

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE
2002-2003

Minutes of Meeting: 5/14/03, 12:15 p.m. in JB-404

Members Present: C. E. Tapie Rohm Jr.—BPA (Chair), Milton Clark (Admin), Carol Haviland—A&L, Young Suk Hwang—ED, Stephen Kinzey—NS, Geri Stahley—SBS

Guests: Sandra Kamusikiri

Old Business:

1. Review of Write Ups of the Social and Behavioral Sciences

The updated listing of the courses to be reviewed and those received as of 5/14/03 were distributed by Milton Clark. There was a brief discussion about some specific courses and the information provided or missing. The committee agreed they would make comments on their draft of any inconsistencies or missing items such as writing or other section items that might not be indicated in the syllabus.

There was a discussion about some of these items that included: If there is no writing requirement, then that should be indicated in the comments because it is a requirement for all GE courses; the college and department should be responsible to check these classes; the report should include that the course does not comply with this requirement (that it be stated on the syllabus) and the course should be put on hold or be resubmitted the next year to see if the requirement has been met, or make a justification why it was not included.

The committee unanimously agreed that it needs to be the university, college, and department's decision: whether or not a large class (such as 180 students) needs to include the writing requirement as part of the course, and if it is a viable request for that size class.

Tapie said the committee will have another meeting to review the final draft of the report before it goes to Faculty Senate.

Tapie stated that after going to the statewide meetings, all the GE courses need to be checked to make sure outcomes assessments are included in each course syllabus (what outcome the student can expect from the course). He added that the committee needs to make sure all GE courses also match the system requirements because our students are really hurting in writing when they leave here (which is becoming noticed by the system comments).

He said as the new chair of Faculty Senate next year, he would like to make sure that the GE courses really are doing what we want them to do, or we need to make recommended changes to the Senate.

New Business:

1. Deletion of SSCI 343 Understanding Socialism

The course has not been offered in five years and is out of date. The committee unanimously agreed to delete the SSCI 343 Understanding Socialism course.

2. G.E. Outcomes Assessment

Sandra Kamusikiri joined the committee to discuss outcomes assessment and stated it is very important system-wide. She distributed some background material (which is available on the assessment website); along with reports the Assessment Committee has developed for the campus and GE courses, as well as a possible boiler-plate model that could be used for faculty to add to their syllabus.

She said faculty helped the University Assessment Committee develop learning goals and objectives for outcomes assessment. A pilot test on basic skills and breadth courses was given using a national exam as an example of what students should be learning. They piloted upper-division, capstone courses, but it was discovered that it was not specific enough for our students, and a national exam will not work for us.

The committee was asked to look at the document, “Alignment Between the University General Education Policy and Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Goals and Objectives” distributed by Sandra, which her committee developed showing the goals of outcomes assessment required for both the Basic Skills Category and the Breadth Areas courses. She said the responsibility of her committee is to make sure these goals are included or implemented by asking faculty to insert questions into their final exams that will evaluate the goals listed, and then the university committee will evaluate the results.

She said in the pilot test, about 2,000 students took the exam. They learned that in terms of the questions, they regionally aligned with writing course objectives and GE documents.

She said her committee and the GE committee have a lot of work to do, and

- 1) have to be careful about reviewing the courses.
- 2) How are our students doing: the classes where given, indicate students are adequate in terms of their knowledge, and we can now say we know this to be true.
- 3) Develop a sustainable structure, i.e., 150 GE courses to choose from by students and the categories are broad in subject but within each area, there are diverse courses – where to align – still may need a college GE coordinator who would ask and monitor faculty each quarter to insert outcomes assessment requirements and ask questions in their exams for measurement.

Tapie said he went to a training course on outcomes assessment and measurements – to see if they are met. There have been discussions about GE classes having writing outcomes assessments and measurements.

Tapie asked Sandra what time period she is looking at to move doing outcomes assessment on the 150 GE classes?

Sandra said the Faculty Senate Resolution says an outcomes assessment structure is needed and the website has the alignment document between the GE & university--
what faculty need to put in and what students can expect upon end of class

Sandra stated that her committee was given the “Alignment document” and told each course needs to include the information listed in that document. A sample (the yellow handout) includes sample models of the language that can be used by faculty to insert into their syllabus – or something that is similar for all types of wording for each area. She said she would like some feedback on the next step of asking faculty to include the model in their syllabus.

Sandra said she has a similar sample for each class that can be put on the website for all faculty to use:

Carol asked to go back to the first document on the goals (Alignment document) because it does not include the information she would want, and strongly suggests that the people in each area look at them before asking the faculty to use it.

Sandra said they are not trying to change the current one, but to meet the requirement she has been told to follow.

There was a discussion that followed, and Sandra stated that her committee is working at the University level and cannot change policy (outcomes assessment does not work at making changes from policy).

The handout is a model (illustrative) and changes can be made to it as needed, but the goals are determined by requirements.

Tapie wants to recommend outcomes assessment as a two-year goal that can be tied into the Senate requirements; and have a leadership workshop that will address all issues with the policy; and subcommittees could be developed and then train those teaching GE courses, and in the 2nd year – the plans can be implemented and questions developed in the cycle reviews to ask if they are implemented. He added that WASC requires this to be embedded in each area also. He recommends:

1. have committees decide what needs to be looked at;
2. start training the faculty on how to input the information; and
3. then check the syllabus the following year.

Sandra said the governing rule for outcomes assessment is that it should not be a burden to the faculty and where needed, her office can supply support to advise them (in the form of release time, travel funds, etc.) and college committees can be put in place in Fall 03 to make sure faculty actually put this in the syllabus.

Sandra would like this committee to look at the GE requirements and make sure they are met, are in concert and aligns with what this committee does, but also meets the outcomes assessment guidelines and deadlines.

Milton said the current cycle is Social and Behavioral Sciences review and maybe during each review cycle, the GE committee's responsibility is to say or identify those that don't have objectives, and the college needs to put the mechanism into place – then it could come back for the GE committee the next year to make sure that the requirement is met.

Sandra would like to make two propositions:

1. have this group, next year, send out instructions to include what you want to see in terms of outcomes assessment; and
2. since operating under Faculty Senate guidelines for Sandra to put this back on her web-site and invite faculty to use it as a resource to include it in their syllabi until GE Committee mandates it.

Milton said our committee needs to review what Sandra plans to put on the web-site first—before deciding if it should be made available to all faculty.

Geri said the GE committee and SBS have already asked the current list being reviewed (in their college) to add outcomes assessment and could send the examples with the report and state, attached are the university recommended objectives for outcomes assessment, which could be attached to the syllabus or inserted into it.

A boilerplate model was discussed, and Sandra said it is essential to include and develop a GE outcomes assessment for the whole university and faculty will be asked to include it in the syllabus now, asking for objectives, but not requiring the exam questions for now.

After a brief discussion Stephen Kinzey moved/Geri Stahley seconded/and the motion passed unanimously:

that the Outcomes Assessment Committee will hold information workshops next year and invite faculty to come and will then talk about how:

1. to plan training,
2. put on web-site as an advisory resource.

And then the GE committee will send the sample as an example with their final draft/report during each cycle.

Then once the committee has an instrument can look at it to see if it works and can be measured and then Sandra will return with a proposal regarding training.

Upon completion, the current SBS report will be given to Sandra as well, per her request.

The GE committee would like a boiler-plate sentence developed in the course report and the example will be attached.

The GE committee will look at the “Alignment Between the University General Education Policy and Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Goals and Objectives” goals, etc. for any changes needed.

The GE courses are being looked at state-wide because courses are being closely scrutinized system-wide. Students are asking questions like: Why can't I transfer from one CSU and have my courses count at all of the CSU's; Why do I have to take additional courses, especially when coming to CSUSB (or from semester to quarter system); and then have to take additional courses, etc.

There was a discussion about: the quality of education and programs being developed by legislators rather than professional educators; and we are quickly losing the courses being developed and taught by professors; how to keep from becoming a “one-stop” shopping education institution, with a boiler-plate CSU education; private institutions, and especially, the big ones like Harvard, Yale, etc. would not allow this to happen and why should we have to adjust to political rather than educational goals.

The next committee meeting will be announced as needed.

The meeting adjourned at 1:45 p.m.

sc/minutes 051403.doc