

A C A D E M I C S E N A T E

AGENDA

Wednesday, November 10, 1982

2:00 p.m. Psych-153

CONSENT CALENDAR

AS 82-49/Ex. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS

Academic Affairs Budget Committee: AL GUTOWSKY, At-large
NORMAN ROTH, At-large

Academic Policies Committee: LEIGH STEPHENS, Senator, 1983
(repl. for W. Collins)

Administrative/Business Budget Committee: CECILIA GRAY
LORRAINE HEIDECKER

To regular calendar
AS 82-50/GPPC, Ex. GRADUATE WRITING PROFICIENCY EXAM *Tabled*

The CSUS Academic Senate endorses as permanent policy the "Policy Relating to Writing Proficiency for Graduate Students." (See Attachment A)

AS 82-51/FisA, Ex. FISCAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE CHARGE

The CSUS Academic Senate approves amendment of the Fiscal Affairs Committee charge as follows:

Shall plan, review, and recommend policies concerning budget, fees, and other fiscal matters. Shall evaluate the fiscal impact of existing programs, changes in existing programs, and new programs. Shall prepare appropriate reports and recommendations for submission to the Senate Executive Committee or other University committees as directed by the Senate. Appoints and recommends faculty members to all budget committees, except the University Planning Committee and the Academic Affairs Budget Committee, to the following University committees:

University Planning Committee: one faculty elected by and from Fiscal Affairs Committee

Academic Affairs Budget Committee: Chair of Fiscal Affairs Committee, one additional faculty member elected by and from Fiscal Affairs, plus two additional faculty members recommended by Fiscal Affairs to the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate

CONSENT CALENDAR -- contd.

AS 82-51/FisA, Ex. FISCAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE CHARGE -- contd.

Administration and Business Affairs Budget Committee: two at-large faculty members

Instructionally-Related Activities Budget Committee: Chair of Fiscal Affairs Committee or designee

Student Service Fee Advisory Committee: one faculty member recommended by the Fiscal Affairs Committee

AS 82-52/GPPC, Ex. UNDERGRADUATE AND GRADUATE DEGREE PROGRAMS POLICY

The Academic Senate recommends amendment of the final paragraph of the "Policy Relating to Undergraduate and Graduate Degree Programs" (see Attachment B).

AS 82-53/UARTP, Ex. UARTP COMMITTEE COMPOSITION

Submitted until December

So regular agenda

The Academic Senate approves amendment of Faculty Manual Section 4.05.07.A.1, subject to ratification by faculty referendum, as follows:

4.05.07 University ARTP Committee

A. Composition

- The UARTP Committee shall be composed of one student selected by the Student Senate, one member elected by the Student Affairs and Academic Services units voting as one unit, one member elected by the Library unit, and tenured faculty members elected by and from their tenured and tenure-track colleagues in each school, division, or equivalent (Library - Student Affairs). Each school, division, or equivalent unit shall elect one member for the UARTP Committee for each 150 faculty positions allocated 100 tenure-track and tenured faculty or fraction thereof assigned to that school as of the current year.

<u>FTEF</u>	<u>UARTP Representative(s)</u>	
0 - 150	1 - 100	One member
151 - 300	101 - 199	Two members
301 - 450	200 - 299	Three members
451 - 600	300 - 399	Four members
	400 - 499	Five members

AS 82-53/UARTP, Ex. UARTP COMMITTEE COMPOSITION -- contd.

No school, division or equivalent unit shall have more than four members on the UARTP Committee. The President's designee shall serve as a non-voting ex-officio executive secretary member of the UARTP Committee.

AS 82-54/UARTP, Ex. ROLE AND AUTHORITY OF DEPARTMENT CHAIR IN MATTERS OF FACULTY APPOINTMENT

The Academic Senate endorses the UARTP Committee's interpretation of the role and authority of departmental chair in matters of faculty appointment as stated in Attachment C.

AS 82-55/Ex. PROPOSED DELETION OF COURSES

The Academic Senate approves the following resolution:

In regular agenda

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate of CSUS has received information that the Assistant Vice Chancellor for Programs and Resources has asked campus administrators in the CSU to identify courses "similar" to courses of an avocational, recreational, or personal development nature deleted from the curricula of the Community College system; and

WHEREAS, Some Department Chairs on this campus have allegedly been asked to further identify and list courses similar to those described above; and

WHEREAS, This request for such information has been instituted without consultation with faculty; and

WHEREAS, Embarking upon such a search for "similar courses" without consulting with faculty represents a direct violation of the principles of collegial consultation in academic matters; therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Executive Vice President be requested to avoid responding to the request from the Chancellor's Office for such data until systematic and appropriate faculty advice and consultation may be achieved; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Academic Senate of CSUS protests this violation of proper consultative procedures on matters relevant to the academic content and conduct of courses.

Information

AS 82-56/FisA, Ex. GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR SELECTING CORE MAJORS

On November 3, 1982, the Executive Committee, on behalf of the Senate, endorsed the recommendations in the Fiscal Affairs Committee's response to the document entitled, "Guiding Principles for Designating Core Majors," with special emphasis on recommendation 4. (See Attachment D)

REGULAR AGENDA

AS 82-48/Flr. MINUTES

Approval of Minutes of meeting of October 13, 1982.

AS 82-57/G.E., Ex. GENERAL EDUCATION POLICY STATEMENT

The Academic Senate approves the General Education Policy Statement (Attachment E).

AS 82-50 }
AS 82-53 }
AS 82-55 }

AS 82-58/AA, Ex. AFFIRMATIVE ACTION COORDINATOR

The Academic Senate approves transmittal of the following resolution to the President:

WHEREAS, a strong and effective affirmative action program is and has been for a number of years an accepted aspect of public policy, and

WHEREAS, affirmative action programs in appointment, retention, and other facets of campus life are critical to the common good and of special significance in maintaining a strong and responsive academic community; and

WHEREAS, the faculty, together with the administrative leadership of this campus, have adopted as policy a non-discrimination statement and have established an affirmative action program in accordance with federal and state regulations, Presidential Executive Orders, Title VII and IX of the Civil Rights Act as amended, Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, the Rehabilitation Act of 1974, and the Vietnam Readjustment Assistance Act; and

WHEREAS, administrative changes without faculty consultation have taken place on two occasions over the past three years resulting in the downgrading of this position to successively lower levels in terms of reporting relationship to the President; and

AS 82-58/AA, Ex. AFFIRMATIVE ACTION COORDINATOR -- contd.

- WHEREAS, the position of campus affirmative action coordinator has in the past been placed in the administrative structure of the University in a direct reporting relationship to the President; and
- WHEREAS, such a direct relationship to the chief executive officer is recommended by Executive Order 11246 as amended; and
- WHEREAS, the U.S. Office of Civil Rights has noted that such direct accountability to the chief executive officer (the President) is often the difference between success and failure of affirmative action programs; and
- WHEREAS, the description appearing in the announcement of the position vacancy for succession to this position currently extant describes a position with largely technical rather than independent professional functions to perform, thus weakening and diluting the capacity of this campus to fulfill its commitment to the goals of affirmative action; therefore, be it
- RESOLVED, that the Academic Senate of CSUS is opposed to and will not participate in a search for a person to fill the affirmative action coordinator's position as currently described; and
- RESOLVED, that the President be urged to suspend the current search process for an affirmative action coordinator until steps have been taken to re-establish the position in a direct reporting relationship to the President.

I. Policy Relating to Writing Proficiency for Graduate Students
(Effective Fall Semester, 1982)

All entering graduate students (those classified in degree programs effective Fall Semester, 1982, and thereafter) are expected to have demonstrated writing proficiency at the undergraduate level as prescribed by California State University. Students applying for admission to graduate programs who have not fulfilled this requirement because of having graduated from a non-CSU institution or having completed undergraduate degree requirements prior to the imposition of the writing standard shall be required to demonstrate writing proficiency as early as possible within the program and not later than advancement to candidacy in a graduate degree program. The University's writing proficiency requirement may be satisfied by passing the CSUS Writing Proficiency Examination with a score of three or better.

Approved April 12, 1982, by the Graduate Policies and Programs Committee

II. Implementation Procedures

In cases where departments wish to use writing proficiency as a graduate admission criterion or as a diagnostic tool for placing students in appropriate course work, and where the Writing Proficiency Examination is not readily available to prospective graduate students, the Graduate Policies and Programs Committee may recommend to the Graduate Dean the use of other appropriate English composition tests to determine writing proficiency providing alternate test standards employed are as rigorous as the University's standard. Such standards will be determined in consultation with the English Department Chair or designee.

If departments wish to adopt or substitute higher writing standards than those required by the University, or to impose additional specialized writing requirements, they may do so with the concurrence of the Graduate Policies and Programs Committee and the approval of the Dean of Graduate Studies. Higher and/or additional standards are to be applied uniformly to all students classified in that degree program even if they have previously demonstrated writing proficiency at the required university level. The English Department will administer only the university writing proficiency requirement. Therefore, it is the responsibility of the department to administer its own higher and/or additional writing standards if such are required.

Graduate applicants who have not satisfied the writing proficiency requirement prior to the submission of their applications may, upon the favorable recommendation of the department, be classified conditionally, but cannot be advanced to candidacy prior to fulfillment of the writing requirement. Applicants otherwise qualified for classification in a graduate

program but who have deficient writing examination scores shall be referred to the department in order that its faculty may review the student's overall potential for graduate study and recommend whether the student should be admitted as a "conditionally classified" student while (s)he attempts to remove the writing deficiency or whether the student should be denied classification outright.

If the student is denied graduate classification outright on the basis of writing deficiency, (s)he may not enroll in any 200 level graduate courses or be considered further for classification in that graduate program until (s)he has demonstrated writing proficiency.

Departments who recommend admission of students to "conditionally classified" graduate status prior to the students demonstrating writing proficiency shall have the responsibility of directing the students to take appropriate action during their first semester's enrollment to demonstrate writing proficiency.

The Dean of Continuing Education will schedule extension courses to assist students gain language and writing skills appropriate for graduate study in various disciplines providing there is sufficient demand for such courses. The English Department will recommend to the Dean qualified instructors for these courses and will assist departments on a consultation basis develop appropriate discipline related teaching and testing materials to assist students in meeting university and departmental writing proficiency requirements. The fee structure for these extension courses shall be sufficient to cover the expense of administering a writing proficiency examination to students.

Graduate students will not be permitted to enroll in English 119 classes that are restricted to undergraduates who have failed the Writing Proficiency Examination, but graduate students will be permitted, if space is available, to enroll in English 120A for the purpose of improving writing skills.

Approved May 10, 1982, by the Graduate Policies and Programs Committee

ATTACHMENT B
Academic Senate agenda, 11/10/82

POLICY RELATING TO
UNDERGRADUATE AND GRADUATE DEGREE PROGRAMS

The University structures its academic degree programs in such a way that sufficient breadth and depth experiences are required to ensure maintenance of degree objectives. In the Bachelor of Arts programs, primary degree objectives are 1) to provide the student with a balanced and coherent liberal arts education that expands one's knowledge and appreciation of the world and enhances his or her ability to deal constructively with life's experiences; 2) to provide the student with appropriate content, methodology, applications in a recognized discipline sufficient to support entry into related vocations or advanced study, or to enhance one's own personal knowledge or skill. The liberal arts function is provided through the University's general education program and related liberal arts electives. The second function is provided by academic major and minor requirements.

Bachelor of Arts Degree majors require a minimum of 24 upper division units and are limited to 45 units including lower division prerequisites. Corequisite units required for completing the major, but taken from a different major field are included in the 45 unit limit unless an exemption is recommended by the University Curriculum Committee and approved by the School Dean and the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The comprehensive liberal studies degree program which includes both major and general education requirements is currently exempt from the 45 unit limitation.

The Bachelor of Science Degree has the same primary objectives as the Bachelor of Arts Degree but is grounded in scientific methodology and emphasizes applications in a wide range of technical and professional fields. Bachelor of Science majors require a minimum of 36 upper division units exclusive of corequisite requirements and are limited to 60 units in the major field, inclusive of lower division requirements. Exemption to the unit limitation of Bachelor of Science programs are made in the same fashion indicated for Bachelor of Arts programs.

Bachelor's degrees in designated disciplines such as Bachelor of Music or Bachelor of Vocational Education carry the same primary objectives as the other baccalaureate degrees, but are more structured and prescribed in major content in order to meet specific vocational or professional goals. Major requirements including all pre-requisites and corequisites may not exceed the difference between the units specified in the general education program, other all-university requirements, and the total number of units required for the Bachelor's degree.

Graduate study is designed to advance knowledge and competencies in specific content areas of individuals holding baccalaureate degrees. It is presumed those engaging in graduate education possess the requisite undergraduate preparation in the liberal arts and appropriate discipline areas to support scholarly discourse and activity. Students found deficient in undergraduate foundation preparation may be denied graduate admission or required to take additional undergraduate work to qualify for classified graduate standing.

The Master of Arts Degree, an extension of the Bachelor of Arts Degree, is grounded in liberal traditions and directed toward the mastery or application of specific content material. Degree programs are designed to prepare individuals for entering related career fields, doctoral programs or other professional areas of study. Master of Arts programs are limited to a 30-unit requirement, exclusive of qualifying undergraduate prerequisites, including units associated with the culminating experience.

The Master of Science Degree, an extension of the Bachelor of Science Degree, is grounded in liberal traditions, scientific methodology, and is directed toward the mastery or application of scientific or technological principles in specific content areas. Degree programs are designed to prepare individuals for entering related career fields, doctoral programs or other professional areas of study. Master of Science programs are limited to a 30-unit requirement, exclusive of undergraduate prerequisites, including units associated with the culminating experience.

Master's degrees in designated professional fields such as Business Administration (MBA), and Social Work (MSW) are designed to prepare individuals to enter specified career fields. These degree programs commonly considered training for practitioners in the field are grounded in liberal traditions, with appropriate foundation study in related arts and science curricula necessary to support the acquisition of professional knowledge and skill in the specific content area. Master's programs in designated professional areas are limited to a 60-unit requirement, exclusive of undergraduate prerequisites, including units associated with the culminating experience.

Exemption from the unit limitation for Master's Degrees are made only upon the recommendation of the appropriate school/division, university review bodies, School Dean/Division Chair, Vice President for Academic Affairs, approval of the President with the concurrence by the Chancellor. Current exceptions are the interdisciplinary Master of Arts program in International Affairs with a limitation of 48 units, the Master of Science program in Counselor Education with a limitation of 60 units, and the Master of Arts program in Speech Pathology and Audiology which exceeds the maximum by 1-3 units.

Students seeking a second master's degree must offer at least 51 units total for both degrees when each degree is a 30-unit program. Comparable totals may apply proportionately when degrees of more than 30 units are involved. Basic requirements for level of courses, culminating requirements, residency, and other university rules apply to all second master's students.

Undergraduate degree programs are expected to include at least five courses with no fewer than fifteen units that are common to the degree program. Graduate degree programs are expected to include at least three courses with no fewer than nine units, excluding independent study, field work, and the culminating experience, that are common to the degree programs.

To maintain program viability, graduate programs are to be scheduled so that students can reasonably expect to complete a thirty unit degree program within two academic years. Enrollments in the program are to be sufficient for the sponsoring academic unit to support the offering of at least 36 units of course work, exclusive of independent study, field work, or the culminating experience (thesis or project), within four semesters. Of these thirty-six units, the nine units common to the degree program are to be offered annually with the scheduling pattern designed to permit students to take at least 27 units of degree applicable course work, exclusive of independent study, field work, or the culminating experience, during a two-year period. Graduate programs whose enrollments do not support consistently the offering of this scheduling pattern may be discontinued or admission to the program suspended, in the manner prescribed by University policy for the discontinuation or suspension of academic degree programs.

To maintain program viability, graduate programs are to be scheduled so that enough courses are offered to insure completion of a 30-unit program within two academic years. As a standard, graduate programs shall offer each year the nine units common to the degree program and at least nine additional units of degree applicable course work. Over a two-year period, 18 units of 200-level courses shall be offered, exclusive of supervisory units, and these units shall not include repeated offerings of the same course. The offerings should be varied enough to allow, and the scheduling pattern should permit, students to take at least 27 units of degree applicable course work, exclusive of supervisory units, over a two-year period. Consideration shall be given to the diverse nature of programs and courses when evaluating program and enrollment viability. Graduate programs whose enrollments do not support consistently the offering of this scheduling pattern may be discontinued or admission to the program may be suspended upon the recommendation of the Graduate Policies and Programs Committee after a formal review of the program. Such program reviews, unless otherwise scheduled, normally take place every five years.

Amendment adopted by Academic Senate Executive Committee on 10/20/82.

UNIVERSITY ARTP COMMITTEE'S
INTERPRETATION OF THE ROLE AND AUTHORITY OF
DEPARTMENTAL CHAIR IN MATTERS OF FACULTY APPOINTMENT

The Faculty Manual, section 4.10.03 states, "the Department Chair shall consult with a committee comprised of tenured members of the department prior to transmitting to the school dean/division chair the department's recommendation for a faculty appointment. In addition, input regarding a prospective candidate's qualifications may be solicited from non-tenured faculty of the department and from students."

The Committee concludes that the above language means that the department chair shall transmit only the appointment recommendation of the tenured faculty committee (TFC), because this recommendation is the department's recommendation.

The term "consultation" in the above section means that the department chair may try to convince the tenured faculty committee of a certain course of action, but if the chair's position is different from the TFC, the latter's position shall prevail. Furthermore, this consultation doesn't oblige the TFC to agree with the chair.

The Faculty Manual, section 3.14.02,A, specifies that (the chair shall) "supervise the recruiting of faculty and staff in accord with the department's programmatic needs and in keeping with the legal mandate of Affirmative Action."

The Committee concludes that the use of the term "supervise" does not give the chair any special authority.

We note that the Public Employment Relations Board (PERB) decided that departmental chairs are part of the faculty bargaining unit and not supervisors because the collective bargaining law (HEERA) specifies that "a departmental chair...who performs the foregoing duties primarily in the interest of and on behalf of the members of the academic department, unit or program, shall not be deemed a supervisory employee solely because of such duties..." (the "foregoing duties" include hiring).

We conclude, then, that since the department chair's supervision of recruitment is done on behalf of the department and since the department's position is reflected in the TFC's recommendation, he or she is bound by the TFC's appointment recommendations.

Fiscal Affairs Committee response to the document entitled,
"Guiding Principles for Designating Core Majors"

As a separate document, the "Guiding Principles for Designating Core Majors" obscures, rather than clarifies, the intent of identifying core major programs. Undergraduate majors in certain disciplines are recognized as core programs by trustee policy and by the University because of their academic content and centrality to the goals and objectives of the University. Although core major designation is a factor in determining the allocation of resources to Arts and Sciences, student demand and program priorities within individual departments must be considered.

Under the proposed model, all programs that have core major designation gain the same "benefits" in terms of the total number of units protected during a two-year period. The Program Profiles prepared by the University Planning Committee (April, 1980) identify the BA major and general education/service functions of numerous A & S departments as having equal priority, if the major qualified for core major status. A list of these departments FTE by level (Fall 81) and number of majors (Fall 81) are provided in Attachment B2.

Although core programs with low student demand (e.g. French, German, Humanities, Physics, and Philosophy) may "benefit" under the proposed model, in that a specified number of units (75 units) scheduled over a two-year period will be protected to preserve the integrity of the major; high demand core major programs in departments that also have a high demand for general education/service courses (e.g. Biological Sciences, English, Government, and Psychology) will be affected adversely. Under the proposed model, departments would be required to reduce the number of undergraduate core major courses/sections to a minimum level, regardless of student demand, in order to meet increasing demand for general education/service courses. Such a model is likely to result in an erosion of the quality of the undergraduate core major and a decline in the number of students majoring in the discipline.

Since the model fails to consider program priorities, student demand, and other functions (e.g. professional undergraduate and graduate major programs) of academic units, Fiscal Affairs Committee recommends the following:

1. Rejection of the document entitled, "Guiding Principles for Designating Core Majors" as a general model for the allocation of resources.

- 2. Inclusion of the following statement in the "University Planning Profiles for Academic Units" as a guideline for the allocation of resources to departments with core majors with below normal budget enrollment levels (item #3 under the section heading - Core Program Support):

"For core majors which fall below normal budget enrollment levels, the maximum number of units protected over a two-year period is 75. However, various configurations may be used in scheduling the 75 units."

- 3. University Planning Committee review of Program Profiles and academic unit responses to the 1982-83 Academic Affairs Budget Committee Program Planning and Budget Statement for the purpose of preparing recommendations for the allocation of resources to and within academic units in a manner which is consistent with the units' program priorities, student demand, and demonstrated program need.
- 4. Submission of the revised University Planning Committee Profile for academic units to the Senate for action.

Approved by Fiscal Affairs Committee 11/1/82.

Attachment: "Guiding Principles for Designating Core Majors"

... (faded text) ...

... (faded text) ...

GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR DESIGNATING CORE MAJORS

Core majors are designated to enhance the institution's ability to offer a strong liberal arts program. Liberal arts degree programs are an extension of liberal arts foundation offerings and, therefore, are considered essential for the maintenance of a viable liberal arts program. Core majors are not designed to provide preferential treatment to some degree programs and not others, neither is the core major designation an academic standard for any degree programs.

The core major designation is primarily an administrative tool for dedicating a specified amount of University resources yearly to Arts and Sciences to assist in the maintenance of basic liberal arts majors within core disciplines. These majors might otherwise be lost if only need and demand criteria were considered in allocating resources. All formula generated resources could possibly be consumed by Arts and Sciences disciplines in fulfilling the School's first instructional priority of providing liberal arts foundation courses through offering GE and service courses. Beyond this special dedication of funds to support partially liberal arts majors, all University degree programs, regardless of where they are housed administratively or whether they have core major designation, are subject to need and demand criteria, and may be subject to enrollment limitations if demands exceed the University's targeted enrollment for the discipline.

Configuration and Allocation of Resources to Core Majors

1. Core majors require at least five common courses totaling not less than fifteen units. (This requirement is a system-wide policy as well as a local one for all undergraduate degree programs regardless of whether they enjoy core major status.)
2. Programs that have core major designations all gain the same benefits in terms of the total number of units protected

during a two-year period. The maximum number of units protected within a core discipline over a two-year period is 75. However, various configurations may be used in scheduling 75 units. If the number of common courses offered yearly is increased, the number of other protected courses decreases proportionally (e.g., Physics requires 39 common units in the BA program. The number of protected electives offered over a two-year period will depend on how many of the common units are offered yearly.).

3. Professional programs and specialties subsumed under core disciplines are not eligible for "protected status" under core major designation. When applicable, courses in the core major designation may also support professional and/or subdiscipline specialties, but the professional nature of the program or the diversity of the disciplines' specialties are not causes for increasing the number of protected units within the core major designation.

ATTACHMENT E
Academic Senate agenda, 11/10/82

Why the G.E. Committee should hear appeals regarding courses accepted for or excluded from the G.E. program:

First and foremost, and regardless of the fact that the administration of the G.E. program has been turned over to the School of Arts and Sciences, G.E. is a University program. All native students are required to complete the program and all schools, divisions, and departments of the University are entitled to submit courses for inclusion in the program. This being the case, it seems appropriate that a University committee be involved at some point in the decision process. The G.E. Committee is the logical committee and the appeal process is the logical point in the overall process.

THE G.E. COMMITTEE IS THE LOGICAL COMMITTEE

The G.E. Committee is the logical committee because it is the University committee with the greatest expertise. In addition to formulating recommendations on the program itself, this committee constructs the criteria by which courses are evaluated.

The G.E. Committee is the logical choice because it has broad University representation which the Academic Council of Arts and Sciences lacks. Unlike members of the Academic Council, G.E. Committee members were elected to this committee specifically because of their interest and involvement in general education issues. Further, the G.E. Committee is directly accountable for its actions to the Academic Senate since it is a committee of that body, whereas the Academic Council is accountable (and indirectly so) only to the faculty of Arts and Sciences.

The G.E. Committee can devote most of its agenda to hearing appeals, whereas the Academic Council regularly has a full agenda devoted to other matters.

Finally, it should be noted that the Academic Council is itself not certain that it should do the job. The Council's vote to support the motion that it should hear appeals passed by only a six to five vote.

THE APPEALS PROCESS IS THE LOGICAL POINT
FOR THE G.E. COMMITTEE TO BE INVOLVED

The hearing of appeals is the right point for the G.E. Committee to enter the process since this would guarantee University consideration of the most controversial and trying situations. Further, participation of the G.E. Committee at this point serves to remind us all that G.E. is a University program.

GENERAL EDUCATION POLICY STATEMENT

1. The General Education program is a University program (see Faculty Manual section 3.07.01).
2. Implementation policy (the structure of the process) shall be reviewed and approved by the Academic Senate.

Review Process:

1. The General Education Committee shall propose to the Academic Senate criteria for all categories of the General Education program.
2. The Academic Senate shall forward approved criteria to the School of Arts and Sciences (A&S) Curriculum Committee.
3. The A&S Curriculum Committee shall review all course proposals and determine their conformity to criteria.
4. The A&S Curriculum Committee shall, in addition, within the review process, develop a consulting process for schools outside A&S.
5. The A&S Curriculum Committee shall report the results of course review to the A&S Academic Council.
6. The A&S Academic Council shall review the report from the A&S Curriculum Committee and forward its approval to the Dean of A&S for final approval.

Appeal Process:

1. Departments shall direct appeals to the General Education Committee.
2. The General Education Committee shall make the final faculty decision regarding each appeal. This decision shall be transmitted to the Dean of A&S with copies to the A&S Curriculum Committee, the A&S Academic Council, and the Academic Senate Executive Committee. This decision shall be final except in rare and compelling circumstances. In such cases, if the Dean of Arts and Sciences overturns the decision of the General Education Committee, the Dean shall communicate the reasons in writing to the General Education Committee.

Approved by the Academic Senate Executive Committee, September 29, 1982.

The Academic Council of the School of Arts & Sciences does not agree with the General Education Administration Policies which are being proposed by the General Education Committee. A proposal which was approved by the Academic Council by a vote of 11 to 1 will be offered as a substitute motion at the Senate meeting which deals with this issue. Please read the attached final version of the Arts & Sciences Academic Council's proposal on review and appeal of G.E. courses. It differs from earlier drafts which you may have seen or heard about.

The following reasons support the Council's proposal:

1. The A & S Council's proposal preserves the concept of final faculty review and recommendation on curricular issues by a committee composed entirely of faculty.
2. As a matter of principle, criteria-setting bodies which perform legislative functions (such as the G.E. Committee) should be independent of the body which finally rules on appeals. This principle of independent review was strongly argued by the G.E. Committee in an Oct. 19, 1982 memo to the Council and is embodied in the Council's proposal which keeps these functions separate. The proposal by the G.E. Committee combines both legislative and judicial actions in one committee.
3. The role of the G.E. Committee as the university policy-making body is not disturbed by the Council's proposal. The G.E. Committee would still set general education criteria and guidelines while the School of Arts & Sciences would review courses and appeals of courses as part of the implementation of the G.E. program.
4. Not every professional school is represented on the G.E. Committee, nor is there balanced distribution of Arts & Sciences representatives on this committee. On the other hand, the participation of professional schools, all divisions in Arts & Sciences, and the G.E. Committee itself, is assured at several levels through the Council's proposal. At the course review level, voting representatives from appropriate schools will serve on each review advisory committee. In addition, a member of the G.E. Committee will serve as an ex-officio member of each subcommittee. If a course is appealed, the University's G.E. Committee will make an independent recommendation to the Council.

GENERAL EDUCATION ADMINISTRATION

A. Course Submission Procedures

1. Courses proposed for the General Education program will be reviewed by the Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee as a part of its normal review process.
2. The Dean of Arts and Sciences, in consultation with the Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee, will establish deadlines for submission of courses to be considered for the General Education program.
3. General Education course proposals from the professional schools
 - (a) must be courses approved by the home departments for their appropriateness for the departments' curriculums, and by the respective school curriculum committees; and
 - (b) must be sent by the school deans to the Dean of Arts and Sciences within the established deadlines, for evaluation of their suitability for the General Education program.
4. A check-off form must accompany all courses proposed for the General Education program. (Contact the Office of the Associate Dean for Curriculum and General Education, Arts and Sciences, ext. 6504, for the forms.)
5. The decision of the Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee to approve or reject courses for the General Education program and the Dean's decision will be transmitted to the proposing academic unit by the Arts and Sciences Dean's Office.

B. Review Process

1. The Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee will form five advisory committees, one for each area of the Title 5 General Education categories. Department, program, and professional school representation on each area advisory committee will be in relation to the substantial number of courses offered in a given area and shall be determined by the Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee.
2. The membership of each area advisory committee shall consist of the following: 1 representative from each of the departments, programs, and professional schools assigned to the committee, including 2 members from the Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee, and 1 non-voting liaison member from the General Education Committee. Departments, programs, and professional schools shall hold internal elections for representatives to serve on assigned advisory committees. Each unit may be represented on more than one advisory committee but may not have more than one representative on any given advisory committee.

3. The Associate Dean of Arts and Sciences (Curriculum and General Education) is an ex officio member of these advisory committees and acts as a resource/liaison person with the Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee. All proposals for inclusion in the G.E. program will be sent to the advisory committees by the Arts and Sciences Associate Dean.
4. The advisory committees will review the proposals in a timely manner and send their recommendations to the Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee through the Arts and Sciences Associate Dean.
5. The Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee may accept or reject the advisory committees' recommendations.
6. If, in rare and compelling circumstances, the Dean of the School of Arts and Sciences overturns the decision of the Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee, the Dean shall communicate his/her reasons in writing to the Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee.

C. Appeals Process

1. Departments shall appeal actions of the Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee to the Arts and Sciences Academic Council, which shall seek the recommendation of the General Education Committee before rendering a decision concerning the appeal.
2. The Academic Council's appeals decisions shall be transmitted to the Dean of Arts and Sciences with copies to the Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee, the General Education Committee, and the Academic Senate Executive Committee.
3. If, in rare and compelling circumstances, the Dean of the School of Arts and Sciences overturns the decision of the Academic Council, the Dean shall communicate his/her reasons in writing to all concerned committees.