division between lower and upper-division courses. Neither would such a conclusion serve transfers from any system other than a California Community College.

To provide some data for discussion, we compared Sacramento State’s graduation requirements program with those of eight other CSU campuses (Table 13). The results suggest that our program is not overly prescriptive regarding the choice of area in which the nine upper-division units are taken. Sacramento State students can take their units from anywhere in Areas B5

through E and, theoretically, they could take all nine units in one area. Sonoma State requires that the nine units be taken from at least two different areas excluding, of course, the Area A basic skills courses. Consistent with the permissive policies of these two campuses, there is no separate listing of lower-division and upper-division courses. San Francisco State has a large number of upper-division clusters of courses from which students select their nine upper-division units, but the courses that are in the clusters are also found listed with the lower-division breadth courses, where they also can meet area unit requirements. The remaining six campuses maintain separate lists of upper-division courses in Areas B, C and D, with CSU, Humboldt also requiring an upper-division course in Area E.

The data show that half of the comparative sample requires that the upper-division GE courses are done in residence while the other half seems to be like our campus in not requiring it.

Table 13. How Some Campuses Meet Part of Section V of E.O. 595

| Campus | 9 units of UD GE | Separation of LD & UD | Must UD be done in residence? |
|---------------------|--|-----------------------|-------------------------------|
| Sacramento State | 9 units from anywhere in B5,C,D,E; could all be in one area | no | no |
| Sonoma State | 9 units in at least two different areas (B,C,D,E) | no | can't tell - like us |
| San Francisco State | 9 units from among 66 UD clusters; clusters do not have each of B,C,D represented | no | yes - 3 courses |
| Chico State | 9 units from 21 themes, lists of separate UD courses (each of B,C,D are represented, integrative, sequenced) | yes ¹ | yes - 3 courses |
| CSU, East Bay | 9 units, 3 each from separate list of UD B,C,D | yes | yes - 3 courses |
| CSU, Stanislaus | 9 units, 3 each from separate list of UD B,C,D | yes ² | can't tell - like us |
| San Jose State | 12 units, 3 each from separate list of UD B,C,D, + 3 units WI | yes ³ | yes - 4 courses |
| CSU, Fresno | 12 units, 3 each from separate list of UD B,C,D + 3 units from separate multicultural/international | yes ⁴ | can't tell - like us |
| CSU, Humboldt | 12 units, 3 each from separate list of UD B,C,D,E | yes | can't tell - like us |

¹a few upper-division courses in the 27 unit breadth

²a few upper-division courses in D (N=3) & E (N=1)

³a few upper-division courses in the 30 unit B-D core

⁴a few upper-division courses in Area E

There also had been some discussion in the 2005-2006 GE/GRPC about whether our program meets the expectations of the remainder of Section V and of Section II.A, which concerns the order in which students take their GE courses, with lower-division before upper. This too was looked at in the comparison of Sacramento State's program with those of eight other CSU campuses (Table 14). At Sacramento State students must have completed their freshman year as well as the Area A basic skills courses before they can enroll in upper-division GE courses. Chico State requires students to be second semester sophomores and have completed the "Golden 4" courses (Areas A and B4). The remaining seven campuses all require that students have junior standing before they can take upper-division GE classes, though they differ in their other course requirements. Three of the seven require the Golden 4, while another three require all 39 lower-division units in GE to be completed and two of these also require the Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR) to have been completed.

Table 14. How Campuses Meet Section II.A.6 and Section V of E.O. 595

| CSU Campus | Restrictions before enrolling in UD GE |
|------------------|--|
| Sacramento State | must have completed 30 LD units including Area A courses |

| | |
|---------------------|--|
| Chico State | must have completed 45 units including the Golden 4 first |
| Sonoma State | must be junior standing; any UD GE taken before 60 units does not count |
| San Francisco State | must be junior standing and must have completed Golden 4 |
| CSU, Stanislaus | must be junior standing and must have completed Golden 4 |
| CSU, Humboldt | must be junior standing and must have completed Golden 4; must be junior standing for Area E |
| CSU, Fresno | must be junior standing and have taken all 39 LD units in A-E |
| CSU, East Bay | must be junior standing, must have completed equiv of 39 LD units in A-D, must have completed the GEAR |
| San Jose State | must be junior standing, must have completed 39 LD units in A-E core, must have satisfied the GEAR |

To return to Section II of E.O. 595, Craft's (1987) depiction of our lower-division GE courses as being discipline-based and intended to prepare students for upper-division courses in the major, suggests that our program might consider more the "spirit" of Section II.A.7 (Table 12). Indeed, the language of Section II.A.7 is reminiscent of Miller's (1988:5) description of general education as originally conceived when it was a reform movement:

"General education is a comprehensive, self-consciously developed and maintained program that develops in individual students the attitude of inquiry; the skills of problem solving; the individual and community values associated with a democratic society; and the knowledge needed to apply these attitudes, skills, and values so that the students may maintain the learning process over a lifetime and function as self-fulfilled individuals and as full participants in a society committed to change through democratic processes. As such, it is marked by its comprehensive scope, by its emphasis on specific and real problems and issues of immediate concern to students and society, by its concern with the needs of the future, and by the application of democratic principles in the methods and procedures of education as well as the goals of education." (emphasis added)

While students and society may well ask about the relevance of particular majors and/or courses, it is in the general education program where relevance should be apparent. Is our program relevant? This is not a new question and it guided the development of the second iteration of our GE program (1969-1979), which required six units of courses (Group III; either lower-division or upper-division) that were "relevant" and included student involvement (Craft, 1987). Nevertheless, how well does the current program (the system's program, in effect since 1982) prepare students to interact with and understand the implications of technology on their lives? Does it provide students with opportunities for an intellectual and experiential understanding of civic engagement? As stated by the Center for Global Education: "Living and working effectively in a global society requires learning with an international perspective."⁴⁹ Are our students receiving such an education that promotes cross-cultural awareness and understanding? A number of areas in GE (Areas B-E) have the potential to address these issues. Table 15 illustrates examples of themed upper division GE offerings at five of the institutions that were considered.

Table 15. How Campuses Meet Section II.A.7 of E.O. 595

| CSU Campus | Nature of UD GE |
|---------------------|--|
| San Francisco State | <p>66 clusters: African Contributions to World Culture; Africana Experience in the US; AIDS: The Modern Epidemic; America and World Affairs; America in the Nineteenth Century; American Culture & Society; Arts in Contemporary Society; Arts in Society; Asian Americans: Diverse Responses to the American Experience; Asian Society, Politics & Culture; Audience & the Arts; Business, Tourism & Technology in a Global Society; California Cultures & Environments; Challenges to Health Care Policy; Chemicals: Enticing, Dangerous, and Essential; Children in Families & Society; Cross-cultural Studies in Language & Art; Dynamics of the City; Ethics for the Contemporary World; Evolution & Change: Processes & Problems; Exploring the Future: Next 20 Years; Family Dynamics & Societal Change; Folklore; Food, Cuisine, & Culture; Gay/Lesbian/Bisexual/Transgender/Queer; Gender & Culture: Identities, Images, Interactions; Globalization and Citizenship in the Americas; Global Peace, Human Rights, & Justice Studies; Health & Wellness; Historical & Cultural Perspectives on the Arts; Holistic Health; Housing, Culture, & Society; Human Communication; Human Development; Human Disability in Society; Human Expression: Diversity, Contradiction, Unity; Human Sexuality: Biological, Psychological, Sociocultural, & Humanistic Aspects; Ideas & the Making of Culture; Integrating the Social Sciences; Islamic Societies & Cultures; Jewish Experience; Latin America: Society & Culture; Law, Crime, & Justice; Making Cities Humane; Maximizing Personal Potential: Body-Mind Integration; Media & Social Issues; Media Literacy in the Electronic Culture; Medieval & Renaissance Europe; Mediterranean & Middle East: Cultural Crossroads; Multicultural Human Relations; Nineteenth & Twentieth Century European Contributions to World Culture; Our Violent Planet; Perspectives on Aging; Planning the Urban Environment; Preservation of a Livable Environment; Raza Immigrant Communities in the U.S.; Religious Studies; Revolution in Comparative Perspective; Science & Human Values; Social Issues & the Media; Stress, Work, & Leisure; Study Abroad: Exploring Cultural, Ethnic, or Social Diversity from Multidisciplinary Perspectives; Third World Development; Understanding Public Policy; Women: Half the World; Women of Color in the U.S.</p> |
| Chico State | <p>21 themes: American Identities & Cultures; Contemporary Health Issues; Cross-Cultural Exploration; Environmental Issues; Ethics & Social Policy; Gender Perspectives; Global Issues; Honors; Mexico & Central America; Minds, Brains & Machines; Science, Technology, and Society; War & Peace in the Nuclear Age; Women's Issues; International Studies Abroad (students must take an approved UD science course at Chico); Global Music, Culture, and Technology; Wealth, Power & Inequality; Catastrophe & Humanity.</p> |
| San Jose State | <p>SJSU Studies (Integrated Knowledge of an Educated Person), 3 categories: Earth & Environment ("Courses in Earth and Environment will cultivate a student's knowledge of the scientific study of the physical universe and its life forms. Students will understand and appreciate the interrelationship of science and human beings to each other"), Self, Society & Equality in the U.S. ("In these courses, students will study the interrelationships of individuals, racial groups, and cultural groups to understand and appreciate issues of diversity, equality, and structured inequality in the U.S., its institutions, and its cultures."), and Culture, Civilization & Global Understanding ("In these courses, students should receive an appreciation for human expression in cultures outside the U.S. and an understanding of how that expression has developed over time. Additionally, students should understand how traditions of cultures outside the U.S. have influenced American culture and society.")</p> |
| CSU, Stanislaus | <p>Summit Program. New program with 5 pairs of courses that fulfill 6 units of UD program: War & Peace (Areas B&C); Waking up to Nature: Ethics, Ecology, and Restoration Practices (Areas C&D); The Real World: A Theatrical Work in Progress (Areas C&D); Perceptions: How We See the World (Areas C&D); Humans in the Information Age (Areas C&D)</p> |
| CSU, Humboldt | <p>No particular theme except for a small set of courses grouped under Communication & Ways of Thinking, one of which can be used for UD GE. The titles include: Computers & Social Change; Gender & Communication: Communication in Natural Resources Conflict Resolution; Analyzing Mass Media Messages; and, Case Studies in Environmental Ethics.</p> |

c) E.O. 665

Executive Order 665 (effective fall 1998) establishes guidelines for the administration of Title 5, California Code of Regulations, Section 40402.1. It establishes the policies and procedures for determining competence in English and Mathematics for entering CSU undergraduates and consequences for those found not competent. It also describes the Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement at the baccalaureate and graduate levels, which has been in effect since 1977-78. The GE program is in compliance with E.O. 665.

5) Program's Coherence, Clarity and Simplicity

Both the 1989 and 2001 program review reports emphasized concerns that the GE program lacked clarity and coherence and its objectives and goals were not understood, which directly relates to this language. Both reports also emphasized the fact that when E.O. 338 (the CSU pattern) was implemented at Sacramento State in 1982 most courses in earlier conceptions of the GE program were ushered into the appropriate GE areas with little planning of their interrelationships. However, comparison of our undergraduate non-major degree requirements with those of eight other campuses suggests that students face no more complexity at Sacramento State than they would at another northern CSU campus (Table 16).

Our graduation requirements in writing include: 1) the GE Area A writing class; 2) a second semester of composition (English 20) outside of the GE program, which must be taken prior to taking the Writing Proficiency Exam (WPE); 3) the WPE, which as of fall 2008 will serve as a placement test and the score of which will be used to place students in English 109 or allow them to take a Writing Intensive course; and, 4) a Writing Intensive course that satisfies GVAR and that may or may not be met by a GE course. Three other campuses also require a second semester of composition, but two are at a freshmen-level while the third is a sophomore-level class (Table 16). To satisfy the GVAR, five of the campuses in the comparison sample use an exam as we have done, two campuses give the option of either taking an exam or taking a course, and one requires that it is fulfilled by a course in the major. Only two of the eight campuses require an upper-division writing intensive course separate from the GVAR. At San Jose State the course is a separate one offered in many majors and raises the number of units in the GE program to 51. At CSU, Stanislaus, the course is also available in many majors, but it does not count for GE. Sacramento State has a race and ethnicity graduation requirement that may or may not be fulfilled by a GE course. Six of the eight other CSU campuses also require a similar domestic diversity requirement. Four of the six campuses require three units in race and ethnicity while the other two require six units. Four of the six campuses also require that the units be fulfilled by GE courses while the other two are like our campus in making it optional.

Only one other campus in our sample requires some competency in foreign language as a graduation requirement.

Sacramento State accommodates the inclusion of code courses in GE by requiring three additional units of work to be completed in Area D. This compromise is allowed under Section V of E.O. 595, and does not completely forfeit choice of social science courses in the process. This is identical to Sonoma State and similar to Stanislaus, although the latter does not require additional units. CSU, Humboldt allows three units of code courses in a 12-unit lower-division Area D while CSU, Fresno has six of their nine lower-division units in Area D given over entirely to code courses. San Jose State allows them to be taken in GE while three other campuses exclude them completely from their GE programs.

Sacramento State now allows nine units of GE to overlap majors. Chico State and San Francisco State allow 12 units to overlap. At CSU, Fresno six units are allowed while it is unclear at San

Table 16. Other Graduation Requirements

| | 2nd Semester Composition | GWAR | WI Requirement | R&E Requirement | Foreign Language | Code Courses in GE | Overlap between GE & Major | Other Requirements |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|--|--|---|--|---|---|
| Sacramento State | yes | WPE | yes - from many majors - can be in GE | yes, 3 in R&E, can be in GE | yes | yes, in D - so 51 unit pattern | 9 units | |
| Chico State | no | a course in major | no | yes, 3 units ethnic, can be in GE | no, but skills in Area C | no | 12 units | 3 units in non-western, can be in GE |
| Sonoma State | no | exam - WEPT | no | yes, 3 units from GE Areas C,D,E | yes, at the intermediate level or above | yes, in D - so 51 unit pattern | no | |
| San Francisco State | yes (ENG 214 or comparable) | exam - JEPET | no | yes, 6 units total must be in GE ¹ | no, but skills in Area C | no | 12 units, maximum of 6 units in UD Segment III | 3 units fulfilling the Lifelong Development requirement in LD or UD GE B-D; language sounds like Area E |
| CSU, Humboldt | no | exam - GWPE | no | yes, 6 units total must be in GE ² | no | 3 LD units can be in Area D | no | |
| CSU, East Bay | yes, but equivalent to 1B | exam - UWSR or a course | no | yes, 3 units, Cultural Groups & Women in the US, must be in GE | no | no | no | 3 units Life Long Learning either LD transfer or UD GE in residency |
| San Jose State | yes, but equivalent to 1B | exam - WST | yes - from many majors - separate UD courses, so 51 unit program | no | no, but intermediate skills in Area C | 0-6, may take in GE, so 51 unit pattern | unclear how many - perhaps 3 units | |
| CSU, Stanislaus | no | exam - WPST | yes - UD course from many majors - is not in GE | yes, 3 unit UD Multicultural Req, can be in GE | no, but LD & UD options in Area C | yes, 6 units in 12 unit Breadth Area D, so 51 unit program | the 9 units of UD courses must not overlap, but unclear about LD | |
| CSU, Fresno | no | exam or UD writing course | no | no | no, but skills in LD Area C and culture courses in Foreign Language in UD | yes, 6 unit of the 9 unit Area D | 6 units allowed if major approves | 3 units in an UD Multicultural/ International course. Not found in GE Areas C-E |

¹ 3 units of American Ethnic & Racial Minorities in LD GE B-D and 3 units of Cultural, Ethnic, or Social Diversity Requirement in UD GE

² 3 domestic plus 3 either domestic or non-domestic in Areas C-D

Jose State about their number. Two campuses do not allow any overlap while CSU, Stanislaus prohibits overlap of their upper-division GE courses.

Half of the comparative sample also had other graduation requirements. San Francisco State and CSU, East Bay require that one of the GE courses that students take must also fulfill Life Long Learning or Development, subsuming into other areas what we require in non-activity Area E courses. Chico State and CSU, Fresno also have a multicultural/international requirement, which at Chico can be fulfilled by courses in GE whereas at CSU, Fresno it is fulfilled by taking upper-division courses from a separate list of classes.

6) Number of Units in Program

If the minimum number of units for general education mandated by Title 5 and E.O. 595 (i.e., 48 units) is what is meant by “appropriate unit limits,” then it is clearly possible to reduce the size of the GE program by any number of means, four of which have been proposed as possibilities in the past:

1. remove C1 (World Civilizations) as it is a campus-specific requirement not essential to meeting system-wide requirements (General Education Review Teams, 1989, 2000-01),
2. remove D2 (Social Issues) as it is a campus-specific requirement not essential to meeting system-wide requirements (General Education Review Team, 1989),
3. move campus-specific graduation requirements (foreign language and second semester composition) back into GE while dropping code courses (General Education Review Team 2000-01),
4. remove code courses from GE (General Education Review Teams, 1989, 2000-01),
5. or, drop campus-specific, non-GE graduation requirements.

Perhaps this is something the Program Review Team can consider.

7) Is There a Unique Upper-Division Experience?

Sacramento State students do not have a uniquely defined upper-division experience other than that for most of them, at least, that work is completed here. The 2000-01 program review team made a suggestion in this regard that work be completed in each of three thematic areas: 1) *Science, Technology and Society*; 2) *Arts, Humanities and Society*; and, 3) *Social Issues of the 21st Century*. This proposal failed in the Senate as it was also dependent upon the separation of lower- and upper-division requirements, which failed. A later call for proposals from faculty for themed sets of classes resulted in no submissions. Recently, however, there is an attempt to offer such a themed cluster (i.e., “Culture Wars” comprising French 130 and English 175H), the success of which has yet to be determined.

8) Does the Program Advantage Transfer Students or Native Students?

Native students can be disadvantaged compared to transfer students in two ways. First, our subdivisions or restrictions in areas C and D only apply to our native students, or those transfers

with an incomplete GE transfer package, because CCCs certify by course, by area or by 39 units. Second, transfers from community colleges can use one course to satisfy both critical thinking (A3) and second semester of composition (supplementary graduation requirement) while native students (or transfers from other CSU campuses) have to take two classes.

Conversely, native students are inherently advantaged by their residency in that they have greater access to a consistent line of academic advising and from the earliest stages of their academic careers the opportunity to work towards unique campus graduation requirements. A transfer student, on the other hand, may not focus on these until selecting and arriving at their CSU campus.

9) Is There Reasonable Overlap with Major and Minor Requirements?

See section A.1.e Facilitating a Timely Graduation for discussion relating to this.

10) Conclusion

This self-study has helped the 2006-2007 GE/GRPC assess the current nature of the Sacramento State GE program and requirements. It has done so by providing the context of state and system requirements as well as, to the extent possible with incomplete records, the historic changes and debates on our own campus. As a result, the committee concludes that the Sacramento State GE program is in compliance with the basic requirements that are given to us. That said, compliance does not necessarily imply that the program is as good as it could possibly be, simply that it is as good as it is required to be, at a moment in time.

The nature of the self-study questions did not provide an avenue to examine and report on faculty and student perspectives on GE, nor to examine and report on the results of the assessment plans implemented under that last program review. Finally, the committee affirms that this report has been ratified by the GE/GRPC as meeting the expectations of the self-study outlined and approved by the Faculty Senate in spring 2006.

11) Appendix A. Summary of December 2005 Report to Chancellor's Office on Facilitating Graduation Action Plans

| Recommendations | Action Taken in Fall 2005 | Potential Changes/Courses of Action |
|--|---|--|
| 1) Reduction of Required Units in Programs Leading to the BA Degree | 21 programs require more than 120 units minimum and 37 cannot be completed in 110 units minimum; four programs have reduced or are in process of reducing units by aligning GE requirements with major requirements | Both GE and major programs asked to examine unit requirements and determine where double counting units or decreasing them might be possible. |
| 2) Selective Reduction of Campus Graduation Requirements | Over past decade significantly improved program management & qualitative supervision of graduation requirements. Based on the outcomes of the Faculty Senate fall retreat, four action plans were proposed and are under discussion in the GE/GRC. Since fall 2005, several of the proposals were approved. | Four action plans include: 1) streamline review; concentrate on number, order and definition of requirements; 2) invite high unit majors to overlap major and grad requirements or replace grad requirements with major courses; 3) investigate policies on overlap etc. to see if useful efficiencies can be found; 4) propose a statement of principles for GE and grad requirements revision. |
| 3) Emphasis on Graduation in Orientation Sessions for New Students | Working on three action plans: 1) require freshmen to attend orientation beginning summer 2006; 2) establish an overnight, residential orientation program for freshmen in summer 2007; and 3) establish a coordinated schedule of fall welcoming activities for all students, but especially new ones. | Four action plans include: 1) at freshmen orientation involve students in calculating and understanding the relationship between number of units taken per semester, number of hours worked per week, and number of semesters needed to graduate; 2) make sure students leave orientation with appropriate course selections; 3) meet with major programs to emphasize the use of 4 and 5 year plans in advising sessions during freshmen orientation; and 4) change orientation leaders' mindsets that freshmen should have a reduced course load in first semester of college. |
| 4) Strengthen Support for both GE and Life/Career Goal Clarification for LD Students | Eleven actions taken in 2005 and before were identified that demonstrate a campus commitment to supporting both GE and life/career goal clarification | Seven plans: 1) require freshmen advising that integrates GE w/ major and career exploration; 2) expand or require Freshman Seminar; 3) develop MOUs w/ additional feeder colleges; 4) encourage early declaration of major upon transfer to Sac State; 5) support from Co-op Ed program; 6) emphasize life/career goal in Freshman Seminars; 7) share outcomes of five Faculty Senate Advising Grants w/ campus in spring 2006. |
| 5) Prominent Association of Career Outcomes w/ Majors in Catalog and Other Student Materials and Resources | There is a myriad of developmentally appropriate career programming info and front-line direct services to students and alumni through the Career Center. Major "Career Possibilities" have been listed in the catalog for 13 years and are now in the online Catalog. Major fairs are held annually. All colleges and most departments provide career development advice to their students. Four colleges have "satellite career offices". | Three action plans: 1) develop one-unit course (e.g., Exploring Majors, Careers and Yourself) to begin during orientation and completed in November, prior to registration for spring semester; 2) compile/distribute a list of best career advising practices to all departments; 3) that the Career Center assists departments in developing consistency in career outcome text in catalog. |

- 6) Choice of Degree Major at a Reasonable, Early Juncture
 Conducted an analysis of attempted units by native and transfer students to determine nature of problem at Sac State. Based on the analysis, developed ten action plans.
 Ten actions sent to Academic Senate committees: 1) more proactive use of "Career Possibilities" in catalog; 2) promote Academic Advising Center's list of "Recommended Career Advisors" in each major; 3) promote Career Center's Internship Directory; 4) require two-semester program of academic advising, major exploration, and career awareness for all freshmen as is being developed by the Coordinator of Freshmen Programs; 5) implement a parallel required academic/career advising component for undeclared transfer students; 6) ensure all Freshman Seminar faculty are addressing the "career awareness and life goals" component; 7) develop a policy requiring native and LD students to declare a major upon completion of 60 units, else a registration hold and junior-level transfers to declare prior to registration for second semester; 8) provide resources to work more intensively with undeclared students; 9) assess workload considerations for faculty engaged in major advising; and 10) develop links between department major advisors and GE advisors in Academic Advising Center.
- 7) Wide Promulgation of Roadmaps to Degree in an Official, Centrally Archived, Graphically Authoritative Format; 8) Alignment of Class Schedules to Roadmaps; 9) Provision in Policy of Mandatory Individual Student Study Plans to the Degree; 10) Use of Cumulated Individual Student Study Plans in Planning Class Schedules
 "DegreeQuest is an interactive graduation roadmap that is designed to assist students in academic planning toward graduation and to assist departments in course scheduling." (Report: pg. 12). Three other actions taken: 1) the first development phase that includes interactive roadmaps for seven academic programs, including GE and graduation requirements will be completed in January 2006; 2) the Enrollment Management Committee developed a plan to strengthen academic planning and better class scheduling at the department level; and 3) Academic Affairs works with all colleges to offer additional classes based on analysis of student demands.
 DegreeQuest will take place in three phases: 1) see at left; beta program will be shared w/ others to solicit trials and feedbacks; 2) expand coverage to all undergraduate academic programs; and 3) "The projected academic plan for students will be connected to online listing of course schedules. Students will receive a recommended list of courses to be taken in sequence. The program can also indicate when the courses will be offered and the meeting schedules. Information collected through DegreeQuest will be combined w/ the aggregated info on student demand and enrollment data to guide class scheduling at the department level." (Report, pg. 13).
- 11) Adoption of Strategies for Student Success and Learning Support
 Aside from traditional strategies to facilitate student success, the Center for Teaching and Learning has been engaging and supporting faculty in improving their teaching strategies. Three actions were taken in fall 2005: 1) training reading and writing tutors to aid instructors in the Colleges of Business and Engineering; 2) Freshmen Programs are developing cohorts of students who study and learn together; and 3) the Faculty Senate approved a GE Honors Program to better serve academically advanced students.
 Five action plans include: 1) strengthen Freshman Programs' administrative structure to allow better training and coordination of instructors; 2) the University Reading and Writing Committee reviewed entire writing program to look for efficient, effective ways to help students meet the writing learning objectives and report back in Spring 2006; 3) beginning fall 2005, students on continued probation are not allowed to take more than 14 units of course work; 4) in AY 2006/07 DDE will offer closed captioning in its video courses; 5) in Spring 2006 a new transfer community will be offered to extend the concept to transfer students.

- 12) Reviewed Enforcement of Policies that Limit or Discourage Drops, Withdrawals, and Grades of Incomplete; 13) Adoption or Renewed Enforcement of Policy that Limits the Number of Course Repetitions
- Following a middle ground emphasizing information dissemination and incremental tightening of policy statements. Re 12, "...our policies are appropriate, but we need to continue to inform and advise our colleagues on the appropriate application of these policies"... especially of the distinctions among types of withdrawals and incompletes, elaboration of faculty and student responsibilities re incomplete contracts, and "identification of appropriate circumstances for the assignment of incompletes. These guidelines will be distributed to faculty before completion of fall 2005" (Report, pgs. 15-16). Re 13, We have an explicit policy; nevertheless, we examined three dimensions of our current policy. "The committee determined that the pattern of course repetitions is inconsequential re progress to graduation." (Report, pg. 16)
- 14) Campus Provision of a Rich CMS Information and Communications Environment for Major Advising; 15) Strong, Timely Major Advisement, Including Mandatory Advisement upon Declaring or upon Changing a Major; 16) Frequent Use of Degree Audits; 17) Mandatory Degree Audits not later than at 70 Semester Units; 18) Mandatory and If Needed Intrusive Advisement as Student Approaches/Exceeds Minimum Units Required for the Degree.
- "...Faculty Senate and Office of the Provost committed equal resources to support a two year advising initiative aimed at stimulating innovation among faculty at the dept, college and campus level. We funded nine projects which involve almost twenty faculty members." (Report, pg. 17).
- Three plans of action: 1) "considering policy and procedural changes" on placing holds on students who have not declared etc.; 2) when students reach 70 units, Student Affairs sends an e-mail notice to students with a link to Degree Audit in SIS.; and 3) deliberate formal policies and business processes for when CMS is made available.
- 19) Development and Use of "Dashboard Indicators" for Campus-wide Monitoring of Graduation
- Re indicators and measures, OIR developed: 1) seven for General Information on Graduation; 2) five for encouraging students to choose efficient pathways to the baccalaureate; and 3) two tools to keep students on efficient pathways to the baccalaureate.
-

12) Bibliography

- Commission on Undergraduate Education (1987) Final Report
- Craft, Jr., G.S. (1987) California State University, Sacramento: The First Forty Years: 1947-1987, CSUS: Hornet Foundation.
- CSU Executive Orders 338, 342, 405, 416, 498, 514, 582, 595, 665
- External Consultant Report (1989) Report of the External Review Team (H. Blake, J.L. Jarrett, A. Silvers, and C.P. Wagoner)
- External Consultant Report (2001) External Consultant Report on Recommendations for California State University, Sacramento's General Education Program (G. Evans and J. Patton)
- Faculty Senate 98-34 University Policy Manual
- Faculty Senate agendas, minutes and actions from AY 2000-2001 to 2005-2006 accessed at the Faculty Senate website
- Gaff, J.G. (1999) General Education: The Changing Agenda. Washington, DC: AACU
- General Education Committee (1988) California State University Sacramento General Education Self-Study (written by R. Kornweibel)
- General Education Committee (2000) CSUS General Education Program Self Study (written by J.R. Donath and M.A. Reihmann)
- General Education Review Team (1989) CSUS General Education Program Review Final Report and Recommendations
- General Education Review Team 2000-01 (2001) Report General Education Program Review Team 2000-01
- Griffith, T. (2006) CSU Evaluations Survey Report.
- Kornweibel, R. (2005) Do We Have What We Value? Do We Value What We Have? Faculty Senate Retreat
- Kornweibel, R. (2006) Graduation Requirements Including General Education: Where We Have Been, Where We Might Go, A Structural Analysis.
- Miller, G.E. (1988) The Meaning of General Education: The Emergence of a Curriculum Paradigm. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Subcommittee for Writing and Reading (2006) Report on the Comprehensive Writing Program Title 5, California Code of Regulations
- Wheeler, G. (March 2006) General Education Activities at California State University, Sacramento

¹ http://www.csus.edu/acse/archive/0506/06_fsa_apr_6_A.doc

² 2006/2007 GE/GRPC members include: Sue Cote, Janet Hecsh (Chair), Vivian Llamas-Green, Richard Marens, Noelle McCurley, Joan Neide, H. Reza Peigahi, Anne-Louise Radimsky, Anthony Sheppard, Christopher Taylor, and David Zeanah.

³ http://www.csus.edu/acse/archive/0102/02fsa_may_2_E.htm

⁴ <http://www.csus.edu/acaf/Portfolios/GE/lrngls.stm>

⁵ http://www.csus.edu/acse/01-02_actions.htm#FS%2002-16B

⁶ http://www.csus.edu/acse/01-02_actions.htm#FS%2002-16C

⁷ http://www.csus.edu/acse/01-02_actions.htm#FS%2002-37

⁸ http://www.csus.edu/acse/archive/0203/02fsm_nov_21.htm

⁹ http://www.csus.edu/acse/02-03_actions.htm#FS%2002-74

¹⁰ http://www.csus.edu/acse/02-03_actions.htm#FS%2002-73

¹¹ http://www.csus.edu/acse/archive/0203/02fsm_nov_7.htm

- ¹² http://www.csus.edu/acse/01-02_actions.htm#FS%2002-16F
- ¹³ http://www.csus.edu/acse/01-02_actions.htm#FS%2002-16E
- ¹⁴ http://www.csus.edu/acse/01-02_actions.htm#FS%2002-16F
- ¹⁵ http://www.csus.edu/acse/01-02_actions.htm#FS%2002-16E
- ¹⁶ http://www.csus.edu/acse/01-02_actions.htm#FS%2002-16D
- ¹⁷ http://www.csus.edu/acse/archive/0203/02fsm_nov_21.htm
- ¹⁸ http://www.csus.edu/acse/01-02_actions.htm#FS%2002-16D
- ¹⁹ http://www.csus.edu/acse/archive/0102/02fsa_apr_11_B.htm
- ²⁰ <http://www.csus.edu/spc/Resources/2004CampusAccountabilityReport.pdf>
- ²¹ http://www.csus.edu/acse/01-02_actions.htm#FS%2002-22 Action deferred pending a thorough study of the implications by Academic Affairs
- ²² http://www.csus.edu/acse/03-04_actions.htm#FS%2004-28
- ²³ http://www.csus.edu/acse/01-02_actions.htm#FS%2002-29
- ²⁴ http://www.csus.edu/acse/archive/0102/02fsa_apr_11_B.htm
- ²⁵ <http://www.csus.edu/acaf/Portfolios/GE/geareacriteria.stm>
- ²⁶ http://www.csus.edu/acse/archive/0304/04fsa_apr_15_C.doc
- ²⁷ http://www.csus.edu/acse/archive/0102/02fsa_apr_11_B_attachment.doc
- ²⁸ <http://www.csus.edu/acaf/Portfolios/GE/index.stm>
- ²⁹ http://www.csus.edu/acse/03-04_actions.htm#FS%2003-39
- ³⁰ http://www.csus.edu/acse/03-04_actions.htm#FS%2004-18B
- ³¹ http://www.csus.edu/acse/03-04_actions.htm#FS%2004-18C
- ³² http://www.csus.edu/acse/03-04_actions.htm#FS%2004-18D
- ³³ http://www.csus.edu/acse/03-04_actions.htm#FS%2004-18E
- ³⁴ <http://www.csus.edu/acaf/ge/outcomes.stm> (Note, in this case the guide is for Area C courses, which will be developing plans in fall 2006)
- ³⁵ <http://saweb.csus.edu/students/departments.aspx#aor>
- ³⁶ Assistant VP for Student Affairs, Tom Griffiths, recently prepared a report (CSU Evaluations Survey Report, October 2006) that is a comparative analysis based on a survey of all 23 CSU campuses regarding transfer credit evaluation (TCE). Dr. Griffiths found that half of the CSU campuses manage to provide students with their TCEs before their first registration. Further, he found no relationship between the successful TCE delivery and the implementation of the Common Management System. He did, however, find a relationship between successful TCE delivery and presence of the Degree Audit Reporting System on campus.
- ³⁷ http://www.csus.edu/acse/05-06_actions.htm
- ³⁸ http://www.csus.edu/acse/03-04_actions.htm#FS%2004-17
- ³⁹ http://www.csus.edu/acse/05-06_actions.htm#FS%2006-83C
- ⁴⁰ http://www.csus.edu/acse/05-06_actions.htm#FS%2006-93
- ⁴¹ http://www.csus.edu/acse/05-06_actions.htm#FS%2006-83
- ⁴² http://www.csus.edu/acse/03-04_actions.htm#FS%2004-27A
- ⁴³ http://www.csus.edu/acse/05-06_actions.htm#FS%2006-90A
- ⁴⁴ http://www.csus.edu/acse/05-06_actions.htm#FS%2006-90
- ⁴⁵ http://www.csus.edu/acse/05-06_actions.htm#FS%2006-90B
- ⁴⁶ <http://www.csus.edu/acaf/Portfolios/GE/goals.htm>
- ⁴⁷ John Dewey is one of the founders of the general education reform movement, which he initiated before WWI and was influential in its development between the two world wars.
- ⁴⁸ Pages 87-89, 155-159, and 231-232 address the history of the general education program.
- ⁴⁹ <http://www.globaled.us/>