

BRING YOUR COPY OF THE AUGUST 22 (RETREAT) AND AUGUST 31 AGENDA!!

1989-90
ACADEMIC SENATE
California State University, Sacramento

AGENDA

Thursday, September 14, 1989
2:30 - 4:30 p.m.
Forest Suite, University Union

INFORMATION

1. Please bring your copy of the August 22 (Retreat) and August 31 Agenda.
2. Attachment A: Amendments/procedural motions, related to action items listed below, recommended by the Executive Committee.
3. Academic Senate Meetings:

Thursday, September 28, 1989, 2:30-4:30 p.m., Forest Suite, University Union--Continuation of G.E.

Thursday, October 12, 1989, 2:30-4:30 p.m., Forest Suite, University Union--Regular Agenda

Thursday, October 26, 1989, 2:30-4:30, Forest Suite, University Union--Regular Agenda

FIRST READING

AS 89-92/Ex. G.E. PROGRAM--ENGINEERING/COMPUTER SCIENCE VARIATION

The Academic Senate endorses, in principle, the GERT recommendation that engineering courses taken in lieu of normal GE requirements must be designed to meet GE objectives and area criteria (page 80) and calls for the review of these courses by appropriate area subcommittees.

REGULAR AGENDA

[See August 22, 1989 Agenda for original motions and Attachment A for proposed amendments/procedural motions.]

AS 89-93 RECISION OF AS 89-73 "G.E. PROGRAM REVISION"

Notice is given herein that Senators Hallinan and Wright intend to introduce a motion to rescind AS 89-73.

- AS 89-74/Ex. G.E. - ADMINISTRATION
- AS 89-75/Ex. G.E. - COMMITTEE RESPONSIBILITIES
- AS 89-76/Ex. G.E. - RESOURCE ALLOCATION
- AS 89-77A/Ex. G.E. - SEQUENCING OF COURSEWORK
- AS 89-77B/Ex. G.E. - SEQUENCING OF COURSEWORK
- AS 89-78/Ex. G.E. - TRANSFER EVALUATIONS
- AS 89-79/Ex. G.E. RATIONALE AND OBJECTIVES
- AS 89-80/Ex. G.E. CONTENT AREA REVISIONS - AREA A: BASIC SUBJECTS (WRITTEN COMPOSITION)
- AS 89-81/Ex. G.E. CONTENT AREA REVISION - AREA A: BASIC SUBJECTS (ALL SUB-AREAS)
- AS 89-82/Ex. G.E. CONTENT REVISION - AREA B: THE PHYSICAL UNIVERSE AND ITS LIFE FORMS
- AS 89-83/Ex. G.E. CONTENT REVISION - AREA B
- AS 89-84/Ex. G.E. CONTENT REVISION - AREA C: THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES (FOREIGN LANGUAGE SKILLS COURSES)
- AS 89-85/Ex. G.E. CONTENT REVISION - AREA C-2 (ARTS, HUMANITIES, AND FOREIGN LANGUAGES)
- AS 89-86/Ex. G.E. CONTENT REVISION - AREA D: THE INDIVIDUAL AND SOCIETY (CODE COURSES)
- AS 89-87/Ex. G.E. CONTENT REVISION - AREA D-1 (FOUNDATIONS IN SOCIAL SCIENCE)
- AS 89-88/Ex. G.E. CONTENT AREA REVISIONS - AREAS B, C, D ("FUNDAMENTAL" AND "SECONDARY" COURSES)
- AS 89-89/Ex. G.E. CONTENT REVISION - AREA E: UNDERSTANDING PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT
- AS 89-90/Ex. G.E. CONTENT REVISION - ALL AREAS
- AS 89-91/Ex. G.E. CONTENT REVISION
- AS 89-92/Ex. G.E. PROGRAM--ENGINEERING/COMPUTER SCIENCE VARIATION

AMENDMENTS/PROCEDURAL MOTIONS
(Seconded Motions from Executive Committee)

AS 89-74/Ex. G.E. - ADMINISTRATION

*FOR COM/RECOMMISE, ISEE
RECEIVES FOR DISCUSSION
agreed to amend -*

9/14/89

The Academic Senate ~~endorses, in principle,~~ GERT's recommendation that a ~~full-time administrative position be devoted to the administration of the G.E. Program and that the G.E. administrator be the administrative position with responsibility for G.E. be redefined in such a way as to provide that 1) administration of the G.E. program constitutes the bulk of the position's time and 2) the position is assigned the appropriate degree of responsibility and authority over the full range of academic administrative tasks related to administration of the program (pages 16-17, 49-51).~~ The Academic Senate requests that the Academic Vice President confer with the Dean of Arts and Sciences and other school deans concerning alternative models for administration of G.E., and that proposed models be presented to the Senate by October 1, 1989, for discussion and recommendation to the President.

SHOULD I BACH file

AS 89-75/Ex. G.E. - COMMITTEE RESPONSIBILITIES

The Academic Senate ^{*accepts for consideration*} ~~endorses, in principle,~~ the following GERT recommendations on the responsibilities of the General Education Committee (GEC):

1. "that GEC assume the duty now exercised by ASCC (Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee) of carrying out the ~~initial-course approval process~~" (page 77); ^{*for G.E. listing*}
2. "that GEC conduct periodic reviews of courses approved for the G.E. Program, using the area subcommittee structure that currently reports to ASCC during the course approval process" (pages 17, 74-76);
3. that "GEC is to have responsibility for recommending to the G.E. administrator on general goals related to resource allocation in several categories, including student orientation and advising, special tutorial and remedial course offerings, student and faculty awareness of the G.E. Program rationale and objectives, outcome assessment, and course offerings appropriate to achieving the university's stated G.E. objectives" (page 17); ^{*propose*}
4. that GEC secure information and ~~conduct~~ ^{*propose*} studies appropriate to G.E. outcome assessment and other matters related to its charge (pages 17, 41).

*9/28/89
Course d
as amended*

ed.

ed.

The Academic Senate refers the statement of G.E. Committee membership and charge (Senate Statutes 3.07.01) and AS 82-57 (General Education Policy Statement [on Course Review]) to the G.E. Committee for revision recommendations by December 1, 1989, addressing ~~with~~ the GERT recommendations stated above. The G.E. Committee is to consult with the School of Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee regarding recommendations 1 and 2 above.

ed.
***AS 89-76/Ex. ^{flr}G.E. - RESOURCE ALLOCATION**

9/28/89
Carried
~~The Academic Senate endorses, in principle, GERT's recommendation that "responsibility for determining section offerings and faculty and other allocations pertinent to the G.E. Program should be shifted more fully than they now are to the faculty committees and administrators directly charged with overseeing the G.E. Program" (page 17), and "that the University should seek an alternative method of funding G.E. versus major courses within departments." (page 91)~~

Carried
ed.
The Academic Senate requests that the Academic Vice President confer with the school deans and budget staff concerning the GERT proposal for revision of the current method of ~~fixed~~ allocations determining G.E. section offerings and faculty and other allocations pertaining to the G.E. program (pages 17-18, 88-93) and inform the Senate by November 15 1989, of findings and recommendations related to the proposal.

***AS 89-77A/Ex. ^{flr}G.E. - SEQUENCING OF COURSEWORK**

The Academic Senate endorses, in principle, the following GERT recommendations regarding sequencing of coursework (pages 20, 64-65, 72-73):

- Carried*
ed.
1. "Entering freshmen, and all transfer students who have not successfully completed English 1A^{2b} are required to enroll in the course (in the first semester year at CSUS), or in an appropriate remedial course if EPT scores disqualify them from the English 1A^{2b}. Students in the latter category are required to enroll in the appropriate remedial courses in subsequent semesters and ^{are} to be afforded needed tutoring each semester until they ~~are able to get on track.~~ have completed English 1A^{2b}"
 2. "Similarly, students (including transferees, unless the requirement has already been satisfied) are required to enroll in a suitable G.E. approved quantitative reasoning course their first semester year at CSUS, or in an appropriate remedial course based on ELM." Students in the latter category are required to enroll in the appropriate

remedial courses in subsequent semesters and ^{are} to be afforded needed tutoring each semester until they have completed the quantitative reasoning requirement.

3. Students not otherwise exempt from EPT ^{/EDT} and ELM testing requirements cannot enroll in any classes during their second semester until the tests are taken and scored. Students may not enroll in classes other than English 1A ^{12B}, quantitative reasoning or appropriate remedial courses, subsequent to the first semester unless they have completed the English 1A ^{12B} and quantitative reasoning requirements or are enrolled in courses needed to progress toward completion of those requirements.

The Academic Senate requests that the Director of Admissions and Records provide the Senate, by ^{11/15} ~~October 1~~, 1989, an estimate of the number of additional sections of English 1A ^{12B} quantitative reasoning and associated remedial courses that would be required to implement the requirement over a three-year period and an analysis of the impact on other G.E. course offerings. (~~Note: under this proposal, students not otherwise exempt from the EPT and ELM testing requirements can not enroll in any classes until the tests are taken and scored.~~) Upon receipt of this information, the Academic Senate requests that the English Department, Learning Skills, and departments offering quantitative reasoning courses provide the Senate, by ^{12/15} ~~December 17~~, 1989, with an analysis of the impact of the requirements, if implemented, on their departments, and recommendations for implementation.

*AS 89-77B/Ex. ^{FIR} G.E. - SEQUENCING OF COURSEWORK

^{9/28/89} ^{Carried} The Academic Senate endorses, in principle, GERT's recommendation that "all upper division courses approved for G.E. credit must require second semester sophomore standing and completion of the basic subjects (Area A) and coursework as prerequisites" (pages 15, 70), and requests that the Director of Admissions and Records and the G.E. administrator provide the Senate, by ^{11/15} ~~October 1~~, 1989, an analysis of the impact of implementation of the proposed prerequisite.

*AS 89-78/Ex. ^{FIR} G.E. - TRANSFER EVALUATIONS

^{9/28/89} ^{Carried} ^{Carried} The Academic Senate endorses, in principle, the GERT recommendation that ~~transfer students who have completed a significant number of units be provided exemptions from some of the G.E. requirements which are unique to the CSUS G.E. Program (pages 20, 93-95).~~ The Academic Senate requests that the Director of Admissions and Records in consultation with Evaluations staff review the specific GERT proposal for

~~exemptions recommended by GERT (page 95) providing transfer students, who have completed a significant number of units in G.E. prior to transfer, exemptions from some of the G.E. requirements which are unique to the CSUS program (pages 20, 93-95), and provide the Senate, by November 15, 1989, with a recommended set of evaluation guidelines for transfer students that can reasonably ensure compliance with G.E. objectives without an overly rigid interpretation of the campus unit distribution requirements.~~ data & comments related to the recommendations.

[AS 89-79 divided into three separate motions:]

AS 89-79A/Ex. 1 & 2 G.E. RATIONALE AND OBJECTIVES

- A. The Academic Senate endorses the GERT recommendation to adopt a new statement of G.E. rationale and objectives which "more concretely identify the understandings, skills, competencies, and perspectives or attitudes which the various elements in the program are aimed toward helping students achieve." (pages 10, 38-40) & provides the philosophical principles that underlie the program.
- 2. B. The Academic Senate endorses, in principle, the GERT recommended statement, titled "Rationale and Objectives of the CSUS General Education Program" (Appendix, pages 99-102) and refers the GERT recommended statement to the General Education Committee as a draft under consideration for adoption as a new campus statement with the request that the G.E. Committee review the "draft" and return it to the Senate with its comments and recommendations, if any, no later than October 15, 1989.

AS 89-79B/Ex. G.E. RATIONALE AND OBJECTIVES

- C. The Academic Senate endorses, in principle, the GERT recommendation that the new statement of G.E. rationale and objectives adopted ~~become a part of~~ ^{inform} the course design, course review and approval, and course instructional goals processes. (pages 10-11, 38-40, 45-48)

AS 89-79C/Ex. G.E. RATIONALE AND OBJECTIVES

- DA. The Academic Senate endorses, in principle, the GERT recommendation that the course review/approval process be modified to provide that all courses included currently or proposed for inclusion in the G.E. Program be evaluated and ranked according to the degree that the course satisfies area or sub-area criteria and the relative value the course would have in serving the overall goals of G.E. (page 46)

1/28/89
Dad
Mason

10/19/89

10/19/89
Carved

2.1
table
agreed
& classified

in consultation
with area subcommittee
& academic depts.

agreed

Carried
Cr2
EB. The Academic Senate endorses, in principle, adoption of the rating scale in the course review/approval process as recommended specifically by GERT (pages 46-47) and refers the GERT proposal on modification of the course review/approval process to the General Education Committee for further development in consultation with members of area subcommittees (and recommendation to the Senate by December 15, 1989. ^{acad. depts} not neglecting aspects of the ranking process proposed by GERT *agreed*
agreed
pages

AS 89-80/Ex. G.E. CONTENT AREA REVISIONS - AREA A: BASIC SUBJECTS (WRITTEN COMPOSITION) [No Change]

AS 89-81/Ex. ~~G.E. CONTENT AREA REVISION - AREA A: BASIC SUBJECTS (ALL SUB AREAS)~~

~~The Academic Senate endorses, in principle, the GERT recommendation to include a library skills component (i.e., some instruction in library use and at least one major assignment requiring that students demonstrate use of library skills) as a curriculum requirement in all Area A courses (pages 13, 54), and requests that the Area A subcommittee, in consultation with departments offering courses in Area A and appropriate library faculty, consider the proposal and recommend on its adoption to the Senate by December 1, 1989.~~

Substitute for AS 89-81 above:

AS 89-81/Ex. G.E. CONTENT AREA REVISION - LIBRARY COMPONENT

Carried
The Academic Senate endorses, in principle, the GERT recommendation that students be provided instruction in library use and be expected to demonstrate competence in use of library skills. The Academic Senate requests that the G.E. Committee, in consultation with the Area A Subcommittee and library faculty, consider the GERT proposal to include a library component in all Area A courses (pages 13, 54) as well as other approaches to library instruction, and develop, by December 1, ^{Feb 15} 1989, a recommendation on library instruction for the Senate's consideration. *agreed*

AS 89-82/Ex. G.E. CONTENT REVISION - AREA B: THE PHYSICAL UNIVERSE AND ITS LIFE FORMS [No Change]

AS 89-83/Ex. G.E. CONTENT REVISION - AREA B [No Change]

AS 89-84/Ex. G.E. CONTENT REVISION - AREA C: THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES (FOREIGN LANGUAGE SKILLS COURSES)

The Academic Senate endorses, in principle, GERT's recommendation to eliminate Foreign Language skills courses

from Area C-2 (pages 32, 57-58). However, the Academic Senate reaffirms AS 89-19 that endorses, in principle, the Foreign Language Council's recommendation for a foreign language competency graduation requirement and also endorses GERT's recommendation to require that students admitted on conditional or probationary status who have not satisfied the foreign language entrance requirement be required to complete or demonstrate competency equivalent to one year of coursework in a foreign language. The Academic Senate requests that, by December 1, 1989, the Department of Foreign Languages, in consultation with administrators and other campus bodies, as appropriate,

- 1) provide the Senate with an analysis of the fiscal and staffing impact of elimination of foreign languages skills courses from Area C-2 and a proposal for minimizing the impact should the recommendation be adopted;
- 2) provide the Senate with a proposal to require that students who do not fulfill the Foreign Language entrance requirement be required to complete or demonstrate equivalency to one year of coursework in Foreign Languages; and
- 3) provide the Senate with long-range plans for implementation of the Foreign Language Council's recommendation for a foreign language competency graduation requirement.

The Academic Senate shall consider proposals pertaining to items 2 and 3 above and any other proposals pertaining to the inclusion of a foreign language requirement as a graduation or G.E. program requirement, prior to or in concert with its consideration of the recommended exclusion of foreign language courses from Area C-2.

AS 89-85/Ex. G.E. CONTENT REVISION - AREA C-2 (ARTS, HUMANITIES, AND FOREIGN LANGUAGES)

The Academic Senate endorses, in principle, GERT's recommendation to revise Area C-2 criteria ~~to specifically exclude courses that are not offered by disciplines in the Arts and the Humanities (page 58),~~ and to require that students take at least one course in the Arts and one course in the Humanities (pages 31, 37, 58), and requests that by December 1, 1989, the General Education Committee, in consultation with appropriate departments and area subcommittees, develop a proposed revision of the description of Area C-2 to accomplish these this objectives.

~~AS 89-86/Ex. G.E. CONTENT REVISION - AREA D: THE INDIVIDUAL AND SOCIETY (CODE COURSES)~~

~~The Academic Senate endorses, in principle, the GERT recommendation to eliminate Area D-3 ("Code" courses) from the~~

~~G.E. Program, reducing Area D to a 12 unit area requirement (pages 33, 60). The Academic Senate shall reconsider this recommendation in light of action taken on the proposed requirement for a second semester course in English composition.~~

~~AS 89-87/Ex. G.E. CONTENT REVISION - AREA D-1 (FOUNDATIONS IN SOCIAL SCIENCE)~~

~~The Academic Senate endorses in principle GERT's recommendation to revise Area D-1(a) and D-1(b) to comply with the intersegmental transfer curriculum requirement for 9 units in the social and behavioral sciences (i.e., increasing D-1(a) from 3-6 units to 6 units and increasing D-1(b) from 0-3 to 6 units, and requiring that students have coursework in at least two social or behavioral sciences) (pages 33, 59). The Academic Senate requests that by December 1, 1989, the General Education Committee, in consultation with appropriate departments and area subcommittees, develop a proposed revision of the description of these areas to accomplish this objective.~~

Combine AS 89-86 with AS 89-87 and substitute the following as AS 89-87:

AS 89-87/Ex. G.E. CONTENT REVISION - AREA D

The Academic Senate endorses, in principle, the GERT recommendation to revise Area D, as necessary, to comply with the Intersegmental Transfer Curriculum (page 32) which

- 1) requires three courses (three semester units each) in social and behavioral sciences, in a minimum of two disciplines, or in an interdisciplinary sequence, exclusive of courses used to satisfy "code" requirements;
- 2) specifies that courses taken to satisfy the nine unit requirement must "ensure opportunities for students to develop understanding of the perspectives and methods of the behavioral and social sciences";
- 3) specifies that material in coursework meeting the requirement is to be presented "from a theoretical point of view and focus on core concepts and methods of the discipline rather than on personal, practical or applied aspects"; and
- 4) requires that students completing the requirement "shall have been exposed to a pattern of coursework designed to help them gain an understanding and appreciation of the contributions and perspectives of women and of ethnic and other minorities and a comparative perspective on both Western and non-Western societies."

The Academic Senate requests that the G.E. Committee, in consultation with the Area D Subcommittee and departments offering courses in Area D subareas, as appropriate, review

Area D and consider the specific GERT proposals for revision of Area D [i.e., increasing D-1a from 3-6 units to 6 units and restricting course inclusion in D-1a (Foundations in Social Science) to one lower division course from each of the social and behavioral science disciplines; increasing D-1b (World Civilizations) from 0-3 units to 3 units; maintaining current D-2 (Major Social Issues) subarea unit and criteria requirements; and deleting Area D-3 (American Institutions)] (pages 32-34, 59-60), and submit to the Senate, by December 1, 1989, a report on current Area D requirements and recommendations for revision, as necessary, related to the following issues:

1. compliance with ITC unit and criteria requirements;
2. inclusion or exclusion of "code courses" in relation to other existing or proposed G.E. requirements;
3. relationship of the GERT proposed cultural diversity requirement (referred to by GERT as "Perspectives of Women and Minorities") and the G.E. Committee recommended "race and ethnicity" requirement to Area D, and the possible revision of subarea criteria, in particular subarea D-2 (Major Social Issues), to accommodate the proposed requirements (see AS 89-91).

AS 89-88/Ex. G.E. CONTENT AREA REVISIONS - AREAS B, C, D
("FUNDAMENTAL" AND "SECONDARY" COURSES)

The Academic Senate endorses, in principle, the GERT recommendation to restructure Areas B, C, and D in such a way that students shall be required to selected a specified number of units from a relatively small sub-area list of "fundamental" courses in the physical and life sciences (Area B), arts and humanities (Area C), and social sciences (Area D) and may complete total area requirements by selection of either additional courses from the sub-area list of "fundamental" courses or from a separate sub-area list of more advanced, narrow, or applied courses referred to by GERT as "secondary courses" (pages 11-15, 66-67). The Academic Senate requests that the Chair reconvene an ad hoc committee consisting of 3-5 former members of GERT selected by the Executive Committee for the purpose of developing a specific proposals, by ~~December 1~~ October 15, 1989, pertaining to the restructuring of areas B, C, and D that incorporates related recommendations in the GERT report in a form appropriate for Senate ~~action~~ consideration. The specific proposal developed shall be referred to the G.E. Committee for review. The Academic Senate requests that the G.E. Committee consult with area subcommittees and departments offering courses in these areas, as appropriate, and submit to the Senate, by December 1, 1989, its recommendations on the proposal.

AS 89-89/Ex. G.E. CONTENT REVISION - AREA E: UNDERSTANDING
PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT

The Academic Senate acknowledges the concerns expressed by the GERT regarding the large number (n=116) of courses in Area E, many of which (n=62) are skills acquisition courses in Physical Education, and the apparent inadequacy of the area criteria statement in providing guidance to the course approval process (pages 60-61). The Academic Senate refers the statement of criteria for Area E to the General Education Committee with a ~~request to consult with appropriate departments and the Area E Subcommittee regarding the issues raised and to propose amendments, by December 1, 1989, as needed to address these concerns, and to join to consider the possibility of major revision of Area E to accommodate the GERT proposed cultural diversity requirement (referred to by GERT as "Perspectives of Women and Minorities") and/or the G.E. Committee recommended "race and ethnicity" requirement (see AS 89-91), and to address other issues raised in the GERT report pertaining to Area E, including the specific issue of whether P.E. skills acquisition and other similar courses should be excluded from the category, or, if included, whether the criteria statement should be revised so as to preclude completion of the area unit requirement with P.E. skills courses alone.~~

The Academic Senate requests that the G.E. Committee consult with the Area E Subcommittee and departments offering courses in Area E, as appropriate, and submit to the Senate, by December 1, 1989, a report on its deliberations and its recommendations, if any, for revision of Area E.

AS 89-90/Ex. G.E. CONTENT REVISION - ALL AREAS

The Academic Senate endorses, in principle, the GERT recommendation that, except for some quantitative reasoning and performance courses, all lower division courses in G.E. should include some writing and that upper division courses should include a writing requirement as a significant element (pages 15, 62) and requests that, by December 1, 1989, the coordinators of the "Writing Across the Curriculum" program, in consultation with the Advanced Study Committee, review GERT's proposal (page 62) and prepare a criteria statement for the writing requirement, including recommendations on the nature, extent and timing of writing assignments, instructor response to and use of writing assignments, and class size, for the Senate's consideration.

In addition, the Academic Senate requests that the Advanced Study Committee review the criteria statement for advanced study courses in relation to the proposed writing requirement in all G.E. courses and conduct an evaluation of the advanced study program for the purpose of submitting to the Senate, by December 1, 1989, a report of its findings and recommendations

for continuation, revision, or deletion of the advanced study requirement.

AS 89-91/Ex. G.E. CONTENT REVISION

~~The Academic Senate endorses, in principle, GERT's recommendation to include a 3 or 6 unit studies in cultural diversity (referred to be GERT as "Perspectives of Women and Minorities") as a "supervenient" type of G.E. requirement (pages 34-35, 68). The Academic Senate directs the Chair to place the G.E. Committee's recommendation on the proposal from Ethnic Studies on the Senate's agenda for action, and requests that the Women's Studies faculty develop and submit a proposal to the G.E. Committee by October 15, 1989, for its review and recommendation to the Senate by December 1, 1989.~~

Substitute for AS 89-91 above:

The Academic Senate endorses, in principle, GERT's recommendation to include studies in cultural diversity (referred to by GERT as "Perspectives of Women and Minorities") in the G.E. Program (pages 34-35, 68) that address specific issues pertaining to race and ethnicity in American society as well as broad issues pertaining to diversity. The Academic Senate acknowledges receipt of the G.E. Committee's proposal for inclusion of a race and ethnicity requirement (Attachment) and directs the Executive Committee to establish an ad hoc committee to include one representative each from the Ethnic Studies Program, Women's Studies Program, and G.E. Committee, and two at-large members appointed by the Executive Committee, to develop and submit to the Senate, by November 1, 1989, a proposal (including a rationale and criteria statement) to include studies on other issues pertaining to cultural diversity in the G.E. Program either through infusion of the curriculum, specific area or course requirements, or supervenient requirement. The Academic Senate shall refer the race and ethnicity proposal (Attachment) and proposals received from the ad hoc committee to the G.E. Committee with the request that the G.E. Committee review the proposals and analyze their impact on Areas C, D, and E, and recommend to the Senate, by December 1, 1989, on how studies in cultural diversity should be included in the G.E. Program. The Academic Senate requests specifically that the G.E. Committee consider the possibility of revising Area D-2 (Major Social Issues) and Area E to accommodate the proposed requirements.

PROPOSED G.E. PROGRAM AMENDMENT

RACE AND ETHNICITY IN AMERICAN SOCIETY

The G. E. Committee recommends that the Academic Senate, in the context of its review of the entire G.E. program and in concert with other recommendations for revision of the program that emerge from the review, consider inclusion of a "Race and Ethnicity in American Society" requirement in the G.E. program.

The G. E. Committee recommends specifically that the G.E. program be amended to include a 3-unit "Race and Ethnicity in American Society" requirement. The G.E. Committee further recommends that courses in the G.E. programs used to satisfy this requirement meet the following criteria:

1. Courses shall examine the culture, contributions and social experience of historically underrepresented ethnic/racial minority groups in the U.S. (i.e., Asian Americans, Black Americans, Mexican Americans and Native Americans).
2. Courses shall examine more than one of the above groups. Occasionally, courses that focus on one group may be approved, provided the course includes comparing and contrasting experiences of this group with the other groups.
3. Course content must include an analysis of concepts of ethnicity, ethnocentrism and racism and how these explain and shape the ethnic experience in the United States.
4. Courses should include an examination of such factors as race, class, gender, age, sexual preference, and how these shape the ethnic experience in the United States.
5. Courses should explore the role culture plays in shaping and sustaining ethnic groups. This might be accomplished by specifying courses in Areas C, D, and E that meet the above criteria or by adding a three-unit Ethnic Studies requirement or by replacing an existing G.E. requirement with an Ethnic Studies requirement.

Although the intent of this requirement is that the course be focused on the four specified underrepresented ethnic/racial minority groups, the experience of other groups of people of color in America (e.g., Puerto Rican, Vietnamese, Cuban, Filipino) may also be included as course components.

5/17/89 - Unanimously approved by G.E. Committee



California State University, Sacramento

SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95819-2694

DEPARTMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY

MEMORANDUM

August 31, 1989

To: The Academic Senate
CSUS

From: Executive Committee
Department of Anthropology

The Executive Committee of the Department of Anthropology, after carefully reviewing the CSUS General Education Program Review Final Report and Recommendations and the proposed motions from the Academic Senate Executive Committee, wishes to make the following statement.

Overall, we find the proposed program for General Education on this campus parochial, remedial, and regressive.

While we agree with some recommendations, e.g., an additional introductory composition course and better course sequencing, we are not convinced that such a radical revision of the GE program is either necessary or desirable. The document lacks empirical evidence of faculty dissatisfaction with the current program, other than occasional reference to unspecified numbers of self-selected respondents to GERT inquiries.

As for the proposed program, the alleged smorgasbord has been replaced by a plat du jour, and cultural diversity, which we understood to be policy on this campus, is replaced by ethnocentrism. For example, the reference to foreign language as merely a skill and its exclusion from the GE program is certainly uninformed, and we note with concern the lack of representation on GERT from mainstream social science.

Finally, we are distressed by the report's language and tone that denigrates past efforts in developing and reviewing the GE program on this campus, dismissing them as "political" and without merit. This stereotypes history and assaults the integrity of those people who have devoted themselves to General Education in committees and in the classroom. Our current GE program deserves better.

/sp