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Charge of Committee
California State University, Dominguez Hills
Academic Senate Resolution

EPC 14-07

Establishment of an Ad Hoc Committee Regarding Lower Division General Education Units

RESOLVED: That the ASCSUDH advise that an ad hoc committee be convened to review the total unit value of CSUDH General Education requirements.

RESOLVED: The ad hoc committee will be comprised of representatives elected by faculty from each of the following:

a) College of Arts & Humanities
b) College of Business Administration & Public Policy
c) College of Education/LBS
d) College of Natural & Behavioral Sciences
e) College of Health Human Services and Nursing
f) Executive Senate Representative
g) Member of the GE Committee
h) Faculty Representative from the Student Learning Outcomes Committee
i) Two Student Representatives
j) Dean of Undergraduate Students (non-voting)

RESOLVED: That the committee, after review of existing GE Requirements and/or units will consider the following recommendations:

1) Make no modifications to GE requirements and/or units (retain the 55 Units)
2) Make no modifications to current GE units but modify manner/ rules about how courses are counted towards majors and/or GE requirements, consistent with EO1065.
3) Make a recommendation to reduce the number of GE requirements EO1065

RESOLVED: The committee will write a report justifying their recommendation, which includes minority viewpoints, and a plan to achieve the recommendation; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Ad Hoc Committee will convene in September 2014 and present a plan to the ASCSUDH by December 2014 to ensure a fall 2015 implementation.

Background:

CSUDH currently requires 55 Units of GE course work which exceeds the system average of 50 units and far exceeds many of the CSU individual campus packages which require only 48 units. In fall 2012, the CSU Chancellor's Office noted that “…504 bachelor's programs and concentrations
exceeded the 120 minimum.”¹ This led to a modification to Title 5 that created a 120-unit maximum limit for most baccalaureate programs in January 2013.²

In efforts to comply with Title 5 many programs reduced the number of units specific to the major resulting in programs where by CSUDH students have fewer courses in their chosen content area major than do students enrolled at other campuses, in similar majors. Additionally, this reduction in the number of courses specific to a given major, may have reduced program quality. Although the CO provided an exemption process, the extent to which exemptions to the Title 5 requirement will best serve students, and the extent to which exemptions are aligned with best educational practices is unknown.

¹EVC Smith Memo to CSU Presidents, Provosts, January 25, 2013.
²Title 5 § 40508, “The Bachelor’s Degree: Total Units.” “Each campus shall establish and maintain a monitoring system to ensure that justification is provided for all program requirements that extend the baccalaureate unit requirement beyond 120 semester units. As of the fall term of the 2014-15 academic year, no baccalaureate degree programs shall extend the unit requirement beyond 120 semester units, with the exception of the Bachelor of Architecture, Bachelor of Music, Bachelor of Fine Arts, and Bachelor of Landscape Architecture degrees. The Chancellor may authorize exceptions to system or campus requirements for degree programs. In fulfillment of this regulation, the Chancellor may require adjustments to program requirements in order to achieve the 120 semester unit maximum. In fulfillment of this regulation, the Chancellor after consultation with discipline faculty and other appropriate individuals may require adjustments to program requirements in order to achieve the 120-unit maximum.
Summary of Member Assignment

Dear Colleagues:

Thank you each for your insights and thoughts during our first meeting today. Here is a summary of each member’s assignment for our next meeting:

- Review of your selected CSU campus materials related to their GE package
- Explore First year programs/ projects or activities at your selected CSU campus
- Identify any “paths” or “tracks” proposed in your selected CSU campus
- Reflect on definition or meaning for the idea of “breath” in GE program
- Reflect on the connection between the GE program and DH core values and institutional learning outcomes for undergraduates

The links below provide information that may be helpful in your reflection given our conversation today.

Electronic copy of DH GE program:

DH institutional learning outcomes:
http://www4.csudh.edu/academic-affairs/student-learning/index

DH strategic plan 2014- current goals and plans
http://www4.csudh.edu/president/strategic-planning/201402-townhall-presentations/index

DH core values, mission and vision

DH strategic plan 2010-14 core values and
http://www4.csudh.edu/president/strategic-planning/archives/index

I will send another email with data information and notes from the meeting.

If you have additional resources and information you want to share with the group please email to all or send to me and I will distribute.

Again, thank you for a very productive discussion. I look forward to our next meeting.
MEMORANDUM

TO: CSU Presidents

FROM: Charles B. Reed
        Chancellor

SUBJECT: General Education Breadth Requirements—Executive Order No. 1065

Attached is a copy of Executive Order No. 1065 relating to California State University General Education Breadth (CSU GE Breadth) requirements. This executive order supersedes Executive Order 1033 and incorporates Title 5 changes adopted by the Board of Trustees at the July 12, 2011 meeting. The changes specify that students seeking a baccalaureate degree in postbaccalaureate standing shall not be required to complete additional general education courses as a requirement for graduation.

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

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

CBR/clm

Attachments

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

Effective Date: September 16, 2011

Supersedes: Executive Order No. 1033

Title: CSU General Education Breadth Requirements

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

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

This document also addresses:

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

Article 1. Applicability

1.1 Prior to Completion of CSU Lower-Division General Education Requirements

The requirements, policies, and procedures adopted pursuant to this executive order shall apply to students enrolling in fall 2008 and subsequent terms who have not
1.2 Subsequent to Completion of Entire CSU General Education Requirements

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

Article 2. Fulfilling General Education Requirements in the CSU

2.1 Pathways

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

1. **CSU General Education Breadth**

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

2. **Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC)**

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

3. **University of California (UC) Campus Lower-Division**

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

2.2 Minimum Requirements

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

2.2.2 Minimum Grades

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

2.2.3 Upper-Division Requirement

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

Residency Requirement

Campuses may require that at least nine of the 48 semester units or twelve of the 72 quarter units shall be earned at the campus granting the degree.

In all cases, students shall meet the residency requirements specified in Title 5 Section 40403.

2.2.4 Exceptions

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

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

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

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

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

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

Double Counting

2.2.6.1 General Education, Major, and Other Requirements

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

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

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

Article 3. Premises of CSU General Education Breadth

3.1 Background

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

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

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

3.2 CSU Student Learning Outcomes

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

LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes Framework

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

Within the LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes framework, campuses may identify more specific outcomes, such as students’ ability to:

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

3.3 Entry-Level Learning Skills

3.3.1 Minimum Competency

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

3.3.2 Remediation

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

Article 4 Subject Area Distribution

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Area B  Scientific Inquiry and Quantitative Reasoning**

**Minimum of 12 semester units or 18 quarter units**

- one course each in subareas B1, B2, and B4, plus laboratory activity related to one of the completed science courses

**B1  Physical Science**

(3 semester units or 4 quarter units)

**B2  Life Science**

(3 semester units or 4 quarter units)

**B3  Laboratory Activity**

associated with a course taken to satisfy either B1 or B2

**B4  Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning**

(3 semester units or 4 quarter units)

A minimum of twelve semester units or eighteen quarter units to include inquiry into the physical universe and its life forms, with some immediate participation in a related laboratory activity, and into mathematical concepts and quantitative reasoning and their applications.

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

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

**Area C  Arts and Humanities**

**Minimum of 12 semester units or 18 quarter units**

- at least one course completed in each of these two subareas:

  **C1  Arts:**  Arts, Cinema, Dance, Music, Theater

  **C2  Humanities:**  Literature, Philosophy, Languages Other than English

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Student learning in this area shall include selective consideration of content such as human behavior, sexuality, nutrition, physical and mental health, stress management, financial literacy, social relationships and relationships with the environment, as well as implications of death and dying and avenues for lifelong learning. Physical activity may be included, provided that it is an integral part of the study elements described herein.
Article 5. Transfer and Articulation

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

5.1 Premises of General Education Breadth Transfer and Certification

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

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

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

5.2 Conditions for Participation in CSU General Education Breadth Certification

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

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

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

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

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

3. Credit units of an interdisciplinary course or integrated set of courses may be distributed among different areas of general education, as appropriate.

c. The CSU Office of the Chancellor, Division of Academic Affairs, shall maintain a list of...
1. Each entry in the list shall include specification of the area or areas and objectives to which the course or examination relates and the number of units associated with each area or objective. (See Attachment A.)

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

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

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

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

5.3 Certification Requirements

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

5.3.3 Subject-Area (Partial) Certification

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

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

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

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

- For Area A, no fewer than 9 semester units (12-15 quarter units), including instruction in oral communication, written communication, and critical thinking. A single course may not be certified as meeting more than one subarea for any given student.
- For Area B, no fewer than 9 semester units (12-15 quarter units), including instruction in mathematics/quantitative reasoning and physical science and life science, at least one part of which must include a laboratory component. A single course may not be certified as meeting more than one subarea for any given student, except for laboratory components incorporated into a physical or life science course.
- For Area C, no fewer than 9 semester units (12-15 quarter units), with at least one course in the arts and one in the humanities (see Attachment A).
- For Area D, no fewer than 9 semester units (12-15 quarter units), with courses taken in at least two disciplines (see Attachment A).
- For Area E, no fewer than 3 semester units (4-5 quarter units).

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

5.4 Certification of Courses and Examinations

5.4.1 Qualification for Certification
A participating institution may certify completion of courses or examinations taken at other eligible institutions, provided that all such courses and examinations would be identified for certification purposes by the institution
5.4.2 If so identified, those courses and examinations shall contribute to qualification of a student for either full certification or subject-area certification, as appropriate.

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

5.5 Limitations of Certification

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

5.5.2 Maximum Number of Credits Allowed

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

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

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

5.5.2.4 Restrictions on Certification of Upper-Division Courses
Baccalaureate-granting institutions certifying a student for units earned in upper-division courses or examinations may provide certification only for those units that were completed during or after the term in which the student achieved upper-division status (i.e.,
5.6 General Education Reciprocity Among CSU Campuses

5.6.1 Full Lower-Division Reciprocity

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

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

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

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

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

5.6.3 Reciprocity for Subject-Area General Education Requirements

5.6.3.1 Definition

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

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

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

5.6.4 Reciprocity Limitations

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

Article 6 Implementation and Governance

6.1 General Education Advisory Committee

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

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

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

The responsibilities of this committee shall be as follows:

a. To review and propose any necessary revisions in the objectives, requirements, and implementation of CSU General Education Breadth policy to ensure high-quality general education.

b. To continue to study general education policies and practices inside and outside the system and, as appropriate, to stimulate intersegmental discussion of the development of general education curricula.

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

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

6.2 Campus Responsibility

6.2.1 Development and Revision of Campus Requirements

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

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

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

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

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

e. Considering the possibility of incorporating integrative courses, especially
at the upper-division level, that feature the interrelationships among
disciplines and traditional general education categories.

f. Providing for reasonable ordering of requirements so that, for example,
courses focusing on learning skills will be completed relatively early and
those emphasizing integrative experiences will be completed relatively
later.

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

h. Considering possibilities for innovative teaching and learning, including
activity as well as observation in all general education coursework.
6.2.2 General Education Breadth Requirements and the Development of New Baccalaureate Degrees

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

6.2.3 Campus Standing General Education Committee

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

6.2.4 General Education Academic Advising

Each campus shall provide for systematic, readily available academic advising specifically oriented to general education as one means of achieving greater cohesiveness in student choices of course offerings to fulfill these requirements.

6.2.5 General Education Review and Assessment

Each campus shall provide for regular periodic reviews of general education program policies and practices in a manner comparable to those of major programs, including evaluation by an external reviewer. The review should include an assessment of general education student learning outcomes (as designed by campuses in consonance with but not constrained by the objectives stated in Article 3.2 of this executive order).

Charles B. Reed,
Chancellor Dated:
September 16, 2011
### Transfer Student Requirements for Lower-Division Certification of CSU General Education Breadth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Units Required</th>
<th>Subareas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area A</strong></td>
<td>English Language Communication and Critical Thinking</td>
<td>Article 4-A, Article 5.3.2.3-A, Article 5.3.3.4-A</td>
<td>9-12-15</td>
<td>A1, A2, A3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A minimum of 9 semester units or 12-15 quarter units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- one course in each subarea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oral Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td>A1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Written Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td>A2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td>A3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area B</strong></td>
<td>Scientific Inquiry and Quantitative Reasoning</td>
<td>Article 4-B, Article 5.3.2.3-B, Article 5.3.3.4-B</td>
<td>9-12-15</td>
<td>B1, B2, B4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A minimum of 9 semester units or 12-15 quarter units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- one course in subareas B1, B2, and B4, plus laboratory activity related to one of the completed science courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical Science</td>
<td></td>
<td>B1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Life Science</td>
<td></td>
<td>B2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Laboratory Activity</td>
<td></td>
<td>B3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>associated with the course taken to satisfy either B1 or B2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning</td>
<td></td>
<td>B4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area C</strong></td>
<td>Arts and Humanities</td>
<td>Sections Article 4-C, Article 5.3.2.3-C, Article 5.3.3.4-C</td>
<td>9-12-15</td>
<td>C1, C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A minimum of 9 semester units or 12-15 quarter units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- at least one course in each subarea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts (Art, Cinema, Dance, Music, Theater)</td>
<td></td>
<td>C1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Humanities (Literature, Philosophy, Languages Other than English)</td>
<td></td>
<td>C2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area D</strong></td>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>Article 4-D Article 5.3.2.3-D Article 5.3.3.4-D</td>
<td>9-12-15</td>
<td>D1, D2, D3, D4, D5, D6, D7, D8, D9, D0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A minimum of 9 semester units or 12-15 quarter units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- courses to be taken in more than one subarea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anthropology and Archeology</td>
<td></td>
<td>D1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td></td>
<td>D2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethnic Studies*</td>
<td></td>
<td>D3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender Studies*</td>
<td></td>
<td>D4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geography</td>
<td></td>
<td>D5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>History*</td>
<td></td>
<td>D6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interdisciplinary Social or Behavioral Science</td>
<td></td>
<td>D7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political Science, Government, and Legal Institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td>D8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td></td>
<td>D9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sociology and Criminology</td>
<td></td>
<td>D0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Ethnic Studies, Gender Studies, or history courses emphasizing artistic or humanistic perspectives may be categorized in Area C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area E</strong></td>
<td>Lifelong Understanding and Self-Development</td>
<td>Article 4-E Article 5.3.2.3-E Article 5.3.3.4-E</td>
<td>3-4-5</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 semester units or 4-5 quarter units required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Baccalaureate programs engage students in an integrated course of study of sufficient breadth and depth to prepare them for work, citizenship, and life-long learning. These programs ensure the development of core competencies including, but not limited to, written and oral communication, quantitative reasoning, information literacy, and critical thinking. In addition, baccalaureate programs actively foster creativity, innovation, an appreciation for diversity, ethical and civic responsibility, civic engagement, and the ability to work with others. Baccalaureate programs also ensure breadth for all students in cultural and aesthetic, social and political, and scientific and technical knowledge expected of educated persons. Undergraduate degrees include significant in-depth study in a given area of knowledge (typically described in terms of a program or major).
CSU CAMPUS WIDE COMPARISON
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSU Campus</th>
<th>Area A Basic Subjects</th>
<th>Area B Natural Sciences</th>
<th>Area C Humanities</th>
<th>Area D Social Sciences</th>
<th>Area E Lifelong Learning</th>
<th>Area F Upper Division</th>
<th>Area G Diversity</th>
<th>Total Semester Units</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSUB</td>
<td>13-17 QU 1 Writing intensive</td>
<td>13-17 QU</td>
<td>13-17 QU</td>
<td>13-17 QU</td>
<td>60 (quarter U)</td>
<td>Area A-D +12 Upper GE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSUCI</td>
<td>9 Min. one of each Oral, Writing, Critical Thinking</td>
<td>12 Min. one of each Phys Sc., Life Sc., Math, Computer</td>
<td>12 Min. one of each Art, Lit, Language, Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU Chico</td>
<td>18-GE Course Mandatory Oral and Written Communication – 4 intensive Writing Course Required</td>
<td>6 GE Units: American Institutions- US History</td>
<td>24 GE Units: 15-GE Units: Arts and Humanities; Individual &amp; Societal Institutions; Learning for Life</td>
<td>3-GE Units: Social Institutions; Geology, Econ., Anthropology</td>
<td>Learning for Life: Child Dev., Kinesiology, Psych, Sociology</td>
<td>9-GE Units: Diversity Studies Pathways</td>
<td>Sustainable Pathways</td>
<td>48 units</td>
<td>4 Intensive Writing Courses in Area A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSUDH</td>
<td>12-14</td>
<td>10-12 (3 units Math incl.)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12 (6units Am Inst incl.)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>55-62</td>
<td>2nd English course in Area A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area A Basic Subjects</td>
<td>Area B Natural Sciences</td>
<td>Area C Humanities</td>
<td>Area D Social Sciences</td>
<td>Area E Lifelong Learning</td>
<td>Area F Upper Division</td>
<td>Area G Diversity</td>
<td>Total Semester Units</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSUEB</td>
<td>12 GE Units: Oral Commun.</td>
<td>20 GE Units: Physical Sci, Life Sci, Laboratory, Quantitative Reasoning, Sci Elective</td>
<td>16 GE Units: Humanities, Fine Arts and Letter, Humanities Elective</td>
<td>16 GE Units: At least 3 disciplines: Social Sci Elective (D1, D2, &amp; D3)</td>
<td>4 GE Units: Performing Arts &amp; Activities (3 Units), &amp; GS 1013 (Spring – 1 unit)</td>
<td>4 GE Units: Electives</td>
<td>3 GE Units: Cultural Women Requirement</td>
<td>72 Units (GE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Must complete 2nd course in Eng Comp (ENG 1002), must complete 1 course emphasizing Cultural Groups/Wos in U.S., must complete min of 12 units GE in residence at CSUEB, must complete min of 60 units in UD, must complete 45+ u in residence, must complete min of 12 upper division GE u after reaching 90 units, must pass the UWSR after reaching 90 u
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSU Campus</th>
<th>Area A Basic Subjects</th>
<th>Area B Natural Sciences</th>
<th>Area C Humanities</th>
<th>Area D Social Sciences</th>
<th>Area E Lifelong Learning</th>
<th>Area F Upper Division</th>
<th>Area G Diversity</th>
<th>Total Semester Units</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>“almost all” GE courses require writing: 1000 words lower division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fullerton</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>“all” GE courses must require “appropriate writing”. Very long list of GE courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU HUMBOLDT</td>
<td>9 units required – 3 units in each category. -Written communication 0ral communication -Critical thinking</td>
<td>Required 9 units, minimum of 3 units in each category: -Math concepts -Life Forms -Physical Universe</td>
<td>9 units Minimum of one course in each subarea: -Arts -Humanities</td>
<td>9 units: Minimum of two subareas -Anthro -Econ -Ethnic Studies -Gender Studies -Geography -History -Interdcpfnry Studies -Political Science</td>
<td>36 Total Units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>Area A Basic Subjects</td>
<td>Area B Natural Sciences</td>
<td>Area C Humanities</td>
<td>Area D Social Sciences</td>
<td>Area E Lifelong Learning</td>
<td>Area F Upper Division</td>
<td>Area G Diversity</td>
<td>Total Semester Units</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSULB</td>
<td>9 units (3 units per course) - Written communication - Oral communication Critical Thinking</td>
<td>9 units - Physical science with a lab - Math / quantitative reasoning</td>
<td>9 units - 3 units in the arts - 3 units in humanities - 3 adtl units in either arts or hum</td>
<td>9 units - US history - US constit 3 adtl units in social sciences and citizenships</td>
<td>3 Unit course - Course to help the individual understand psychological, physiological, and social organism</td>
<td>9 units Capstone Requirement</td>
<td>3 units in global issues and 3 units in human diversity</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Uses a pkg path, GE requirement consists of 3 steps 1. Fundamental learning skills 2. Exploration courses 3. Capstone (they start earlier)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSULA</td>
<td>18 All GE course mandatory writing</td>
<td>6-9</td>
<td>6-9</td>
<td>6-9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 courses from course taken in areas C,D,E, or F</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Maritime Academy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No GE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSUMB</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10-13</td>
<td>9-10 (4 units language incl.)</td>
<td>8-10 (2 units service learning incl)</td>
<td>3-6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Met w/UD service learning</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>No more 4 LD courses w/same prefix as major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSUN</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LOWER DIVISION ADHOC COMMITTEE FALL**
## LOWER DIVISION ADHOC COMMITTEE FALL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area A Basic Subjects</th>
<th>Area B Natural Sciences</th>
<th>Area C Humanities</th>
<th>Area D Social Sciences</th>
<th>Area E Lifelong Learning</th>
<th>Area F Upper Division</th>
<th>Area G Diversity</th>
<th>Total Semester Units</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CS PolyTech Pomona</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One course from each sub-area (3 areas)</td>
<td>At least 1 course from each lecture sub-area, including at least one Lab course from Physical &amp; Biological Sciences (5 areas)</td>
<td>One course from each sub-area (4 areas)</td>
<td>Two courses in US History, Constitution, American Ideal. At least 1 course in the other three areas. (4 areas)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACRAMENTO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>In addition to the GE requirements, Sacramento requires a 2nd semester composition course and foreign language proficiency, 3 unit writing intensive also required and comes from GE or certain majors. WI course satisfies GWAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 each of Oral, Written, Critical Thinking (a 2nd semester of composition is required, but no as part of the GE pattern)</td>
<td>3 units each in Phy Sci, Life Forms, Math, and Further Studies. Lab is built into 3 unit phy sci and life forms courses (we have the lab as separate)</td>
<td>3 units each of “World Civilizations” (primarily history courses), Arts, Humanities, and Further Studies</td>
<td>Social and behavioral sciences, World Cultures, Contemporary Social Issues + 6 units Amer Institutions</td>
<td>Upper division, included in previous unit counts</td>
<td>3 pulled from courses in areas C-E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area A Basic Subjects</td>
<td>Area B Natural Sciences</td>
<td>Area C Humanities</td>
<td>Area D Social Sciences</td>
<td>Area E Lifelong Learning</td>
<td>Area F Upper Division</td>
<td>Area G Diversity</td>
<td>Total Semester Units</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernadino</td>
<td>12 (quarter system): 4 units each in Writing, Oral, and Critical Thinking. This does not include the Directed Self placement composition courses which would have students take up to 8 additional units of college-level composition before the GE class.</td>
<td>20 4 units math. 5 units life sci (incl lab) 2 unit special topic course. 4 unit integrative capstone (this is their Upper Division GE)</td>
<td>20 4 units arts. 4 units literature. 4 units for lang or lit. 4 units philosophy. 4 units capstone (upper division GE)</td>
<td>20 8 units Amer Hist and Institutions. 4 units world cultures. 4 units “discipline perspectives” 4 units Capstone (upper division GE)</td>
<td>6 Lifetime fitness (2 units) + social and psychological issues (2 units) p.e. (2 units)</td>
<td>0-4 Upper Division Writing Requirement (This is the GWAR requirement – they either take advanced expository writing or pass an exam)</td>
<td>78-86 quarter units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU San Diego</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## LOWER DIVISION ADHOC COMMITTEE FALL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSU San Francisco</th>
<th>Area A Basic Subjects</th>
<th>Area B Natural Sciences</th>
<th>Area C Humanities</th>
<th>Area D Social Sciences</th>
<th>Area E Lifelong Learning</th>
<th>Area F Upper Division</th>
<th>Area G Diversity</th>
<th>Total Semester Units</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Overlay requirement. (Overlay courses fulfill grad reqmsnts but do not have specific unit reqmt) can be satisfied by either an independen t course or a course that also satisfied another geon requirement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| CSUSJ             |                       |                         |                   |                        |                         |                      |                   | 30 (LD) 48-51 Total | Grad Includes 2 PE courses |
|                   | 9                     | 9                       | 9                 | 3                      | 9-12                    |                      |                   |                    |                      |

<p>| Cal Poly SLO      | 12 QU (3 classes)     | 20/16/28 (depends on major/coll ege) | 12/16/12 (depends on major/coll ege) | 16 (including American Institutions) | 12 UD 1 UD Arts and Hum, 1 UD Society and the individual and 1 UD Technology | 72 Quarter units (LD &amp; UD) |                    |                    | Some exceptions, double counting, flex counts, Engineering different than other majors |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area A Basic Subjects</th>
<th>Area B Natural Sciences</th>
<th>Area C Humanities</th>
<th>Area D Social Sciences</th>
<th>Area E Lifelong Learning</th>
<th>Area F Upper Division</th>
<th>Area G Diversity</th>
<th>Total Semester Units</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSU San Marcos</td>
<td>9 units (oral, written and critical thinking)</td>
<td>12 units (Phy and Life Science, Lab and Math-lower and upper)</td>
<td>12 units (Art, Hum, one elective and one upper Art or Hum)</td>
<td>15 units (three US requirements, one Disciple specific or interdisciplinar y Soc Sc. and one upper soc sc)</td>
<td>3 units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU Sonoma</td>
<td>9 (oral, written and critical thinking)</td>
<td>12 (Phy and Life Science, Lab and Math-lower and upper)</td>
<td>12 (art/music, Literature, Comparative or Foreign Language and elective)</td>
<td>15 3 US requirement, History, soc SC and International</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STANISLAUS</td>
<td>9 9 9 12 3</td>
<td>9 (UD can not be same discipline as major)</td>
<td>3 (may double count with another GE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51-54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Total semester units in General Education … 50
Including:
- 9 upper division units, taken no sooner than the term in which upper division standing (60 units) is attained;
- an approved science laboratory; and
- a course in ethnic studies.

HOW TO OBTAIN AN ACADEMIC ADVISOR

- If you have a major, contact your major department office for referral to your advisor, in your major.
- If you are an undeclared major, contact Advising Services, Salazar 1070, (707) 664-2730.
- Consult your academic advisor regularly.
- For GE and Registration Assistance, see a Peer Advisor, Salazar 1070.

GRADUATION

- Graduation is not automatic. We recommend filing your application one year in advance of graduation. This allows you to obtain an official evaluation from the Admissions and Records Office and to work with your advisor to resolve any problems before your final semester. The deadline to apply for graduation for each semester is published in the Catalog/Class Schedule.
- If you are denied graduation, you must reapply unless all deficiencies are made up during the same semester.

Various examination options (AP, CLEP, course challenge examinations, Credit by Examination) are available to meet some of the GE requirements. Contact the appropriate department or the Testing Office, Salazar 1070, (707) 664-2947. Go to http://www.sonoma.edu/testing/ for more information on testing.

Elements of a BA/BS/BA Degree (120-132 units)

- General Education Units
  - 41 units lower division
  - 5 units upper division
  - 30 units total GE
- Elective Units
  - may be used toward a minor, second major, or other professional preparation
- Units for your MAJOR
  - Consult the SSU online catalog to find unit requirements

Note: Minimum units to graduate = 120 - 132 units
- 12 units X 8 semesters = 96 units
- 14 units X 8 semesters = 112 units
- 16 units X 8 semesters = 128 units

Written English Proficiency Test (WEPT)

All graduates of CSU campuses are required to certify their writing competency before being awarded degrees. At SSU, this certification is achieved via a passing score on the Written English Proficiency Test (WEPT), which is offered several times per term in both handwritten and computer formats. The WEPT is a two-hour essay test. Topics are designed to be of general interest, and exams are scored on the basis of the quality of argument, development, organization, style, and sentence-correctness. Students should take the test during their junior year, and they can repeat the test needed.

For more information about the test please call the Writing Center at (707) 664-4401 or go to:
http://www.sonoma.edu/programs/writingcenter/

To see the current WEPT schedule, go to:
http://www.sonoma.edu/programs/writingcenter/wept/
Reference Materials and Background
General Education at Dominguez Hills

**History:** When, in the late 1970s and early 1980s, Dominguez Hills extensively revised its GE program, in response to an initiative by then-President Donald Gerth, it created a package which forms a coherent whole, while usefully differentiating the goals of upper-division from those of lower-division courses. The former introduce the academic disciplines, while the latter encourage interdisciplinary study.

This GE reform committee of the late 1970s had nothing to do with Proposition 13 (as has been recently asserted), but instead anticipated and indeed influenced a call from the Chancellor’s Office to rethink GE programs, especially for transfer students. A number of deans and other administrators sat on that committee, including the president himself; it was headed by Dr. Marilyn Sutton. The primary issue was the need for a solid academic grounding as preparation for upper-division work in the major, rather than FTE.

CO Executive Order 338 (the first regarding GE) in 1980 called for each campus to re-think its GE program with the following goals in mind:

A. Taking such measures as may be necessary to assure that General Education-Breadth Requirements are planned and organized in such a manner that their objectives are perceived as interrelated elements, not as isolated fragments.

B. Considering the organization of approved courses into a variety of “cores” or “themes” with underlying unifying rationales among which students may choose.

C. Evaluating all courses approved as meeting current General Education-Breadth Requirements to determine which, if any, meet the objectives and particular requirement contained herein.

D. Considering development of new courses as they may be necessary to meet the objectives and particular requirements contained herein.

E. Considering the possibility of integrative courses, especially at the upper division level, which feature the interrelationships among disciplines within and across traditional general education categories.

F. Providing for reasonable ordering of requirements so that, for example, learning skills will be completed relatively early and integrative experiences relatively later.

G. Developing programs in terms of educational goals and student needs rather than in terms of traditional titles of academic disciplines and organizational units.

H. Giving attention to possibilities for activity as well as observation in all program subdivisions.

As we can see, DH’s program, approved by Presidential Memorandum in 1979, anticipates in its design CO item E, integrative interdisciplinary courses at the upper-division level, a practice which has served the campus until the current year. It also embedded several other goals included in the EO of the following year, its category numbering reflecting the goal of item F, the priority of basic skills courses.
Its lower-division framework was much the same as the current one; HUM 200 was added slightly later, in about 1982, and Physics 100 became one of several choices rather than the sole component in its category. This latter and other (fairly minor) changes took place in the 1990s.

The 1979 design structured courses into basic skills, natural sciences, social sciences, humanities and a lifelong learning course at the lower-division level, introducing interdisciplinary courses at the upper-division level, our only opportunity to provide GE for transfer students. Students were offered choices in each category of GE, but an effort was made to require breadth in each student’s program. Awareness of our student population’s particular needs led the design committee to require two college-level composition courses (as well as one at the upper-division level which is, however, a graduation, not a course, requirement).

This GE design has proved flexible enough to allow the addition of courses within categories and strong enough to last for a good while.

Lois Feuer

2014
Upper-Division General Education at Dominguez Hills
A Brief Survey

History: When, in 1979, Dominguez Hills extensively revised its GE program, in response to an initiative by then-President Donald Gerth, it instituted the requirement that three upper-division courses be integrative and interdisciplinary. It was ahead of the curve on this, and in fact a year later the next Chancellor’s Office Memorandum on General Education incorporated this idea. The most recent revision of the CO Executive Order calls for integrative, interdisciplinary courses but structures that requirement more loosely. The GE committee of the 1980s had nothing to do with Proposition 13, but instead responded to a call from the CO to rethink GE programs, especially for transfer students. A number of deans and other administrators sat on that committee, including the president himself; it was headed by Dr. Marilyn Sutton. The primary issue was the need for a solid academic grounding as preparation for upper-division work in the major, rather than FTE. The package forms a coherent whole, while usefully differentiating upper-division from lower-division courses.

Other campuses:

Not all campuses honor the spirit of interdisciplinarity; the larger campuses in particular (which get away with a lot of exceptions to this and other CO guidelines, because they can and because they don’t always value GE very much; they tend also to have students who come from stronger school districts than do ours) use long lists of departmental courses by which students may satisfy the requirements, while describing the program as interdisciplinary. But many campuses, especially those most like DH, have truly integrative and interdisciplinary courses and requirements. For example:

Bakersfield requires students to organize their upper-division work by themes, taking one course in each theme.

Chico requires students to choose a theme such as American Identities and Culture, Ethics and Social Policy, or Global Issues and to select courses based on that theme.

Fresno requires four upper-division courses, three integrative courses and one multicultural/international course.

Cal State LA organizes its upper-division courses by themes distributed among the areas. Students must take courses outside their majors, as is also the case at several other campuses.

Pomona has an Interdisciplinary GE Program with IGE-prefix courses at both lower and upper-division levels. It also has an upper-division program with a Synthesis list of courses in Humanities, Social Sciences, and Science.

San Bernardino requires integrative capstone upper-division GE courses with Natural Science, Humanities, and Social Science-prefix courses.

Summary: quite a few campuses have programs analogous, though not identical, to ours, though ours is in fact the most sincerely interdisciplinary and pedagogically sound.
Advantages of the DH Program: Historical Issues

Historically, the following are among the reasons the program was adopted and has been continued through several reviews:

1. Since such a large proportion of our students are transfer students, many have received a community college lower-division general education program that is fairly narrowly conceived. Often their programs are patched together from courses at several different institutions, with little integration of the student’s education. Integrative, interdisciplinary GE courses allow the student to cap their general education with cohesive courses that offer a broader view of their world and of the ways that disciplines converge on problems, issues, and topics in that world. Human knowledge and understanding are not, in the real world, divided into departmental categories, and students benefit from seeing how disciplines work together to achieve understanding.

2. Since the upper-division courses are generic-prefix courses, Dominguez Hills has heretofore been spared the turf wars that accompany general education decisions on other campuses, and have in fact occasionally arisen in our lower-division GE discussions at DH. Other campuses have on more than one occasion expressed admiration for and a desire to emulate the DH pattern for that reason (as to me as the Bakersfield outside evaluator for GE, several years ago).

3. Integrative and interdisciplinary courses offer faculty and students the opportunity to explore topics and ideas not otherwise available, since they would not fit into departmental, disciplinary slots. Examples include Science, Technology, and Society, Success and Values in the U.S., Harlem Renaissance, Immigration in the U.S., and Intercultural Communications. These creative and innovative courses, crossing disciplinary lines, provide faculty (and students) access to teaching topics not otherwise available, and on which they may have both expertise and interest. These can be a form of “perk” for the faculty member, a form of renewal and faculty development.

4. With area committees governing the upper-division GE requirements, maintenance of the interdisciplinary and integrative nature of the courses is possible. If departments are put in charge of these courses, they will, logically, serve departmental rather than GE needs, and courses that serve the major will replace the interdisciplinary and integrative courses now offered. Departments are, and ought to be, guardians of their disciplines, but the area committees, and the goals and objectives of our upper-division program, are trans-disciplinary. Especially in the frequently-occurring times of budget constraint, the temptation of departments to raise GE class sizes, fill major courses, and provide workload for faculty, will trump the policy goals of the program and the interests of the students. Area committees also make possible the required assessment of courses, and serve to ensure the comparability and commensurability of these courses, an important aspect of that assessment.

5. If General Education students are placed into department-major courses, as would happen were the current program disbanded, serious educational concerns will arise. The GE student, lacking the background of the program majors in the course, will be both unequipped to take such a course and not necessarily motivated by the topic. If students are allowed to take their GE courses in their major fields, the goal of a broad liberal arts education has been lost. Many schools have rules against students taking these courses in their own fields, for the reason that these are breadth requirements, designed to expand the students’ horizons beyond their own majors.
Likewise, the majors in courses with GE students in them will be disadvantaged by the dilution of their major courses with unprepared students. Either the course will need to be watered down so much as to no longer serve the majors well, or large numbers of GE students will be at serious risk of failure.

**Workload and FTE**

FTE is a bookkeeping, not an educational, issue. If FTE is the concern, remedies can readily be found without dismantling the current upper-division GE program. In fact, in the past, such remedies have been put in place, but their implementation fell by the wayside with the many college reorganizations and changes of administrators in the last many years. At one time, it was agreed that the upper-division area committees would be granted workload appropriate to the course-offering needs, with the FTE of those faculty associated with departments returning to the departments (the FTE generated by adjunct faculty not associated with departments was returned to the deans’ offices or area groups for distribution). The courses were offered, their syllabi generated, their faculty selected, by the area committees, just as now, but the FTE generated was returned, in part, to the departments. There is no reason such arrangements cannot be re-instituted, with discussion at the dean level about the bookkeeping requirements.

Lois Feuer

Professor of English Emerita

October 30, 2014

---

**Note:** As a faculty member who had served on and chaired General Education committees over several decades, and headed a thorough-going review of our GE program in the 1990s—many of whose recommendations were subsequently adopted—I was asked in 2009 to give a brief overview of the issues in our upper-division GE program. The above comments, lightly revised, attempted to meet that request. They reflect both the data available then, and my own support for what has been a very successful program, serving our students and faculty well. I acknowledge that bias, and still believe, on reflection, that the goal of an interdisciplinary program that meets the needs of our broad range of students, is the right one.
Helen Oesterheld Comments on LDGE

Dear Kaye,

I am sending along some information that may or may not be relevant to the ad hoc l/d GE review committee.

Part of this information was sent to Jerry today, who wanted me to clarify the point I made in the GE meeting yesterday.

Here is the gist of it:
Many CSUs with lower-unit GE packages require only one writing course in Area A; however, they also require a second-year or second-semester writing course that is NOT a GE requirement but is a graduation requirement. So, though the GE package is indeed fewer units, there are "graduation requirement" units that must be completed but which don’t appear in the numerical counts for GE.

Some CSU campuses that use this method are:
- Sacramento (requires a second comp class not counted in GE and a language class not counted in GE but both are required to graduate)
- Los Angeles (requires ENG 101 for GE and ENG 102 to graduate)
- East Bay (requires ENG 1001 for GE and ENG 1002 to graduate)

In addition to these campuses that require 2 writing courses to graduate but not for GE, three CSU campuses mandate require two writing courses as GE requirements. They are

- Dominguez Hills
- Humboldt
- San Francisco

Other campuses (San Bernardino, Sacramento, and Sonoma, for example) offer a "stretch" model where students spend added seat time in a writing course or take two semesters to satisfy Area A2 in GE.

The larger point is that other campus's GE programs and other graduation requirements need to be scrutinized beyond the counting and comparison of units.

On a note related to the "stretch" programs, our ENG curriculum committee is just about ready to submit a curricular change that will affect the structure of developmental and first-year comp courses, proposing a renumbering and "stretching." I will make sure these changes are passed on to you when they are final.

Just wanted to pass this info along,
Helen Oesterheld <hoesterheld@csudh.edu>
English department
The Value of the Liberal Arts Curriculum

Lorna Fitzsimmons

“Everything that lives, lives not alone, nor for itself”

These words by William Blake epitomize the gentle intersubjectivity and compassion reaped from liberal arts. Blake’s profound awareness of and respect for the interconnectedness of all creatures—his “deep ecology”—is meaningful for our current concerns as we face a crossroads in the General Education curriculum at CSUDH.

In the few minutes we have to share with one another on this occasion, I shall try to suggest how vital the liberal arts curriculum is for the modern world. At present, in the grips of globalization and socio-economic instability, we face many challenges, as individuals, communities, nations, and participants in ecological concentricities. In some ways, the world appears to be ripening with opportunities for global interrelationships, yet in the midst of extended interconnectivity, our common humanity is sometimes overlooked and our sense of integrity compromised.

Social change, fragmentation of familial structures, and new cultural interactions can be causes of distress, exploitation, and tragedy. Clinical psychologist Barbara Killinger, in her study Integrity (2010), helps us to grapple with the effects of two major changes in our times, what she terms “a move away from relationships” and the “seduction of greed.”

The insidious crime of identity theft is indicative of these problems. Never before have we had to deal with this form of deviance on such a phenomenal scale—it is the fastest growing crime in the world. Estimated losses amount to over 2.5 billion US dollars per year. Beyond the monetary factors, this crime causes anxiety and loss of trust, corroding the fiber of social relationships. Even children’s identities are being stolen. Tragically, such crimes and attitudinal weaknesses are only the tip of the iceberg—the publicized manifestation of a pervasive problem which is not specific to any region or nation, or any one group or class of people, but, rather, is symptomatic of the erosion or destabilization of core values and institutions around the world.

The liberal arts curriculum is an important and timely antidote to such problems. Liberal arts is Indispensable, of course, in its own right, and rightly defensible as intrinsically valuable. There is no question of that. To conceive it, further, as a social undertaking that facilitates an awareness of responsibility for the other is not to succumb to shallow instrumentalism, but rather to celebrate its multidimensionality, which is rather like a rose window—at once beautiful in and of itself whilst quidditive to the social fiber.

The value, then, of the liberal arts: it cannot be said enough that liberal arts facilitates appreciation of core virtues—and here I concur with T.S. Eliot’s triad, giving, sympathizing, and attaining self-control—by which the individual becomes conscious of his or her responsibility for the other and learns that doing good is an end in itself.

Against actual or potential conflicts, liberal arts fortifies our resolve for peaceful interactions, respect for cultural differences, and considerate contributions to the public sphere. As Victor Ferrall argues, in Liberal Arts at the Brink, published by Harvard in 2011, “thoughtfulness as a habit of mind” is a “precious resource” of liberal education. Without it, responsible citizenship is at a disadvantage.

Liberal arts helps us to think outside the box of our habitual frameworks about who we are and the nature of our relationships and responsibilities to others. Through liberal arts, we cultivate awareness of the
“inescapable network of mutuality” to which people of all ethnicities and races belong, as Martin Luther King Jr., in “Letter from Birmingham Jail,” writes so eloquently. Similarly, Mahatma Gandhi perceived that “The truly noble know all men as one.”

Liberal arts in the modern university is indispensable in helping people to think outside their narrow specialism whilst encouraging respect for all belief systems, a tolerant openness to peaceful co-existence. Heidegger, in his essay on Hölderlin’s poem “In Lovely Blue,” speaks of “dwelling” as a kindly authenticity facilitated by conversations with poetry, the art form of which Kant thought so highly.

Liberal education provides expanded opportunities to dwell with translations of poetry, philosophy, visual culture, music, and social and natural science discourses from around the world, and hence to reflect upon how other cultures have understood the limits and potentialities of human relations to nature, society, and the self.

Awareness of such potential and our responsibility to harvest it in order to contribute to the common good is greatly needed at this time. Scholars in the modern university lament the resistance to diligence and the general decline in academic standards. Respect for high standards is essential in our current aspirations to be citizens of the world. Toward that end, liberal arts plays a crucial role. As Martha Nussbaum observes, liberal education extends to all the opportunity to develop powers of reasoning without which “genuine dialogue” between people cannot take place. Such dialogues are needed within and between nations, and transnationally.

The liberal arts general education curriculum is both an anchor that helps to put fashionable trends in perspective and an impetus for innovative integrative learning that cultivates new directions in thought.

Pluralistic, multicultural, and increasingly integrative, liberal arts in the modern university is indispensable for the cultivation of knowledge and skills needed not only for academic success but also well-being in personal and professional relationships. As reported by Tricia A. Seifert in 2008, data indicate that liberal arts experiences have a “positive effect on four liberal arts outcomes, including intercultural effectiveness, inclination to inquire and lifelong learning, well-being, and leadership.” In terms of emotional fulfillment, the liberal arts can provide students with great pleasure in discovery and skill enhancement, as Martin Bloomer points out in School of Rome (2011).

In sum, modern liberal arts is a cornucopia, for those willing to labor together. The harvest can be a bountiful one, not only for the individual, but also collectivities.

To conclude, I return us to the words with which we began, “Everything that lives, lives not alone, nor for itself.” This collective orientation is essential to keep in mind as we consider any changes to the GE curriculum or procedures that manage it. It is important not to approach GE from a solely departmental perspective but a rather to take a larger vantage point that considers the relation of individual courses to the liberal arts curriculum as a whole and, in turn, the latter’s relationship to a healthy pluralistic society.

With this in mind, as chair of the GE Committee, I am therefore obliged to remind the senate that the full curriculum review process should include the General Education Committee, when pertinent, and that the “guiding assumption underlying Dominguez Hills General Education offerings is that they are courses for non-specialists, presenting subject matter related to the wider context of knowledge and stimulating interest in lifelong learning. Ordinarily, such courses are different from introductory lower division courses for a major and at the upper division level are not courses used in a major. General Education courses present breadth, deal with representative concepts, and provide for some integration of these concepts with further study” (Univ. Catalog).
MINUTES OF THE ADHOC COMMITTEE
(10/9, 10/23, 10/30, 11/6, 11/13)
Meeting initiated by Dr. Kaye Bragg- this meeting is meant to brainstorm on what needs to be done for the GE program on campus. She presented a folder provided by Jerry Moore, which has information in regards to other GE programs for the rest of the CSU campuses. This can be used as reference to determine what can be done with the CSUDH GE curriculum.

**Discussions/Questions**

What are the boundaries? No boundaries as long as the Golden 4 (Math, Communication, Writing, & Critical Thinking) areas are met.

Is there a certain number of units needed? What is the purpose? Can the purpose be accomplished with less units? How much is enough?

Are our current GE courses serving the students well? What is GE supposed to do in terms of breadth? Are we doing enough? A comment was brought up about large class sizes and the difficulty of the Writing component. Dr. Bragg mentioned about a new initiative on student success that is supposed to assist with that: Writing Across Curriculum.

A committee member presented her thought about GE courses helping students to “find themselves” since they are exposed to various areas and disciplines.

The following items need to be followed up on:

1. Reduction (no consensus) or paths/ tracks given majors
2. Breadth (need to explore) related to changes in requirements per area/topic
3. Current Writing Intensive Courses (can they be embedded into GE)
4. Competencies related to accreditation requirements
5. DH mission and values

A student committee member mentioned that from her experience, certain GE courses are not needed with certain majors. This discussion followed to mention that many GE’s are being taught by PT instructors instead of FT faculty members, but may be irrelevant since there are great PT instructors teaching courses as well.

Can we give the students more options and have “packages” to choose from? And reduce the number of units?

Everyone agrees that there needs to be more incorporation of writing and critical thinking. Dr. Bragg will request data looking at enrollment on GE from the office of Institutional Assessment.
Can there be a 1st year experience component? Can we use strategies or extra-curricular activities to meet this? The university’s accreditation has been in conversation about moving towards competencies.

Another committee member expressed his concern in regards to student success after graduation that needs to be considered. From his experience, it seems that many students are not “qualified” for their careers or do not have the skills necessary.

Can the Institutional Goals be incorporated into GE’s? What are the goals and values of the university? Do they fit with GE? *To be explored.*

**Themes**
- Looking at overall collection of experiences in lower division package- Can it be changed?
- Could we have alternative packages/tracks for different majors?
- Talk about specific experiences for freshmen. Do other CSU’s have them?
- Notion of GE reflecting Dominguez Hills. Look at goals and reflect on who we are.

**Proposals**
- Have examples; learn about the GE classes and know what happens in class.
- Bring competencies: *Dr. Bragg will get collection of syllabi per GE area and distribute and will obtain data (info) on GE courses.*
- Explore GE programs from other CSU campuses. Each member received materials per campus
- Figure out what “breadth” means and continue the discussion.

*Meeting adjourned*
Lower Division GE- Ad Hoc Committee Meeting
October 23, 2014 – Meeting Minutes

9am-10am

Notes by: Kaye Bragg

Initial review of documents sent to members: GE chair/Lorna PPT on liberal arts education; summary chart of GE programs across CSU; English writing requirements across CSUs by Helen.

Brief discussion of committee report as a memo noting common questions or issues that we should address in the GE; suggestions of potential changes and suggestions for alternative approach to area courses.

Review and discussion about summary chart elements:

- Agreement that lower division GE courses set foundation for major knowledge
- Several competencies were discussed as essential part of lower division GE instruction: communication in oral and written forms, critical reading/comprehension
- Review of requirements by CO for GE (golden fours)
- Discussion of collection of courses per area and potential for more flexibility in areas for student choices

Continued discussion of purpose of lower division GE courses noted two alternative ideas:

- GE courses expose students to knowledge outside the major and expose students to new ideas/inquiry
- GE courses should integrate general knowledge with exposure to major in first, two years through blending of major courses with lower division GE
- Agreement that there needs to be more integration across areas so students understand how total GE program (all areas) fits together or how areas are related?

Continued discussion regarding how to achieve this integration of areas in GE program:

- Discussion of greater freedom in selection of courses per area- examples from summary chart were noted in which students need five classes and could select a minimum of one per four areas with one elective
- Referencing summary chart an example of per area select courses but may count lower division major course for one course (science major/area B or history major/ area C)

Brief discussion of themes or paths that would be a collection of courses around a problem or topic

- Examples of paths from Northridge, Long Beach (exploration courses) and Chico (interdisciplinary pathways)
- Paths/theme could be alternative plan of pre-existing GE courses bundled together for students
Committee agreed for the next meeting:

- Review paths/ themes of Northridge, Long Beach and Chico to discuss if this model could address questions of GE-major integration
- Review of GE chair PPT and comments related to “breath and scope of general education.” Members would then begin drafting statement regarding this purpose to be preserved in GE
- Discussion of competency in GE lower division will continue given WASC requirements
- Discussion of “what is unique in GE in relation to our CSUDH mission/ core values”

Meeting adjourned
Lower Division GE- Ad Hoc Committee Meeting
October 30, 2014 – Meeting Minutes

9am-10am

Notes by: Susanne Walker

In attendance: Kaye Bragg, George Jennings, Ivonne Heinz- Balcazaar, Nop Ratanasiripong, Debra Best, Lisa Hutton, Jamie Dote-Kwan, Bea Gadduang, Hillina Greybreohannes

Absent: Cal Caswell

Kaye Bragg opened the meeting with an overview of what would be addressed

- Explore breadth
- Determine who could write a paragraph/key points of the importance of GE retaining the element of breadth being important
- Revisit comparison of the charts, with a focus on the paths/themes

Best shared a comment she had heard where increasingly majors are preparing people for specific jobs and in light of that it became increasingly more important for GE courses to provide depth. That college in part is where people learn to think and learn different modes of thinking, as majors are preparing people for specific careers they are getting less of that and so that is an area that GE needs to continue to do and that different modes of ties into the breadth.

Jennings asked if it was true.

Best posed the question, why do you go to college: to find a job, better yourself economically, but not necessarily thinking about the broad liberal arts education.

Jennings asked that while there may be lots of talk out there in the media supporting this idea – is it real?

Heinz-Balcazaar responded that it depended on the discipline. She said some disciplines will be more related to one way of thinking, others are inherently interdisciplinary therefore some more depth and more ways of critical thinking. Heinz-Balcazaar agreed pursuing depth and multi-critical thinking. She wanted to ensure that that GE is infused with depth and multi-critical thinking, assuming that some disciplines will not, poses a challenge. For example, math causes us to think in a certain way. To take it a step further, how does math link to languages, history and philosophy, Heinz-Balcazaar wondered?

Bragg said her concern was that some of it could put us back between a bifurcation between GE and the major. “One thing that has come out of some of the conversations” Bragg said, “is the idea that we need to have an integration and that general education needs to compliment the major.” Bragg said that the lower GE provides different modes of thinking through the variety across the HUM, social sciences and sciences and then that is used as the foundation for the major and then the major will go deep into the way of inquiry or forms of writing and reinforce that in the area and field. Bragg
emphasized that they needed to work together – not do one and then do the other. Bragg shared that that seems to be the challenge students are having with GE right now, its seen more as “once I get through this and I can then move onto this”, and Bragg felt that there is a disconnect. Bragg felt that modes of thinking is an interesting idea because it speaks to the areas that we have in the lower division.

Best continued on Modes of Thinking – different parts of the brain get used by different modes of thinking.

Hutton said she believes we’re talking about infusing more of an inquiry approach in terms of how do you think in different subject areas. It seems that you have to deal with the idea of using breadth, but then there’s the idea of using depth. Do GE’s need to be deeper within each breadth area and less wide? If you’re going to really go into modes of thinking and inquiry – are most of our GE’s introductory courses, then possibly they’re not getting the same kind of depth into a subject. Maybe there’s still breadth because they’re having to choose from different areas – is there some difficulty with that or would you get the breadth with the pathway idea of connecting several courses like music and science and so you get more depth by connecting these courses in terms of a theme.

Ratanasiripong said it is also how she sees it. She said there are two populations to deal with. One group comes in without a clue of what they want to be or what interest they may have and the other group knows. Let’s get the breadth on one side and all general done and take that opportunity to have a pathway of patterns like Northridge. Then they can choose it as the minor but that could be a choice for them to move into a depth of knowledge in that area so they broaden their options.

Bragg – if you look at GE and look at learning outcomes that we have per area under the GE they are not going to meet this kind of category of depth to the degree that you’re talking about. There is a piece of that in terms of the social science or in terms of humanities but it is much more of a sampler so that they’ll gain at least an appreciation. They will also have some of the key concepts to understand some of these ideas. The assumption is that depth is going to come in the major. When we look at the lower division there has been the idea of common competencies that would go across, such as critical reading and critical communication (both oral and written) and those would be competencies that would be across all areas. You have pieces of it in classes and depending on who is teaching it they’re going to emphasize it in different ways but when you look at the learning outcomes and goals per area – it’s not the inquiry – so that would be a new shift, a new consideration.

Hutton – could you narrow the competencies by GE area instead of everyone trying to do everything? Would it be natural that D1 in social sciences or in D2 in writing intensive, is that too restrictive? Hutton said she liked the universities that had more writing intensive required in their lower GE and having the oral communication, critical thinking (which could really be in all of them), critical reading or logic. Hutton asked, “what would that look like so that everyone does not have to have that laundry list of competencies?

Dote-Kwan said she agreed, the models she liked were where the writing was more than just a responsibility of one or two English courses and it was a concerted effort to have writing across a number of courses in GE. The second items Dote-Kwan addressed were the WASC competencies of GE – (Dote-Kwan read from WASC Standards 2.2A “Baccalaureate programs engage students in an integrated course of study of sufficient breadth and depth to prepare them for work, citizenship, and life-long
learning. These programs ensure the development of core competencies including, but not limited to, written and oral communication, quantitative reasoning, information literacy, and critical thinking. In addition, baccalaureate programs actively foster creativity, innovation, an appreciation for diversity, ethical and civic responsibility, civic engagement, and the ability to work with others. Baccalaureate programs also ensure breadth for all students in cultural and aesthetic, social and political, and scientific and technical knowledge expected of educated persons. Undergraduate degrees include significant in-depth study in a given area. “The institution has a program of General Education that is integrated throughout the curriculum, including at the upper division level, together with significant in-depth study in a given area.”

Bragg – The GE committee was asked to go through the different areas and embed/identify these competencies and which areas they could go into and do a revision on the current collection of learning objectives. In some areas this has happened and other areas it has not. We were asked to take the WASC ideas of competencies, but that really hasn’t moved. Bragg said one thing that could be put in the report was a suggestion for that to happen and move forward with it – and that we would encourage that. We could also say that we think these things need to be placed in the lower division GE and therefore the next step would be for the different areas and the individuals teaching in those areas to begin to move forward with that and have that discussion. Whether it is all of those in all the areas or if they’re placed in an appropriate area given the area. We agree that: 1. the core competencies should be in there 2. which should be in all or should they only be in a limited area.

**PATHS**

Ratanasiripong said she liked the way the paths were laid out in CHICO’s model. Best agreed. Best said part of the reason why, was that CHICO was closest to CSUDH’s model. Ratanasiripong said it also provides both, the five disciplines in three groups, oral communication, writing, critical thinking, math and science the second group – American Institutions and U.S. Government and the third part is that in number one and number two, all students have to complete it, they have to choose the pathways they want and consider it a minor and each pathway is 18 units. There are options.

Hutton – wondered within a pathway in that scenario, will you get enough of breadth, i.e. in nursing, will you be studying health from other discipline’s perspective?

Bragg said some of the paths are better at crossing than others. The Paths were designed by faculty and interested areas coming together. Some are broader and more diverse and Bragg felt that was key if you were going to do that Path.

Hutton said the Paths in Chico seemed to be more thematic and not topical.

Bragg said some take a theme, some have a common topic or a problem and then they look at the problem from a variety of different approaches.

Hutton said the other thing about CHICO is that they require all the upper division GE’s be in the pathways.

Bragg said this could be a way to have integration in some of the areas if we did it in lower division. How many points it would be, we will not settle here in the next 2-3 weeks. Is this idea of theme or path, the subcommittee wants to suggest be explored to try and address an issue that we’ve addressed in
lower division GE with regard to a lack of integration. Is this a means of integration or is there something else we can do?

Jennings said he wasn’t sure why we feel that there is a lack of integration.

Heinz-Balcazaar – brought up the example of the student who shared her impression of taking film classes as a Political Science major. She said all she does in the film classes is watch films. Heinz-Balcazaar said we did not help the student get the connection between film and political science knowing that films are very political.

Bragg gave the suggestion of an approach to helping students make the connection through simple assessments, or an ongoing student portfolio, asking them from what you learned in this class, how does it change or contribute to your idea about your major. We might want it to tie to the major or not – to be sure there’s the breadth as well.

Jennings felt that this idea wouldn’t come through assessment, it would have to come from the faculty member who is facilitating the class, and they may not do a good job if they had to facilitate different themes.

INTEGRATION

Best said going back to core competencies – the written, oral, information literacy, critical thinking, there needs to be a way to infuse it throughout the curriculum. Best further stated that while in writing, two composition courses are at the core - it can’t be the end of it. It needs to be infused in GE and the university with the writing intensive requirements and the major is pushing it in that direction but right now as structured there is a gap. We have the core, we have the writing intensive in the major that we’re working on – but there’s a year in between.

Dote-Kwan said we could make this recommendation of an integrative approach – but we wanted to know who would be responsible for it. If they’re integrated, they would have to be cross disciplined. Jamie Dote-Kwan asked, would you then charge the college with this? Are you going to say there has to be a path to Humanities? Jamie Dote-Kwan said she can’t see this getting done.

Bragg said in a perfect scenario – she would not charge the college, she does not think they would make headway that way. Bragg said what she believes needs to be done is to say faculty who would be interested in participating in a collaborative (4 or 5 faculty) who teach GE or in their department they teach GE, would come together for a term and then do a pilot and give it a try. Bragg said it would have to be faculty who would be willing to talk to other faculty. Bragg said when they did the GE paired courses with our learning communities, it was faculty, 2 people working together, out of the 10 we did, 7 were very successful. Faculty came into each other’s classes. They did interact with each other. It was totally faculty driven. Bragg said they set up the kind of logistics to make it work, but it was because faculty talked to each other. Bragg said she felt it would be the only way you could get a Path around a theme or around a topic. Faculty would have to identify what the theme or the topic would be so that they’re passionate about it.

Dote-Kwan offered the suggestion of when you open up GE, having students able to pick things or they see that there’s more of an alignment with what they want to do within their career path is great. “However”, she said, “if we open up GE much like at Monterrey Bay has, that two additional courses
have to be writing intensives.” It forces the people that want to have courses in GE to up the ante – they just can’t take anything. Or you could say throughout GE you have to have two service learning courses. So the courses that go into GE now have to have more than just meeting the requirement in that area. If we opened up to offer more courses within GE but they had more rigid requirements in order to be part of GE than I think what we’ll accomplish is that we will have that 1st year and 2nd year writing we’ll have the writing, and then we can add more critical thinking and more service learning.

Bragg said that Jamie Dote-Kwan really picked up on the communications piece, so perhaps we want to say is that all GE courses would have to have a minimum of one of these in them and that would up the ante. I don’t know that we just want to do writing or would we want to say, if you’re going to have a course in GE, it’s got to have something related to these competencies.

Hutton said she really believes something needs to done with the writing and she wanted to highlight that the reading somehow needs to be included as well as it seems to be an issue with our students. Which could be Logic or Critical thinking – but there’s that piece of reading that looks different in different disciplines.

Jennings said in some of the campuses that he looked at – they require that every GE class has to have a minimum level of writing. 1000 in the lower division and 2000 in the more advanced classes, He felt that we could do something like that at Dominguez Hills and he felt it was odd that we haven’t. Jennings thought it would be good to find out what are the institutional barriers that prevent us from doing it. If we have institutional barriers that prevent us then we need to say that and move on to something else. If the issue, in the case of writing, is class size – than perhaps grading support is needed.

Bragg said it would be good to identify what we believe we ought to do and then identify what the institutional barriers might be that prevent us from doing that. It may be class size, it may be instructor, does the instructor have the knowledge of what and how would be the way to do this, so there is an element of professional development that could be needed. Bragg said she hopes that it may be important enough that we say, this is important and we need to do it now. We have enough people pushing in the same direction.

Heinz-Balcazaar said she thinks that the way Chico is doing it would be very helpful to us in terms of critical thinking. We will achieve breadth and depth. Heinz-Balcazaar said she is very concerned with critical thinking as it relates to writing – students may follow mechanics of writing while abandoning content.

Bragg said the real question becomes if we want this collection of competencies to be in the GE, there needs to be a minimum of 1 in each course that would be part of this. Bragg noted that Dote-Kwan’s suggestion of embedding high impact practices and possibly saying that everyone is going to be required to do something like service learning, community or a research project. URSOA came out of a commitment to have more research, and there has been a discussion to have more service learning – we have not discussed in this group about what is unique about our G.E., something in here needs to say this is Dominguez Hills, in upper division GE you see it but not in lower division GE. Do we want to say another element of integrating it could be a project, servicing learning, research activity, where a student has to have one or two of those in lower division GE? Bragg said she was just offering different possibilities.
Ratanasiripong said she doesn’t object to the idea but how will our students be ready for it. She said from her perspective for students to come up with some research project or type of service learning it requires some level of maturity.

Bragg said it might be that a freshman could be part of a research project and a focus group and can say they participated in a scientific study.

Hutton said that there may be more teach scaffolding in earlier grades but students are doing research. It may not look the same but students are capable.

Best said she is worried about asking lower division GE students to do too much. Best said there are two things that we want to infuse here the competencies and the high impact practices. However, perhaps a better fit for the high impact practices would upper division GE.

Jennings said he wasn’t sure why we’re going off in all of these different directions. “Originally”, Jennings said, “we were asked to deal with the 55 units that we require and to see whether or not we could reduce those. It worries me that we can talk, make recommendations and then people will put them on the shelf and ask, what about the 55 units.”

Hutton said she recalls that in the first meeting discussing that CSUDH was a lot higher than the other systems and majors are saying they are needing more space for their major requirement with the 120 unit limit. And so we were trying to recreate a reduction, maybe not huge, by a class or two, that in order to do that maybe we need to make sure that the writing and other competencies are better infused and we could do more with less. We had discussed that ENG 111 would be the easiest target and that’s not necessarily the right way to go.

Dote-Kwan said she agreed with Jennings. She understands that as a representative of the Senate, they do believe that we need breadth, but there was major pushback about the 120 from the Chancellor’s office and the majors that they don’t have enough units to complete the major when our GE package is so big. They asked if it couldn’t be done with less.

Ratanasiripong said that it was also discussed that maybe we cannot look at units alone.

Bragg said that the one thing that has been identified is that we can begin to look at a commitment to the core competencies and that having those required across a number of different courses you would then not have a single course designated for that and that may reduce the count.

Hutton said that 48 is what most packages are able to do and it is significantly less than where we’re currently at.

Bragg continued, “Within an area, allowing people to have more choices across the area, so you didn’t have to do it like a check list. And within areas that the student has the major in, the student would not have to repeat a course that would be addressed or covered in their major. They then are “forced” into the breadth mode.

Hutton said looking back at CHICO they had their core, which included their basic core and American Institutions and then they had the 18 units, so then there was a set thing they all had to do. But within the 18 units you could still have the high impact practices and the core competencies.
Best said you could take out the American Institutions, and not make that part of the GE, just require two classes in social sciences.

Hutton – then we’re not really doing anything.

Bragg – that’s correct, we would be shifting things. One options is to shift things out of GE and put them in graduation requirements.

The group agreed then that would not achieve the goal.

Dote-Kwan asked the group to look at LA where all GE courses have mandatory writing. Their Area A has American Institutions and math. We have our math over in Area D. Then they reduced B, C, & D in terms of total. People can take 3 courses in each area, but the minimum is 2 courses. If you look at that, we’re not picking on any particular Area, across the board they’re saying these 3 areas, you can pick 2-3 courses and then they put the required courses in the basic area. LA has very similar students to us in terms of remediation, income, first generation, etc.

Jennings pointed out that in EO1065 it specifies how many units you’re supposed to have in each area. He suggested beginning with what is requirement and then see how far we can deviate from it.

Hutton said there are also all the D1, D2, D3 and D4 and you took away all the subcategories, maybe instead of 1 in each subcategory you have a total of 3.

Best said the subcategories exist for a reason. For example, in Area B, the subcategories are Physical Science and Biological Science, which are two very different modes of thinking and in D1 and D2, American Institution requirement, 1 is Economics, Political Science and Sociology, and the other is History, again, very different modes of thinking.

Greybreohannes – what about Northridge Causeway – found it very interesting

Bragg said the Pathways are programs or a layer. You can choose to do that or you can do GE program. Basic requirements and then if you’re going to do a path that you have these choices. It was their way to walk between the two.

Bragg asked that people think about how we can reduce.

Jennings asked if the Chancellor’s requirement have to add up to 48? Do you have to have 12 units of social science, 3 units of lifelong learning? Suppose if someone in social science integrated lifelong learning, could it count for both or something like that. What are the restrictions?

Bragg said we can look specifically at Area changes that you have in the topics per area.

Dote-Kwan asked who came up with the four areas within our GE package, did we impose it on ourselves?

Jennings said he believed it had to do with communicating with the Community College in the articulation.

Bragg said she would check with Lorna Fitzsimmons why we have the design that we have and send out EO1065.

Meeting adjourned
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One last meeting has been set for next Thurs, November 13th. After that meeting, Bragg said, she’ll draft the ideas that have been shared thus far, put it in an organized fashion and then send out a draft electronically to this team, looking for comments and feedback on that draft. The redraft would go to you mid-December, before you do your grades and then had a final go to the Senate Exec before the end of the semester.

Bragg read from an email that she had received from Debra Best that she had received from previous Emeritus Lois Feuer, regarding the history of GE. In the 1970s and 80’s, DH did a revision of GE. The GE Reform committee had nothing to do with Prop 13. The CO order #338 in 1980 asked for a rethink of GE along the following lines.

1. Initiate GE that has breadth, requirements were planned and organized in such a manner that the objectives would be interrelated elements and not fragments.
2. The courses would be around core or themes with underlying unifying rationale for them.
3. An evaluation of all courses through the GE breadth requirements to determine if some would stay or some would be out of the initial review program
4. Development of new courses as needed given requirements and review
5. Integrative courses especially at the Upper Division that would be inter-relationships among disciplines. (we see that within the three that we have – Bragg commented)
6. Develop programs in terms of educational goals and students needs rather than traditional titles of disciplines.
7. Given attention to possibilities for activity as well as observation in all program subdivisions

Bragg said for the meeting she wanted people to talk about the organization of Lower Division GE, potential for reframing or restructuring. She reminded the committee that they had started that discussion when talking about pulling American Institutions and
sliding that over into Area A. We talked briefly about looking in each of the areas and for majors that had areas appropriate in those areas, they would be able to meet the requirement in that area but then have to choose other courses so that they would have some flexibility there.

Hutton asked if we’re still under the assumption that we’re trying to reduce those numbers.

Bragg said we’re still exploring it and that it’s something that we can put in the report that these are some options that we see.

Ratanasiripong said that it does seem like going with the requirement of 48 units as laid out in EO1065 would be the way to go.

Jennings said he sees that there are two ways of arriving at that:

1. Reduce social sciences by 1 course
2. Reduce English by 1 course

Doing the social sciences could be easier. Allow history to count as units in the GE as part of the 12 required. It would get us down from the 52.

Hutton stated that English 111 is sometimes problematic. Both our transfer and native students need writing intensives. Competencies need to be built in.

Best said a solution could be to make English 111 a graduation requirement and take it out of GE

Bragg asked what kind of impact that would have on GE.

Best said she didn’t believe that it would have on impact on GE that it would really be more of a challenge with ENG 111.

Hutton said that it still has to count towards the 120 units, so it does not help those majors struggling to stay within the 120 unit cap.

Dote-Kwan said that in the other GE packages there is the commitment across all that writing will be included in all GE courses. Bragg said there is a great fear that it would not be enforced.

Another suggestion was to reduce the Lab courses to 0-units, but Dote Kwan said, we need to keep the Lab courses unit bearing. In the past, the departments were asked to change their then 0-unit labs to unit bearing courses, since it under-estimated the
campus’ lab usage and prevented us from ever getting a new science building. We cannot go back to backwards to reduce GE.

Dote-Kwan proposed the following, which requires reducing Areas B, C, and D to 6-unit in Lower Division GE:

Area A 12-15 (existing) plus 9 units (i.e., 3 Math, 3 US Constitution, 3 US History required)
Area B 7 - 10
Area C 6 - 9
Area D 6 - 9
Area E 3

Lower Division GE Total = 43
Upper Division GE Total = 9
This would equal 52 units.

Kaye Bragg suggested the possibility that the 3 units in Area E could include High Impact Practices

There was also the discussion of making Area C (HUM) 9 - 12 and moving ENG 111 to Area C from Area A.

Best argued that HUM 200 would have a very hard time with that as ENG 111 is a prerequisite for HUM 200. Also, HUM 200 is a breadth class, it encompasses the interdisciplinary breadth that we’re saying we want across GE.

Dote-Kwan said that likely many other departments could make that same argument regarding breadth (e.g., PHI 101 Values and Society).

Dote-Kwan said we’re only saving three units, if we don’t want to give up ENG, move the two social sciences courses into mandatory and offer more courses options for breadth.

Jennings offered another option would be to further reduce Area D to 3-6 units since it has the mandatory U.S. Constitution and U.S. History; therefore total Lower Division GE would be 40.

Doubling Counting Discussion:
In addition, Jennings talked about the possibility of allowing upper division to count in the lower division.
Best said we would want to make sure we do not compete with our own classes in lower division. We wouldn’t want to offer more than one. We need to encourage more departments to offer lower division classes.

Bragg spoke about rearranging. Taking the range of units and at the end of it, be required to go outside of the major.

Hutton talked about Liberal Studies where that hasn’t worked.

Bragg said if you double count, the additional was going to be in your major.

Heinz-Balcazaar said she could see how Women’s Studies would benefit from double counting. Bragg said that several multi-cultural courses could benefit from it. Hutton spoke about schematics vs. reducing total # and pushing people out of major area.

Writing Across GE Discussion:

Bragg brought up core competencies/core commitments and that this group has talked about using GE for writing within any GE courses.

Best said the problem with the quantity of writing, imagine 7 papers that are grading, revised, and resubmitted in the various disciplines. ENG 111 are taught by people who are trained in composition.

Best stated that advising becomes more challenging. And that it can already be confusing to students on what they need to take to be able to graduate.

Bragg – advising EOP, there’s already a sequencing

Hutton – some are ENG 110, transfer students need it as well

Best – Feeder schools do not have an equal to E111

Dote-Kwan suggested moving 111 into Area C – if areas B, C, and D are equal, no one can say that anyone one group is being singled out.

Jennings said in Area D we require 15 and only need 12

Bragg spoke about the importance of balance. She asked the group to think about how we can cut down and still maintain exposure and breadth.

There was discussion about HUM200 must take, but transfer students don’t have to – if they are certified.

Best will reach out to Lorna Fitzsimmons to get the copy of the 2009 GE report and share it with the group.
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Bragg began the meeting by saying she would like to make sure that particular summary points are included in the final report based on the running list that had been discussed at the AdHoc meetings. She will try to do a draft document and send it out by November 19th and have the committee offer their comments, and then send out another draft for everyone to review. Bragg reminded the committee that there are no preconceived notions of what needs to be in the document except to capture the different things that have been talked about. Floor open:

Best said picking up on something that was brought up last time of moving ENG111 into category C, Best said it can’t be done as it does not fulfill the learning objectives for Area C, it’s a skills class, not a Humanities class. Bragg noted that in other words in order to do that the whole curriculum would need to be redesigned in that area. Best said they’re trying to turn into a bridge class, in writing across the curriculum that runs counter to the kind of revisions that would be required.

Bragg suggested going back to the idea of reconfiguring the information in Area A so that we organized it differently so that all of the Golden Four required are in that. Bragg said that last meeting there was the assumption that it was a good idea in terms of helping students understand the design of the program.

Jennings said that the group should focus on reducing the Area D requirement to 12 from 15. He said the reason it is 15 is because it also includes the upper division. 12 lower division and 3 upper division. EO1065 only requires 12. Maybe it could be done
by taking US History and California Government to count in perspectives on individuals
groups and societies and then it would fulfill what we were asked to.

Dote-Kwan said she thought that they were going to try to move all of the lower
division areas down to 9 units. Jennings said yes, 9 lower division plus three upper
division. Dote-Kwan said that what you’re saying to include both US Constitution and
US History, then there really is one free elective option in D. Dote-Kwan said what she
had thought they agreed to was across the board reducing B, C and D, where B would
be 7, C would be 6 and D would be 6, and that would save 3 units. Dote-Kwan said
another option to further reduce could be having the mandatory US and Constitution as
part of D and D would go down to only 1 free elective and then that would reduce the
package by another 3. Dote-Kwan said that’s how she would lay out the
recommendation to further reduce it. Bragg asked, using this pattern, are there any
other areas where they could do a further reduction or what we spoke about tin the
beginning was a change in choice within an area.

Gadduang asked if we reduce it we would be done to 45 and isn’t it 48 what the
Chancellor’s office wants? Gadduang said we could use the last three units to address
the piece that we first spoke about including something that reflects what Dominguez
Hills is all about into the courses. Bragg said using this template that Dote-Kwan
started another option is to identify issues or themes that would then be a collection
across so that a student could then take a path, but that is more of a layover, so a
student would do a path through GE and do the courses that are linked on a common
theme out of C, out of D that they would follow.

Dote-Kwan asked if it would be mentioned that we did talk about not having the
second English course (ENG111) with a big if of only if there was the commitment of
writing across all of GE courses. Bragg said how she intends on framing that is that the
committee looked at two options as it related to English, the first a commitment for
writing in all GE classes, that discussion was also tied to embedding the WASC
competencies inside the GE courses. Second was another option considered talking
about eliminating one of the English courses but the committee felt very strongly that
we should not do that because everyone felt that students should write more.
Jennings suggested including that if Dominguez Hills implements all of the
recommendations than one could revisit the idea of whether or not people need English
111.

Dote-Kwan said didn’t we also talk about with ENG 111, there’s a whole second year
where the students aren’t writing. And the committee spoke about a requirement that
students have to take two writing intensive courses that are part of GE, not every
course in GE but need to take two courses that also met a writing requirement.
Bragg said that there has been an underlying theme about looking at the learning outcomes and the objectives for each area and that those are not sufficient given the competencies that WASC has. So whether it writing across all the curriculum, writing intensive courses, that there’s a commitment that the courses in GE tend to be knowledge and content driven and not skill and competencies and so we would like to see those that are referenced in the different area.

Caswell with regard to STEM – feels it’s important to include in the final report that we support the idea of improving or providing support for STEM. Imbedding some portion of our elements of STEM would be valuable.

Bragg said that could tie into the potential for double counting in certain areas or giving credit for a STEM major for requirements in the lower division GE. Should we say that it’s an option that’s encouraged in the sciences so that in some of the courses within the major they’re taking this, so instead they would not need to take a course in lab or science area because they’re going to have a course that complements it?

Best offered that with regard to double counting it runs against the breadth that GE is trying to create. Bragg said we had the idea that if you’re doing something in your major or a path within your major that requires STEM, then we would want you to take a course in something else to get that breadth. So when you meet a requirement in Area B, you’re not excused in the other areas from getting the breadth.

Jennings said in Area B, you can already count majors classes for mathematics, for sciences and for labs. You can do it, if you know about it. Jennings said what he would abdicate for is the critical reasoning thing and it is likely that many of the courses in math and science could argue that they could satisfy that and that would be reasonable.

Bragg said the consequence if they’re meeting the requirement through something in the major than it expands the options in the major that would be available to them. Bragg asked if they’re still getting the breadth of GE. They’re not being excused from other areas, its taking that Area in their major. Bragg gave the example of if you’re in History, can I double count one of my history courses in the upper division for one of the lower division in Area D to double count and satisfy. Best said psychology and sociology are entirely different than history. Jennings said you already have the mandated history classes. Ratanasiripong felt there ought to be a maximum number of units allowed in double counting.

Best said she felt the challenge with reducing Area D, it leaves them with a narrow view of history as its strictly US history they would be dealing with. She went on to say that the students need to have as much exposure to the world as they can. Bragg said she agreed, but is that the elements of the Upper Division and provide the interaction
across disciplines. Jennings said if you’re going to reduce it what will your students take?

**Best** asked how do we get Area B down to 7 units? Dote-Kwan said you can make the math quantitative skills as part of basic skills. As per **EO1065**, you are required to take Physical Science, Life Science, Laboratory Activity, and Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning. Unless you offer a physical/life science combo class, there’s no way around it. It has to be a minimum of 10 units. Moving mathematics into basic skills.

Bragg said it’s a shift in the totals per the areas and by doing that politically we are saying, we’re making everyone take a “hit”, so to speak. Dote-Kwan said you could say you get 2 free choices in each area. Best said in Area D, the 6 units would be the history and the political science? Dote-Kwan, said if you moved political science and U.S. history into a basic skills and then social science would have two options, but then you’re reducing by three units. Give them 1 option and put the U.S. history and U.S. Constitution back, and they test out of U.S. Constitution than they have the two choices here too. Our student reps said they would really like more choice. Bragg said it seems like again offer a combined course. Best said you could say that this one class requires an exam and if you don’t pass the exam you have to take the class and separate it out, which would lower it three units.

Jennings said if you take the exam and pass, you still have to take another social sciences course. Bragg said another option to explore is to take of those and have a course redesign that would satisfy both of those. Jennings asked if they test out of it, do they get credit for the three units? Bragg said they meet the requirement but they do not get credit for the units. If you satisfy the requirement, it doesn’t necessarily mean you get the units.

Bragg asked do we in lower GE want to create an option, an interdisciplinary option that would combine a science, a social science, a history, a humanity exploration driven by a particular theme or concept that they’re then going to apply across the areas and would be proposed to get the credit in the areas, you would have to do that package. In B, and in C, and in D and those would count for a course in those areas. Best asked would upper division be included in that? Best said she sees that in upper division they’re already interdisciplinary by nature. In terms of getting this started, how can we use existing GE courses to draw connections between them? You have to have departments who are willing to work with either what we have as the current objectives in that area and play with an assignment that would then reinforce whatever that theme is going forward. Committee felt this should be proposed. The key would be in advising so students understand that it is a package. Best said departments need to offer a wider variety of general education courses and this might push departments into doing that. Best recognized that a bigger reason that there aren’t more GE courses is
because they’re not taught by tenured and tenured track faculty so there isn’t the incentive to develop those courses.

Bragg said another theme that was discussed briefly was to have GE more integrated into the undergraduate experience so that students understood how this fit with the requirements instead of being a checklist. Best said part of it a push to getting students connected with their department sooner.

Jennings said one of the things that College of Business is doing is sending out invitation to student to take a look at the College of Business earlier. It could be a benefit for other colleges as well. The idea of starting your major classes before you finish up General Ed could lend to this as well Best offered. Dote-Kwan would it be possible to develop guidelines that could be put in a packet that would be given to advisors who are advising in lower division GE, i.e. if you plan on majoring in English, these are the GE courses that would set you up the best. Best said there does need to be more conversations between departments in terms of connecting GE classes to other majors, i.e. English has two people who could put together a science fiction class which would suddenly make Area C attractive to Science majors, drawing connections like that. Bragg said that would be one of the other recommendations we would want to say, as new faculty are coming in, as departments are looking at their curriculum, that there may be new opportunities within those areas that now they have expertise that could submit those courses so that the major has a toe back into the lower division.

Meeting adjourned