

A C A D E M I C   S E N A T E  
O F  
C A L I F O R N I A   S T A T E   U N I V E R S I T Y  
S A C R A M E N T O

Minutes

Issue #9

November 19, 1987

**ROLL CALL**

Present: Alexander, Barnes, Barrena, Beckwith, Bess, Brackmann, Burger, Cook, Cordero de Noriega, Dillon (Parliamentarian), Farrand, Favila, Gillott, Harralson, Kellough, Koester, Lee, Martell, Maxwell, Mills, Moore, Nicola, Palmer, Phelps, Radimsky, Raske, Rehfuss, Rice, Rios, Rodriguez, Rombold, Sauls, Savino, Scheel, Shannon, Sharp, Strong, Sullivan, Tobey, Tooker, Torcom, Tzakiri, Van Auker, Yousif

Absent: Figler, Fitzwater, Hamilton, Kaltenbach, Madden, Stephens, Wycosky

**INFORMATION**

Invited Guests

Dr. Claudia H. Hampton  
Member, Board of Trustees (1974-1994)  
The California State University

Dr. Ray Geigle  
Chair, CSU Academic Senate  
and Professor of Political Science  
CSC, Bakersfield

Open Forum--Faculty Professional Development (See Attachment A)

**ACTION ITEMS****\*AS 87-88/FA, Ex., Flr. LOTTERY FUNDS (DISCRETIONARY) FOR CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT**

The Academic Senate recommends adoption of the following policies and procedures for use of the 1987-88 "discretionary" Lottery Funds (\$60,000) allocated for Curriculum Development.

**Curriculum Development Mini-Grants****Program Objective:**

The key aim of this grant program is to encourage the development of projects which would improve curriculum or programs in accordance with the mission and goals of the California State University, Sacramento. Proposals must address both current and long-range curricular or programmatic needs and priorities identified by department, school, University or the California State University.<sup>1</sup> In specific terms, it is expected that funded proposals will involve and benefit a program, departmental major, concentration or emphasis, or interdepartmental curricular coordination. These Mini-Grants are not intended to support individual faculty professional development.

**Guidelines and Priorities:**

Awards ranging from \$100-\$3,024 may be used for various categories of support: travel, student assistance, materials, conference registration, library research, and up to three units of assigned time (\$1,008/unit). Projects must accomplish one or more the following:

1. Fulfill immediate curricula needs of CSUS mandated by revised CSU admission and high school graduation requirements;
2. Meet changes recommended by departmental curriculum priorities, program reviews, accreditation reports, and/or other professional assessments or documents. (For example, student internship programs; revision and creation of course sequences; updating course content in light of new ideas/applications; and/or undergraduate student research.)

---

<sup>1</sup>University priorities are identified in the University Resources and Planning Committee's "Plans and Priorities" statement available in the Dean's Office of each school.

3. Encourage cross-disciplinary cooperation and interaction among faculty. For instance, multicultural curriculum planning; explorations of new theories, methodologies, or practices which are common across disciplines.

Project Administration:

1. Applications may come from individuals or from groups. Given the nature of the aim to emphasize the collective impact of the proposal on the department or other academic unit, applicants shall secure the signatures of the Chair and send an informational copy of the application to the Dean.
2. A Review Committee to screen proposals for both the 1987-88 Curriculum Development Mini-Grants and the Instructional Improvement Workshops will be appointed by the Executive Committee of the Senate. The membership shall include: three faculty members from the School of Arts and Sciences, one faculty member from each of the four professional schools, one non-instructional faculty member, one ex-officio, non-voting member appointed by the Vice President for Academic Affairs, and one ex-officio, non-voting member from the ad hoc Committee on Faculty Professional Development. Applicants may not serve as members of the Review Committee.
3. The Review Committee will forward its recommendations regarding funding of the proposals to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. Any recommendation that this committee may have on policies or committee procedures will follow the regular Senate channels and deliberations.

Carried.

\*AS 87-89/FA, Ex., Flr. LOTTERY FUNDS FOR INSTRUCTIONAL  
ENHANCEMENT

The Academic Senate recommends adoption of the following policies and procedures for use of the 1987-88 "Program Improvement" Lottery Funds (\$14,148) allocated for Instructional Enhancement Workshop Programs.

Instructional Enhancement Workshops

Program Objective:

The key aim of this program is to encourage the development of workshops which would enhance the instructional programs of California State University, Sacramento, in accordance with its mission and goals. The objective is to seek faculty who would

organize and conduct instructional enhancement workshops. Faculty with specific expertise in the subject areas listed below are invited to submit applications for the preparation and delivery of workshops involving faculty from one or several disciplines.

Guidelines and Priorities:

Awards will be for up to three units of assigned time to the faculty workshop leader. In general, workshops will be planned and conducted during Spring 1988. In special cases awards might be granted to prepare a workshop during the spring which would be held in the summer or fall. The workshops may require a varying number of sessions in a number of possible styles including both group and tutorial formats. The underlying outcome of each workshop(s) should be the development of and experimentation with instructional strategies, the integration of new technology into instructional programs, and/or the promotion of cross-disciplinary interaction and cooperation.

Proposals are sought in the following three areas:

1. Quantitative Analytic Skills
  - discipline-based computer training
  - computer applications to instruction (SPSS set-ups; modeling; simulation games; behavioral research)
  - courses designed to include students as "participants" rather than "observers" with hands-on emphases
2. Non-Quantitative Analytic Skills
  - teaching problem-solving
  - developing skills in reasoning and logic
  - incorporating emphasis on reasoning skills
3. Oral Communication
  - discussion as an instructional method
  - lecturing effectively
  - small group learning methods

Project Administration:

1. Applications may come from individuals or from groups and must contain the signature of the Chair. An informational copy of the application should be sent to the Dean.
2. A Review Committee to screen proposals for both the 1987-88 Curriculum Development Mini-Grants and the Instructional Improvement Workshops will be appointed by the Executive Committee of the Senate. The membership shall include: three faculty members from the School of Arts and Sciences, one faculty member from each of the four professional

schools, one non-instructional faculty member, one ex-officio, non-voting person appointed by the Vice President for Academic Affairs, and one ex-officio, non-voting member from the ad hoc Committee on Faculty Professional Development. Applicants may not serve as members of the Review Committee.

3. The Review Committee will forward its recommendations regarding funding of the proposals to the Dean for Faculty and Staff Affairs. Any recommendation that this committee may have on policies or committee procedures will follow the regular Senate channels and deliberations.

Carried.

AS 87-90/FA, Ex. LOTTERY FUNDS--PROCEDURES

The Academic Senate entrusts the ad hoc Committee on Faculty Professional Development with the following tasks related to the Curriculum Development Mini-Grants Program and the Instructional Improvement Workshop Program:

- preparation of application procedures
- preparation of reviewer rating forms
- preparation of final report forms.

Carried.

**FIRST READING** (See Attachment B)

AS 87-91/GE, Ex. GENERAL EDUCATION PROGRAM, RESOLUTION ON

Whereas, CSU, Sacramento is about to begin a program review of General Education, and

Whereas, The CSU, the UC and the CCC are currently negotiating a common transfer G.E. curriculum [see draft attached] that will set standards for all lower division students seeking bachelors degrees from any CSU or UC campus; therefore, be it

Resolved That the Academic Senate recommends:

1. A moratorium on program changes (courses additions or deletions would still be permitted) to General Education until,
  - a) the completion of the review.
  - b) conclusion of intersegmental negotiations,
  - c) the revision of Title V Section 40405 (or the determination that no changes will be made).

2. In order to insure timely and appropriate campus planning and action
  - a) the energetic monitoring of, attendance at and participation in the activities of CSU system and intersegmental committees including but not limited to the CSU G.E. Advisory Committee
  - b) the funding to provide the mentioned monitoring, attendance and participation.
3. Consideration by appropriate school deans and the Academic Vice President of a temporary limitation on tenure track hiring in any department whose enrollment might be substantially reduced or altered by implementation of any proposed core transfer curriculum.
4. Regular reporting at intervals no greater than 60 days by the G.E. administrator and the G.E. Committee chair to the Chair of the Senate and the Academic Vice president on the current status of the program review, and the progress of intersegmental and CSU system initiatives.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

  
Janice McPherson, Secretary

\*President's approval requested.

OPEN FORUM ON THE TOPIC OF FACULTY PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

**Introduction--Chair Barrena**

The topic of this open forum--Faculty Professional Development--is receiving a great deal of attention at the systemwide level as well as individual campuses. Although we have always recognized that faculty professional development activities, including research, participation in professional meetings and other activities designed to keep faculty current in their disciplines and improve teaching effectiveness, are essential to achieving the goals of our teaching mission, we can now begin to be optimistic about these activities being supported by our local administration, the system, and hopefully the State.

The principal source of this optimism is the Report of the Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education which contains two encouraging recommendations. The first appears in recommendation #2 on the mission of the CSU, that reads, "Research, scholarship, and creative activity in support of its undergraduate and graduate instructional mission is authorized in the California State University, and shall be supported by the State." The second appears in recommendation #17 that reads, "The Governor and the Legislature, by providing adequate state financial support, and the governing boards, by policy, shall actively encourage and support faculty professional development."

There has been an active joint effort on the part of the Statewide Academic Senate, the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees, and the CFA to convince the joint Legislative Committee on the Master Plan, chaired by Assemblyman Vasconcellos, that these recommendations be adopted. As part of this effort, the statewide Academic Senate has paid particular attention to the definition of research, scholarship and creative activity and faculty professional development. A resolution adopting a comprehensive statement on faculty professional development will appear on the January agenda of the Statewide Academic Senate (copy distributed to Senators). This issue has also been identified as a high priority by the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees as evidenced by the inclusion of a program change proposal in the 1988-89 support budget (copy of the PCP distributed to Senators). Specifically, the PCP requests \$7.5 million for support of research, scholarship and creativity in the form of mini-grants, summer fellowships and leaves for research, scholarship and creative activity. In addition, \$4 million has been requested for the enhancement of teaching

effectiveness and \$2.9 million for recruitment of faculty.

So, where are we now? Whether we have 50 cents or \$5 million to support faculty professional development, we must have a comprehensive campus plan for faculty professional development, consistent with systemwide guidelines, that defines the scope and purpose of faculty professional development activities, delineates the priorities of the campus, and provides a mechanism for the allocation of funds in support of these activities. To this end, the Faculty Affairs Committee has established an ad hoc Committee on Faculty Professional Development. The membership of the Committee was described in my cover letter to the agenda. The purpose of this open forum is to provide input to the Committee for their use in the development of the plan.

#### **Comments--President Gerth**

President Gerth commented briefly on the importance of the Senate's consideration of the issue of faculty professional development and its work on the development of a campus plan to the future and good health of the University. The President noted that the issue of faculty professional development is "a piece of a greater puzzle related to workload in general and the whole question of what it means to be a member of the faculty in terms of role and in terms of support for that role."

#### **Comments--Trustee Hampton**

Trustee Hampton informed the Senate of her particular interest in the items on the agenda. She noted that the Trustees, through herself as representative of the system on the Master Plan Commission, did insert the language related to research, scholarship, and creative activity in the CSU mission statement and asked for the mandate that there be state support of these activities. She emphasized the fact that the "fleshing out and implementation (of the Program Change Proposal on research, scholarship, and creative activity and the other two PCP's that relate to faculty in the budget) properly belong within the province of the Senate." She indicated that she was pleased to be able to "listen and accept input" from the faculty and learn more about "where additional support is needed" in order to maintain the proper role of a Trustee which she described as an "advocacy role" and a "support role."



### **Comments--Chair Geigle**

Chair Geigle informed the Senate that the System has submitted a Program Change Proposal (PCP) requesting \$7.5 million for support of research, scholarship and creative activity. He noted that the category of research, scholarship and creative activity has been defined as a category separate from faculty professional development, and that funds for faculty professional development have been requested in the "compensation package" in the budget. Chair Geigle explained that this approach was taken since it is not as easy for the Governor to "blue pencil" items in the compensation package as it is to "blue pencil" requests in the form of a PCP. Chair Geigle indicated that in relation to defending the budget, "good examples and anecdotal information does best in the Legislature." He requested that we provide "specific applications in how both these activities (the research category and the development category) uniquely and by themselves, improve instruction." He noted that, based on previous experience with the Legislature, "we (the CSU) can't go and say that we want to do research like the University of California," and that the approach that has been taken by the CSU is to state that "all of our research and all of our development is student centered." Chair Geigle urged that we "read the revised mission statement (in the Report of the Master Plan Commission) very carefully." He indicated the Statewide Academic Senate needs to know whether we (the campus) is committed to the entire mission statement. He reminded the Senate that the first part of the mission statement states that research, scholarship, and creative activity is authorized and shall be supported, but that the second part states that the CSU "shall have a particular responsibility...for research in elementary and secondary instruction and for conducting research related to the instructional use of new technology." Chair Geigle indicated that the second part was equally important and that "whether the Statewide Senate can or cannot support that language is a function of whether you (campus senates) tell us to." Chair Geigle noted that it was clear to the Statewide Senate that campus senates support the first part of the mission statement, and that it was important for campus senates to discuss the second part of the statement and indicate whether the Statewide Senate should support it.

### **Comments from the Floor**

Comments from the floor addressed the following issues:

1. The general issue of faculty workload and support for research and faculty professional development.

2. The definition of research.
3. Whether support and administration of support for research and faculty professional development should be combined or separate.
4. Relative priorities assigned to research and faculty professional development.

Frank Darknell, Professor of Sociology, stated emphatically that what is needed to promote faculty professional development is a 9-unit teaching load. Professor Darknell suggested that the Senate reject the limited funds made available for faculty professional development as a protest and go on public record demanding a reduction in teaching load. President Gerth agreed that it was imperative that there be a change in faculty workload and indicated that the Statewide Senate leadership, union leadership, campus presidents, the Chancellor, and the Board of Trustees are united on this issue. President Gerth suggested that it would be wiser to spend our time figuring out how to accomplish a reduction in workload rather than debating whether or not it should be done.

Several senators spoke to the issue of how research and faculty professional development have been defined at the systemwide and campus level. Specifically, senators (Alexander, Barrena, Sharp) objected to the position taken by the Statewide Academic Senate, referred to in Geigle's opening comments, that "all of our research and all of our development is student centered" since it suggests that faculty in the CSU do not engage in the kind of research conducted at the University of California. Barrena reported that the consensus reached at a recent Statewide Academic Senate Retreat was that the CSU should not attempt to define research in the CSU and how it differs from research in the UC, but should address differences in the range and purpose of research in the CSU compared to the UC. Peter Sharp, Management, suggested that the role of research in the CSU should be argued as a human resource development issue, essential to providing a quality instructional program.

Senators and guests also expressed opposition to the narrow definition of research used by the campus Research and Scholarly Activity Committee in awarding assigned time grants. This opposition was expressed by Senators Brackmann, Tzakiri, and Moore, and by Claude Duval, Chair of the Department of Foreign Languages. Specifically, these individuals objected to the Research and Scholarly Activity Committee's decision to use the 15 faculty positions allocated for research to fund "traditional"

research only, and argued that, at the campus level, research should be broadly defined to include "traditional" research, "applied research," and research in direct support of instruction.

With regard to the question of whether the categories of research and faculty professional development should be combined or separate, arguments in favor of separation (Senators Tzakiri, Brackmann and Sharp; Professors Curry and Reinelt) prevailed. It was noted that, at one time, equal numbers of faculty positions were available for support of faculty program development activities and research, and that, somehow, positions for the former disappeared. It was argued that funds for faculty/program development must be restored and that, at a minimum, faculty/program development activities should be supported at a level equal to support of research activities.

Janelle Reinelt, chair of the ad hoc Committee on Faculty Professional Development, delivered a poignant statement that summarized the sense of the Senate on the issue of support of faculty professional development and research. Professor Reinelt acknowledged the feelings of frustration and unhappiness with the current situation and the division it has caused within the faculty. She identified inequity and inadequate funding of faculty professional development as key issues, and noted the need to go forward with the development of a policy that provides appropriate redress.

RESOLUTION ON GENERAL EDUCATION--FIRST READING

**Introduction--Chair Barrena**

The resolution on General Education (AS 87-91) is introduced as a **First Reading** item to introduce the Senate to the proposed transfer G.E. curriculum and its possible impact on the campus' G.E. program. At this time, the Senate is not expected to act on the resolution or to deal with the specific content of the proposed transfer G.E. curriculum. Rather, the Senate is expected to become informed about the issues and the process that will involve campus senates in future stages of the development of the transfer G.E. curriculum.

**Comments--Richard Kornweibel, Chair, General Education Committee**

Kornweibel reported that the G.E. Committee, about one year ago, began work on what it thought would be a deliberate and careful examination of the campus G.E. program. He noted that this process has been overtaken by another process at the statewide level (i.e., the development of a transfer G.E. curriculum) and that the two processes would take place simultaneously. Kornweibel stated that the G.E. Committee will move ahead with its examination of the campus G.E. program and "will consider internally generated considerations for modification of G.E., and do it in a timely way to account for whatever changes occur on a statewide or systemwide level."

**Comments--Ray Geigle, Chair, CSU Academic Senate**

Geigle presented a brief history of events leading to the development of the G.E. transfer curriculum. He reported that it had its genesis, about 2-1/2 - 3 years ago, in the state legislature in beginning discussions about the establishment of a commission to review the 1960 Master Plan. He noted that, in these beginning discussions, various constituencies, including the Statewide Academic Senate, were contacted by legislators to advise them on whether a review was desirable and to identify issues that should be addressed. Geigle reported that staff people to Vasconcellos, Hart, and Hayden said that "they were inundated in one category over and above every other one, and that was the issue of transfer from the Community Colleges to the California State University and the University of California."

Geigle also reported that various minority organizations had stated that "the Community Colleges were a closed door for minorities, . . . and that there were barriers (to transfer) that could be removed." Geigle suggested that this was a major consideration on the minds of most legislators with whom the Statewide Academic Senate had discussions on whether the Master Plan should be reviewed, and that the current issue (i.e., the G.E. transfer curriculum) had its origin in their input on the question of how and where we are spending our money in higher education to accomplish transfer.

Geigle noted that these preliminary discussions were followed by the establishment of the Commission, and that over a two-year period, these same groups convinced the Commission that the "Community Colleges in the State of California are weaker than they ought to be and weaker than the state can tolerate." Geigle stated that, in his opinion, all 17 Commissioners were committed to the proposition that, when the review of the Master Plan was complete, the Community Colleges would be stronger and that the major area in which they would be stronger would be transfer. He indicated that this commitment took many configurations in the Master Plan Report, and noted, in particular, the recommendation that the two four-year institutions should not exceed a 60/40 ratio (60% upper division/40% lower division). Geigle explained that since the UC currently exceeds this ratio, implementation of the recommendation means that as much as 6% of the enrollment at the UC would have to be shifted to the Community Colleges, and that the position of the Legislature is that if students are shifted, they must be guaranteed access to four-year institutions. Geigle noted that there were many elements of the Master Plan that address the issue of transfer, and that it is important to recognize that the G.E. transfer curriculum is only one part of a very large package. He noted that this element (the G.E. transfer curriculum) has about a two-year history, and related anecdotes about student problems with transfer that he had heard from legislators. Geigle suggested that there was some basis for concern about transfer in CSU as well as the UC. Geigle indicated that, although CSUS is the example that is used to demonstrate how articulation should be done, that it is done less well in the rest of the state. Geigle indicated that we (the CSU) have done less than an adequate job of articulating our own G.E. program, and that students are faced with different requirements when they transfer between campuses of the CSU. Geigle stated that the Statewide Academic Senate's response to the Master Plan Commission's finding that we (higher education) have not addressed, as well as we ought, the question of transfer, has been that "we know all those things, but what we chose was richness of curriculum, and we were willing to have the student pay a transfer cost in order to have this richness." He added that we (the CSU) have told the Legislature that "as an

academy, we don't know everything that can be known about general education" and that "if we knew the perfect model that every human being ought to have in G.E., then we could have perfect reciprocity. Geigle stated that we have told them that we don't what that (the perfect model) is, and, therefore, it is very good for the academy and its is very good for students to have this much variability in general education programs on the campus. Geigle reported that the response of the Legislature to this position is that we may keep our richness but we must increase what we're doing in terms of transfer. Geigle noted that the Legislature and the Statewide Senate are paying particular attention to the transfer function in terms of "equity" considerations.

Geigle reminded the Senate that this issue reached the Intersegmental Senate (Executive Committees of CCC, UC, and CSU) sometime last summer after a 2-1/2 year history. He referenced, in paraphrased form, the recommendations of the Master Plan Report, that served as the basis for the development of a transfer curriculum by the Intersegmental Senate. Specifically, he cited the following recommendations: 1) "There will be among the three segments of higher education in the State of California a transfer core curriculum," and 2) "students who would be ineligible for entry into the UC or CSU must complete the entire lower division transfer general education core. Geigle informed the Senate that the Statewide Senate frequently reviews legislative bills that might negatively impact on higher education and must constantly request that the Legislature refrain from "writing our curriculum," and that we (the CSU) have been successful in convincing them not to do so on the grounds that we are able to solve the problems internally.

To illustrate how the Legislature might dictate to the CSU, Geigle informed the State about AB 1725, an Omnibus Community College Bill, that tells the Community Colleges how to set up shop and conduct their business. Geigle suggested that we must act to address the issue of transfer in order to avoid legislative imposition of a transfer curriculum. Geigle informed the Senate that the UC Council (equivalent to the CSU Statewide Academic Senate) had already proposed a general education program (40 unit semester program) that would allow for full reciprocity among their nine campuses, and that the proposal also allows campuses to retain specific G.E. programs. Geigle noted that the UC brought their new proposal to the first meeting of the Subcommittee of the Intersegmental Senate, and that our (CSU) faculty brought Executive Order 338 (The CSU G.E. program), and explained that the document developed by the Intersegmental Committee represents compromises among the segments. Geigle

emphasized the fact that implementation of a transfer G.E. curriculum does not prohibit campuses from retaining individual G.E. programs for native students.

Geigle summarized his presentation by stating that the proposed G.E. transfer curriculum is sent to us (local senates) for advice. He stated that he thinks that there are sufficient pressures that we cannot avoid. He noted that many faculty might take the position that we have a good enough G.E. program and that the cost that we're paying for the quality of the program is about right. Geigle indicated that he didn't think that we can get away with that position, and that if we don't do something, someone else will. However, he indicated that this was a recommendation we could make and that the Statewide Academic Senate would take seriously. He suggested that another form a recommendation might take is to suggest that the transfer program consist of fewer units. Geigle stated that the Statewide Academic Senate invites our input over whatever time period is appropriate. He indicated that discussions might last many months, beginning with input from the 19 campuses, action by the CSU Senate, and, finally, the Intersegmental Senate.

#### Comments from the Floor

Many of the comments from the floor dealt with the issue of whether a problem actually exists. Bob Bess, Executive Vice President, who, in his previous position in the Chancellor's Office, heard many of the anecdotes referred to by Geigle, stated that with regard to the CSU, since certification of the G.E. program was put in place in 1968, no one has presented a bona fide case. He noted that we have in place a policy framework which permits students at any of the community colleges and the campuses of the CSU to present a 39-unit package to any CSU campus. Bess suggested that given this reality, it seems that the only thing being accomplished by the G.E. transfer curriculum is to include the University of California. Geigle countered Bess' argument essentially by noting that campuses and students don't follow existing rules. Barrena suggested that the approach being taken does not address the basic issue which, in her opinion, is failure of campuses to engage in effective articulation. Ted Hornback noted that articulation is a very important issue with curricular implications and is complicated further when all three segments are involved. Hornback also argued that it was foolhardy to think that our native students could be treated differently from transfer students, and that whatever program is developed for Community College students would have to be provided for native students. John Maxwell objected to the development of the G.E. transfer curriculum in order to address the inability of students to make decisions

about their lives. Geigle countered Maxwell's argument by providing examples of changes students make that are beyond their control.

Tohru Yamanaka returned to the question of defining the transfer problem, noting that, in his experience the problem is not G.E., but meeting major requirements, and asked why the Legislature and the Statewide Senate have focused their attention on G.E. Geigle responded that the ideal model envisioned by the Legislature, which they believe will facilitate transfer of students, particularly minority students, is a common G.E. program. Pat Rice supported Yamanaka's argument, stating that it has not been demonstrated that G.E. is a problem. Jean Torcom, recognizing political realities, suggested that an effort be made to educate legislators "who don't really know what they are doing, but are perfectly willing to move in and make law there anyway." Geigle answered that we would have to have very reliable data to convince them that what they believe is happening is not happening. He added that Community Colleges would present opposition to this position. Torcom expressed bewilderment over this response since it was her understanding that students regularly transfer to CSUS and their G.E. is done. President Gerth noted that "it takes two to articulate" and that CSUS and U.C., Davis are very open to articulation with the Community Colleges. Gerth also noted that the Los Rios Community College District and other nearby community colleges are quite different from most community colleges in the state with regard to attention given to their transfer function. Hornback noted that the development of a G.E. transfer curriculum does not diminish the need for articulation of content of specific courses. Kornweibel directed the Senate's attention to the G.E. resolution on the Senate's agenda which calls for a moratorium on G.E. changes pending resolution of the question of the G.E. transfer curriculum, and noted that the G.E. Committee has no preconceptions on how to respond to the G.E. transfer curriculum and is open to input from the campus.