

BRING YOUR COPIES OF AUGUST 22 (RETREAT) AND SEPTEMBER 14 AGENDA!!

1989-90
ACADEMIC SENATE
California State University, Sacramento

AGENDA

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

INFORMATION

1. Please bring your copy of the August 22 (Retreat) and Attachment A of the September 14 Agenda.
2. Academic Senate Meetings:

Thursdays, 2:30-4:30 p.m., Forest Suite, UU
October 12
October 26 *OCTOBER 19 - PLAYWRIGHTS THEATRE*
November 9
November 30

REGULAR AGENDA

[See August 22, 1989 Agenda for original motions and Attachment A of September 14 Agenda for proposed amendments/procedural motions.]

- 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

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



California State University, Sacramento

6000 J STREET, SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95819-2694

ACADEMIC SENATE



M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: September 22, 1989

TO: Senators
Department Chairs

FROM: Juanita Barrena, Chair
Academic Senate

SUBJECT: Academic Senate Meeting--September 28, 1989

=====

The Academic Senate will meet on September 28, 1989, from 2:30-4:30, in the Forest Suite (3rd floor University Union). The Agenda (enclosed) consists of action items related to recommendations in the General Education Review Team Report. Please bring your copy of the August 22 Senate Agenda which contains the text of the main motions and your copy of the September 14 Agenda which contains the text of amendments to the motions proposed by the Executive Committee.

I would like to explain (again) how the agenda has been constructed and what the "position" of the Executive Committee is on agenda items. It was, in fact, the position of the Executive Committee that the Senate consider each of the recommendations in the GERT report. In order to enable the Senate to do so, it was necessary to formulate motions that dealt with each of the recommendations. As a courtesy to the Review Team, the Executive Committee chose to present each motion in the form of an endorsement, in principle. In addition, the Executive Committee chose to place the items on the agenda without recommendation. That is, the Executive Committee did not take a position on whether or not the recommendations should be endorsed. I understand that a number of senators and others members of the academic community have expressed concern about the manner in which the motions are presented (i.e., use of the phrase "endorses, in principle") in that they view it as committing the Senate to a course of action without sufficient time to consider the issues. In each case, where the Senate believes that it would be premature to endorse a recommendation (even in

principle) or does not believe that it is necessary to express its sentiment on the recommendation to the individuals charged with developing proposals, but wishes to have a proposal developed for consideration, the Senate may amend the motion to read, the "Academic Senate accepts for consideration" rather than "endorses, in principle." The Senate may also move to table or postpone to a definite time any of the motions or it may conclude its consideration of the recommendation by defeating the motion. If the Senate wishes to assert, for the record, its opposition to specific recommendations, it may, following defeat of a motion "to endorse, in principle" or "accept for consideration" adopt a motion stating that the Academic Senate opposes the recommendation.

Amendments proposed by the Executive Committee also do not necessarily have the support of the Executive Committee. They were formulated to enable the Senate to address specific issues raised during the first reading of the main motions. When each item is introduced, the Senate must first dispose of the proposed amendment and then take up the main motion. As a matter of course, when the main motion is before the Senate, and the main motion contains the phrase "endorses, in principle" I will entertain a motion to amend by substitution of the phrase "accepts for consideration." Such an amendment, if introduced, is subject to debate and disposition prior to the introduction of other amendments to the main motion.

When the main motion is again before the Senate, it will be subject to debate and further amendment. When the main motion consists of several parts, I will try to order the debate to focus on the parts in sequence.

Well, I have now either clarified the process or made it more confusing. Nevertheless, I would like to make a few additional comments on the matter of the agenda and the process that the Senate is engaged in. The Senate is not acting on a package recommended by GERT. Rather, it is considering individual recommendations. The Senate may, at this time, endorse some, accept others for further consideration, without endorsement, and reject others. Finally, by adoption of AS 89-73, the Senate committed itself to considering the GERT recommendations, it did not commit itself to revising the program. If, in the Senate's judgment, following consideration of the recommendations, it determines that no change is necessary, it will remain, as is. In light, however, of the 1985 WASC report on CSUS accreditation which contains recommendation concerning the current G.E. program (Attachment A) and the new WASC standards pertaining to G.E. (Attachment B), the Senate must be prepared to provide evidence to the WASC team that will visit the campus in March 1990 that the WASC recommendations have been or will be addressed or that the standard on G.E. is, in fact, met by the current program.

Re: September 28 Senate Meeting 3

September 22, 1989

The only other item that I would like to bring to your attention is a memorandum prepared by Bob Foreman, chair of the GERT. The memorandum (Attachment C) was prepared by Professor Foreman, at my request, to respond to some of the questions and concerns raised at the meeting on September 14. Senators interested in obtaining a copy of the External Review Team Report referenced in Professor Foreman's memorandum should contact the Senate Office (x6593).

JB:jlm

cc: Members, General Education Committee
Attachments A through C
Enclosure - September 28 Senate Agenda

Excerpted from June 1985 report of the Western Association of
Schools and Colleges (WASC) on CSUS accreditation, pages 11-12:

Related to these efforts to develop a coherent and defensible undergraduate program, more attention is needed in curtailing the demands of certain departments and programs for so much of the student's time that these students have few, if any, courses that can genuinely be called electives. The Team notes with approval that Engineering has been asked to reduce its undergraduate requirements in the major field to the one-half level by the time the next catalog is prepared.

General Education

Another area that needs serious attention is General Education. The Self-Study highlights that the General Education program is a problem and the Team's findings support this generalization.

The formal outline of an appropriate General Education requirement is in place, and considerable progress has been made in working out certain aspects of the program, particularly within the last three years. Yet we find that at the present the University does not give ample evidence of compliance with 4.C 2 and 3: there is not a clearly enough stated rationale for the requirements, nor is there adequate evidence of intellectual and internal consistency within the program. Further, the requirements are not met by all students and exceptions seem to be made for "political" rather than educational reasons. It could be that no General Education program at all is preferable to the artifact born in dissension and created out of politics and compromise, and which is perceived by many students as merely an annoying obstacle to the earning of a degree.

The Team recommends that the program in General Education be reviewed by a carefully chosen external committee to be invited to the campus for that specific purpose. Such a review could help bring needed perspective to the many complex issues of policy and alter the nature of the understandable academic politics that make the implementation of these educational policies so difficult.

Excerpted from the WASC Handbook of Accreditation, dated January 1988, pages 25-28:

STANDARD FOUR: EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

STANDARD 4.A **The achievement and maintenance of quality programs is the primary responsibility of every accredited institution; hence, the evaluation of educational programs and their continuous improvement is an ongoing responsibility. As it analyzes its goals and discovers how conditions and needs change, the institution continually redefines for itself the elements that will result in programs of high quality.**

GENERAL REQUIREMENTS

4.A.1 The institution demonstrates its commitment to high standards of teaching and scholarship. Adequate procedures and resources exist to evaluate and improve the quality of instruction.

4.A.2 The institution provides an environment conducive to study and learning.

4.A.3 The structure and goals of all educational programs (including special programs and courses as defined in 4.E) are consistent with institutional purposes; they are developed, approved, administered, and periodically reviewed under established institutional policies and procedures through a clearly defined process.

4.A.4 Degree programs have a coherent design and are characterized by continuity, sequential progression, and a synthesis of learning.

4.A.5 In each field of study, degree objectives are clearly specified: the subject matter to be covered; the intellectual skills and learning methods to be acquired; the affective and creative capabilities to be developed; and, if relevant, the specific career-preparation practices to be mastered.

4.A.6 Efforts are undertaken to develop and implement ways to measure the educational effectiveness of programs.

4.A.7 Whenever the institution admits groups of students with special needs (e.g., international students, disabled students, reentry students) or identifies a group which may have unique needs (e.g., honor students), there are adequate academic support and enrichment services to meet the special needs of these students.

4.A.8 Courses and programs are planned both for optimal learning and accessible scheduling. Programs offered in concentrated or abbreviated time frames are designed to ensure that courses requiring development of analytical skills allow sufficient time to permit reflective analysis of the material. Where such instructional formats are employed, the institution is under a particular obligation to meet the expectations of 4.A.6.

4.A.9 Programs and courses are offered in a manner that ensures students the opportunity to complete the entire program as announced.

4.A.10 Each student is taught by a sufficient number of different faculty to ensure diversity of instruction and exposure to different viewpoints.

STANDARD 4.B
UNDER-
GRADUATE
PROGRAMS

The undergraduate program is designed to give students a substantial, coherent, and articulated exposure to the major, broad domains of higher education.

With a few exceptions, Bachelor's degree programs have a tripartite structure: the General Education segment requires students to master enabling skills for autonomous learning and to develop an understanding of the fundamental areas of knowledge; the Major segment requires students to achieve depth in a specific area; and the Electives segment provides the opportunity for students to select diverse exposure to other areas of interest.

Undergraduate studies as a whole have a clear rationale, and the three segments articulate in such ways as to reflect that rationale. The undergraduate program, as a whole, is characterized by clarity and order, characteristics which are visible in model curricula in official bulletins, and also in student records of actual programs pursued.

4.B.1 When an institution offers more than one Bachelor's degree, the differences in structure and function are clearly stated.

4.B.2 Undergraduate studies ensure, among other outcomes: (a) competence in written and oral communication; (b) quantitative skills; and (c) the habit of critical analysis of data and argument. In addition to these basic abilities and habits of mind, goals also include an appreciation of cultural diversity.

4.B.3 Professional and technical terms are clearly defined, e.g., special major, area of concentration, distribution requirements, experiential learning.

4.B.4 The general education segment of the undergraduate program is based on a rationale that is clearly articulated, informs the design of all courses, and provides the criteria by which the appropriateness of each course to the general education segment is evaluated.

4.B.5 In setting the pattern for general education, an institution specifies the minimum number of general education units to be required for *all* undergraduate students working toward any Bachelor's degree. Where exceptions are provided to special groups of students (e.g., through double counting), they are clearly stated and justified.

4.B.6 General education is integrated with the entire undergraduate program and includes offerings at the upper division level.

4.B.7 The general education program ensures adequate breadth for all students pursuing the Bachelor's degree. Offerings are included that focus on the subject matters and methodologies of the humanities, the natural sciences (including mathematics), and the social sciences; the program may also include courses that focus on the interrelationships between subject matters in these three major disciplinary fields.

4.B.8 The institution has clearly articulated policies for the transfer of credit to ensure that students who transfer in with general education course credits meet its own standards for the completion of the general education requirement. Where patterns of transfer from specific community and junior colleges are established, efforts are undertaken to formulate articulation agreements regarding general education.

4.B.9 The equivalent of two years of study toward the baccalaureate degree will be in general education and unrestricted electives even if this extends the basic program. Institutions which offer programs that do not meet this standard bear the burden of proof that the tripartite goals of the baccalaureate are otherwise met.

4.B.10 Advising procedures are designed and maintained to meet student needs for information and advice. Faculty and other personnel responsible for academic advising are adequately informed and prepared to discharge their advising functions.

4.B.11 Whenever remedial work is required of students who are admitted to any program, clear policies govern the procedures that are followed, including such matters as permissible student load and possible granting of credit; when remedial courses yield credit, students are informed whether or not the units count toward the degree.

4.B.12 A sufficient number of full-time faculty (see 5.A.2) are available to support all undergraduate programs. The number of full-time faculty is proportionate to the type and range of degrees offered and the number of students served.

4.B.13 Except as qualified in 4.E.2, full-time faculty are involved in the delivery of each off-campus program, including providing some physical presence and participating in instruction, in a manner determined by the institution.

4.B.14 Basic library collections, learning resources, and equipment are held by the institution to support all undergraduate degree programs. Library usage is required in all undergraduate degree programs. (See also 6.B.1 and 6.B.2.)

4.B.15 Undergraduate degrees are awarded only by those institutions that offer undergraduate programs. Graduate or professional schools which do not offer complete undergraduate programs refrain from awarding undergraduate degrees to any of their students unless those students meet the undergraduate requirements specified in this standard.

Memorandum to Senators/Department Chairs:
September 28 Academic Senate Meeting



California State University, Sacramento

6000 J STREET, SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95819-2694

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY

September 19, 1989

California State University - Sacramento
6000 J Street
Sacramento, California 95819

MEMORANDUM

SEP 19 1989

TO: Juanita Barrena, Chair
Academic Senate

FROM: Robert A. Foreman
Philosophy

SUBJECT: basis of GERT findings

Academic Senate Received

413

The Anthropology Department's August 31 memorandum to the Senate and some speakers during the September 14 Senate meeting have questioned the basis of some of the findings in the GERT report. From the discussion at the September 14 meeting, it appears that many senators are not aware of the nature and extent of the polling of faculty views which GERT undertook as part of its charge during our GE review last year. You suggested to me that it might be helpful if I wrote an explanatory memo for the benefit of those who had questions about this. So I address the following remarks to the Academic Senate.

GERT's report was the result of a year long examination of the CSUS GE program. One of our charges was to develop and administer questionnaires about GE for faculty, staff, students and administrators, as well as to conduct any interviews and other fact finding activities we deemed appropriate. GERT spent much of the Fall, 1988 semester developing suitable survey questionnaires for faculty, staff, students, department chairs and deans. We developed these after studying similar instruments used on other campuses, and in consultation with some of the faculty from the Sociology Department and staff from the Office of Institutional Studies. We obtained advice not only concerning survey questions but also concerning survey techniques.

The questionnaires included a request for written comments. Because we wanted to ensure that each faculty member had the opportunity to reply to the questionnaire and to submit written comments about GE during the review, we decided to send the questionnaire to every faculty member, both full and part time. The university provided us with a list of some 1100 faculty. We received completed questionnaires from 342 faculty members (also from 448 students in randomly selected advanced study GE sections, 48 librarians and student affairs professional staff members, and 36 department chairs). Analysis of the questionnaire information concerning full v. part time status, length of service, service

teaching area, and so on, indicates that the sample of faculty responding to the questionnaire is a good representation of the faculty as a whole. That, together with the large number of faculty responding gave GERT reason to believe that the survey provided reliable data as to faculty opinions on GE.

The Anthropology Department and some Senate members have charged that GERT's report relies on anecdotal evidence for its findings. I have no idea what they think they have found in the report to support such an allegation (they offered no instances as evidence). Our charge was to report our findings, not to present our many binders full of data, letters and documents. We do not present all the relevant data in our report, but it is simply false that we appeal in our report to anecdotal evidence. We often used examples to illustrate points. But a careful reader can distinguish that sort of thing from the fallacy of appeal to anecdotal evidence. When we have quoted "anonymous written comments," it was always to illustrate a view, not necessarily one we intended to endorse.

I can assure the Senate that there is a great deal of faculty dissatisfaction with GE. In saying that, I report a conclusion for which GERT has ample, solid evidence. However, it must be remembered that faculty sentiment is not the only thing relevant to the evaluation of our GE program. GERT's assessment and recommendations are based on many other things besides opinion surveys. Our GE program has been the object of other studies, including the GE Committee self-studies, the last WASC review, which was critical of many of the same features of our program that GERT faulted, and the External Review Team report, which was in some respects much more critical of the program than was GERT and suggested much more extensive GE reform than does GERT. Our own report was based in part on the assessments reported by these other study groups. We also compared our program against existing standards for GE programs such as Title V, EO 338 and WASC accreditation standards.

Those who suggest that there is nothing wrong with our program may have something to go by in saying this, I don't know what. But the GERT membership was not rigged to ensure ahead of time that all GERT members would be unreasonably biased toward finding fault with the GE program. Our report is the result of a lengthy, conscientious, earnest study. The written report is an attempt to explain as carefully as we could do what we found as a result of our study, and to explain our reasons. There was no dissenting opinion from GERT, even though the charge to us from the Senate provided for a minority report. I do not expect that every one will or should agree with our findings, nor, a fortiori, with our recommendations. But I assure you that we have come to our findings honestly and conscientiously, and that we are intelligent enough to have recognized our limits. When we could find only anecdotal evidence for a view, that is what we reported to you.

cc: members of the Academic Senate

regularly updated. When approved at the institutional and/or board level, it is widely publicized on campus.

B.2. The relationship between institutional purposes and structural programs is clear and is reflected in long-range planning for both on and off-campus instruction.

B.3. The institution engages in periodic review of program or departmental quality under clearly specified and implemented procedures. Policies and procedures for deletion of programs and/or courses are consistently administered and address the needs of faculty and students.

B.4. Institutional renewal is on-going and is based upon current institutional data, which reveal success or failure in achieving purposes and projected outcomes.

B.5. Evidence demonstrates the success of graduates and benefits to the external community in areas consistent with stated institutional purposes.

B.6. Responsibility for curricular design and implementation vested in a designated body or bodies with clearly established channels of communication and control. The faculty has a major role in design and implementation.

B.7. Human, financial, and physical resource allocations are made in terms of academic program needs and objectives and are consistent with plans.

standard 4.C. Undergraduate Programs *

Undergraduate degree programs, while adhering to the principles Standard 4.A., share a commonality of components – general education, a major field, and elective opportunity – with an emphasis on education for humane, ethical, and competent participation in society.

Although there are a variety of baccalaureate degrees—professional, specialized, and liberal arts—the baccalaureate degree itself signifies that the student has attained a certain measurable level of intellectual training and has acquired a sum of liberal learning that incorporates a coherent program of general education, progress toward specialization, and electives. Of

major importance is the general education requirement, which exposes students to varieties of method and content.

Some, though by no means all, components of this standard are:

4.C.1. The general education program emphasizes and promotes basic competence in communication, quantitative skills, and critical analysis and may include the study of foreign language or culture.

✓ 4.C.2. General education is integrated with the entire undergraduate program, relates disciplines one to another, and includes offerings drawn from the sciences, the social sciences, and the humanities.

✓ 4.C.3. General education requirements are based on a clearly stated rationale and demonstrate both intellectual and internal consistency; they are met by all students seeking the degree.

4.C.4. When general education requirements are met through means other than courses, the institution demonstrates that Standard 4.C.1. and 4.C.2. have been met.

4.C.5. Courses required for the major are arranged in a systematic fashion to develop a level of specialization appropriate to an undergraduate education.

4.C.6. Electives are selected by the student out of personal interest or intellectual curiosity. They may reinforce both general education and the major; they may be related to but are not required by the major field of study.

4.C.7. Normally, no more than one-half of the student's studies toward the baccalaureate degree is in the major field, with the rest of the program allocated to general education and electives.

4.C.8. Standards for admission include a definition of communication and quantification skills required for students to begin college work toward a degree at the institution.

4.C.9. Any credits accepted for transfer meet the standards of the degree-granting institution and those of the Commission. (See policy on Transfer and Award of Academic Credit, page 138.)

4.C.10. Follow-up of graduates attempts to measure accomplishment of goals.

*See policy on The Baccalaureate Degree, page 104.

I. STATEMENT OF PHILOSOPHY

As affirmed by the faculty of CSUS, the purpose of this University is to foster the preservation, communication, and development of knowledge, the cultivation of wisdom and the understanding of values that will help ensure the survival of mankind and improve the quality of human life. Furthermore, within the context of free and independent inquiry, the University strives to ensure that all baccalaureate students have a rich and varied curriculum that includes a coherent program of general studies as well as in-depth study in their major field.

In support of the University's stated purpose, the General Education Program at CSUS aims not only to prepare students who are knowledgeable and well informed, but to foster in them:

- a taste for learning in a climate of curiosity and wonder,
- an independent and critical cast of mind based on a respect for knowledge,
- a capacity for creativity and imagination,
- a sense of ethical responsibility that includes tolerance, sympathy for humankind and commitment to improve the quality of life.

The Committee seeks to promote these goals by incorporating the following curricular objectives into the General Education Program at CSUS:

- students are to develop the basic competencies essential for their self-development and for an active and creative participation in modern society. They are to learn to organize and express their ideas effectively in English, especially in written form,
- students are to acquire outside their major field a core of knowledge common to educated persons in our society. They are to gain a familiarity with the principles of natural phenomena, the insights afforded by the social sciences into the human experience, and the contributions of the humanities to the enrichment of human existence,
- students are to acquire broad perspectives on the human experience through a study of both western and non-western civilizations. They are to develop a sensitivity to the dilemmas facing humankind by an introduction to key social issues of the contemporary era.

The skills and knowledge attained in the liberal arts foundations of the General Education Program are to prepare students not only to pursue advanced knowledge in their fields of specialization, but also to make rational and humane examinations of the complex issues that shall confront them in their lives as educated persons. Consequently, the Advanced Study courses in the program offer

the students further opportunity to develop their reasoning and writing skills through an analysis of complex and significant issues selected by the faculty of the University.

Note: FS 79-85/GE,FA,Ex. (11-9-79). Program structure approved as part of FS 79-85/GE,FA,Ex. replaced in 6-2-82.