

1990-91
ACADEMIC SENATE
California State University, Sacramento

AGENDA
Thursday, February 28, 1991
2:30 - 4:30 p.m.
Forest Suite, University Union

INFORMATION

1. Spring 1991 Academic Senate Meetings (Tentative Schedule)
Thursdays, 2:30-4:30 p.m.
Forest Suite, University Union (unless noted otherwise)
March 14 (ad hoc Committee on Resource Allocations)
March 21
April 4 CLS 1003 (if needed)
April 11
April 25
May 2
2:30-3:00, '91-92 Nominations
3:00-4:30, '90-91 Senate
May 9
May 16
2:30-3:00, '91-92 Elections
3:00-4:30, '90-91 Senate

REGULAR AGENDA

Old Business

AS 90-132/GE G.E. PROGRAM, RACE AND ETHNICITY REQUIREMENT--
IMPLEMENTATION

Carried
The Academic Senate recommends that:

Courses accepted to satisfy the Race and Ethnicity requirement may be upper or lower division courses. A student may also satisfy the requirement at a community college upon completion of an appropriate course.

To ensure that courses taken at other institutions meet the established general education criteria, the G.E. Administrator and the Articulation Officer shall develop a system of regular consultation on general education with area community colleges.

As part of the pattern of consultation, the Articulation Officer shall request meetings of community college administrators and faculty with CSUS administrators and faculty regarding the CSUS Race and Ethnicity requirement. Among other goals, these meetings will do the following:

1. Inform community colleges of the intent and criteria used to evaluate courses proposed for the requirement at CSUS;
2. Offer to work with community colleges in developing or selecting courses;
3. Request that community colleges send course information (catalog description, syllabus, etc.) on any course identified as meeting the requirement to the G.E. Administrator; and
4. Inform community colleges that CSUS wishes to work in a collegial environment but that it might object to the listing of a course if the CSUS G.E. Administrator had serious reservations.

The Articulation Officer shall inform the other California Community Colleges of the CSUS requirement and inform them that their students upon matriculation at CSUS would be able to request (with documentation) that an appropriate course be reviewed for acceptance.

AS 90-132A/Ex. G.E. PROGRAM, RACE AND ETHNICITY REQUIREMENT--
IMPLEMENTATION

[The Executive Committee introduces a motion to substitute the following text for AS 90-132.]

The Academic Senate recommends that:

Courses taken to satisfy the Race and Ethnicity in American Society requirement may be upper or lower division courses, but must be taken in residence at CSU, Sacramento. As in all other cases with regard to General Education requirements, students may petition for exception.

Carried AS 90-133/GE, Ex. G.E. PROGRAM, RACE AND ETHNICITY REQUIREMENT--
-CRITERIA STATEMENT (Translates AS 89-91)

The Academic Senate recommends that the following criteria statement be added to the CSUS "General Education--Breadth Requirements" after the criteria statement for Categories A-E:

Race and Ethnicity in American Society

Courses approved for this category must meet the criteria for this category and one of the other categories (A-E) in the General Education program. Courses in this category shall be designed to examine the culture, contributions and social experience of historically underrepresented ethnic/racial minority groups in the U.S. including, but not limited to, Asian American, ~~Black~~ African Americans, Mexican Americans and Native Americans. The content of the courses must focus

on at least two of these groups or, if one group is the focus, then there must be evidence that the experiences of the group is compared and contrasted with those of another group. In addition, the courses shall include an analysis of concepts of ethnicity, ethnocentrism and racism and how they shape and explain the ethnic experience in the U.S. How factors such as race, class, gender, age and sexual preference orientation shape the ethnic experience in the U.S. should be examined ~~when appropriate to the course content.~~ ~~*Courses to satisfy this requirement must be taken in residence.~~

~~*Added only if AS 90-132A is adopted.~~

New Business

Carried
AS 91-12/G.E., Ex. G.E. CONTENT REVISION--AREA D1 (Amends AS 90-84A)

The Academic Senate recommends amending Area D of the General Education Program pattern description in the Class Schedule, as follows [amendment underscored], for implementation Fall 1992:

Area D. The Individual and Society (15 units)

The nine units taken in Areas D-1 and D-2 must be taken in at least two different subject designations. If two courses are taken in Area D-1(a), they must be from different subject designations.

DISCUSSION ITEM

Review of Courses for General Education Listing
(Responds to AS 90-32; see Attachments A-E)

In the Spring 1990 semester (March 15, 1990), the Academic Senate adopted AS 90-32, as follows:

*AS 90-32/Ex., Flr. G.E. COURSES, PROCEDURES FOR SELECTION OF
[responds to AS 89-75 and AS 89-79C.2]

The Academic Senate requests that the School of Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee review its current procedures for review and selection of courses for listing in the General Education Program as described in Arts and Sciences policy statements titled "General Education Advisory Committees Policies and Procedures" and "General Education

Administration." The Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee shall recommend revision, as necessary to insure the objectivity of the course review process and insure participation of faculty from schools other than Arts and Sciences. In this regard, particular attention should be given to the modification of the current area subcommittee structure to reflect the universitywide character of the G.E. Program. The Academic Senate requests that the School of Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee submit proposed procedures for initial review and selection of G.E. courses to the Senate prior to implementation of any revision of the G.E. Program.

Specific Topics for Discussion

1. Review committee charge
 - a. development of definitions and evaluation standards pertaining to area criteria
 - b. Evaluation of courses for G. E. listing
 - c. Recommends/approves courses for G.E. listing (to be determined)
 - d. Periodic review of courses included in the program for reapproval of listing
 - e. Periodic review of area or subarea criteria, requirements and standards
 - f. Periodic assessment of achievement of area objectives
2. Comparison of models (Attachment E)
3. Debate issues:
 - a. Number of review committees
 - b. Committee composition (should composition be related to involvement in G.E. or not related to involvement in G.E.?)
 - c. Membership selection process (appointed or elected and by whom?)
 - d. Authority for G.E. listing
 - 1) Should it be a one step or two step process?
 - 2) If two step, what group should have authority for G.E. listing?
 - e. Appeal process
 - 1) Should it be a one step or two step process?
 - 2) What group(s) should hear the appeal(s)?



California State University, Sacramento

SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95819-2694

SCHOOL OF ARTS AND SCIENCES
OFFICE OF THE DEAN
FAX (916) 278-5787

California State University, Sacramento
6060 J Street
Sacramento, California 95819

DEC 14 1990

Academic Senate Calendar
413

MEMORANDUM

December 12, 1990

To: Juanita Barrena, Chair
Academic Senate

From: *Dick*
Dick Kornweibel, Chair
General Education Committee

Re: System for selection of general education courses

Attached find the recommendation from the Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee. It has been discussed at great length by the General Education Committee. A motion to endorse the recommendation of the A&S Curriculum Committee failed. (I also offered the opportunity for someone to move to endorse an amended version of the recommendation and no motion was offered.) The GE Committee adopted a substitute proposal that will be found at the end of this document.

This is a complex (and not just a controversial) issue. In the very lengthy discussion in the General Education Committee we heard a number of concerns and I will attempt to enumerate them. In my view, there are at least four major areas at issue and I hope that the consideration in the senate recognizes that elements from the Curriculum Committee proposal and the alternative one provided by the GE Committee can be mixed. Other elements could also quite logically be added. What are the major areas at issue: First, should there be several committees or just one? Second, how should the committee or committees be constituted? Third, to whom should the committee or committees report? Finally, how many levels of review/approval/appeal should exist?

Commenting specifically on the Curriculum Committee proposal, perhaps the strongest concern raised in the GE Committee, was with the suggestion of a single committee to do all course selection and review. If anything like the total number of current courses is proposed only the most cursory examination will be possible even using teams. Further, our new program is more complex than the

Page Two

present one. We are subdividing areas B and C and adding new supervenient requirements. All of these will require screening. We have also added provision for the quinquennial review of all courses. With just one committee this will be a constant and ongoing process that might overwhelm even the most dedicated and industrious. Having but one committee also rejects a notion implicit in the current and new program: that it benefits the program by having a continuing group for each area of the program that is especially knowledgeable. Even with more explicit criteria statements, analysis of course proposals will be difficult and the acquired expertise of a committee thoroughly familiar with only one area of the program may be very desirable.

The second topic, how should a committee (or committees) be constituted is the most controversial. I cannot, speaking for the GE committee, do so on this point with utter certainty since there was within the committee a range of opinion, but the majority of the committee does not agree with the A&S Curriculum Committee's implied concern of a perceived lack of objectivity in course review in the present structure. No evidence has been presented to the GE Committee that a lack of objectivity is more than a rumor. One member of the GE Committee and a former member of GERT, asserted that GERT's concerns in this area were first and foremost that approved courses need regular review and second, that area criteria need regular review. Both the A&S proposal and the GE Committee proposal address another concern, that of broader participation in the selection of courses by faculty outside A&S, though by different means. It is interesting that in the GE committee discussion, someone from outside A&S argued against the participation of those outside A&S. However, the majority of the GE committee see benefit in broader participation.

When the A&S Curriculum Committee was asked to review current procedures for listing of courses it was not specifically asked to review reporting relationships or levels of review/approval/appeal. It did not and certainly should not be faulted for not doing so. In its discussion the GE committee did raise these issues and as you will see proposes that course approval committees report directly to the GE committee. The proposal also suggests that the committees approval (rather than recommend to a second body) and that the appeal process be severely pruned. Under current policy, an area committee recommends to the A&S Curriculum Committee. Its decisions are appealable first to the A&S Council, then to the A&S Dean, and then to the GE Committee. If used with any regularity, this procedure might have half of the faculty involved.

General Education Committee Proposal for GE Course Listing
(As recommended December 5, 1990)

1. Selection of courses for the GE program shall be done by five committees, one each for the E.O. 338 areas. [These committees would also perform the review function as specified elsewhere]. After initial determination of whether a course is appropriate for listing, the same committee will also consider if a course meets standards established for supervenient requirements, unless that responsibility is otherwise delegated.
2. Each of these area committees will be constituted for an academic year with the following membership:
 - A. One member elected by and from the professional schools
 - B. One member appointed by any department (inside or outside A&S) that has listed or wishes to submit for listing courses in the area.
 - C. One member ex-officio from the GE Committee
 - D. The GE Administrator ex-officio.
3. Each area committee should adopt appropriate procedures except that procedures must include the provision that no member will vote on any course from her/his department.
4. There will be established a committee on the Race and Ethnicity requirement. Its composition will be determined in the same manner as the area committees.
5. The action of the committees will list courses for the GE program. Appeals may be made to the GE Committee and its action will be final.

Appeals may be made only by:

- A. A department which requested listing of a course and was denied.
- B. A department or faculty member objecting to the listing of another department's course on the grounds that the approved course does not meet the criteria.

Enclosures

California State University Sacramento
6000 J Street
Sacramento, California 95819

FEB 08 1991

Academic Senate Received

413



California State University: Sacramento

SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95819-2694

SCHOOL OF ARTS AND SCIENCES
OFFICE OF THE DEAN
FAX (916) 278-5787

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

DEC 14 1990

TO: Cecilia D. Gray, Associate Dean
School of Arts and Sciences

FROM: Henry Chambers, Chair *Henry Chambers*
Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee

DATE: October 25, 1990

RE: G.E. Advisory Committee Recommendation

Academic Senate Records
413

The School of Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee has been asked to "review its current procedures for review and selection of courses for listing in the General Education Program . . . and recommend revision, as necessary to insure objectivity of the course review process and insure participation of faculty from schools other than Arts and Sciences. In this regard, particular attention should be given to the modification of the current area subcommittee structure to reflect the university-wide character of the G.E. program."

The A & S Curriculum Committee met on Thursday, October 25 and voted to approve the following proposal for a newly constituted G.E. Advisory Committee:

A 13 member advisory committee, 9 from the School of Arts and Sciences (3 each from Sciences and Mathematics, Behavioral and Social Sciences, and Humanities and Fine Arts) and 1 from each of the professional schools (a total of 4) shall be elected by all university faculty. Candidates with demonstrated interest and expertise shall be nominated by their respective departments, 1 nomination per department.

All Advisory Committee members shall be elected for one, two or three year terms. No more than one member of a department may serve on the committee at the same time. No serving member of the University G.E. Committee or the A & S Curriculum Committee can be a voting member of the G.E. Advisory Committee. One ex-officio member each from the University G.E. Committee and the A & S Curriculum Committee will serve on the G.E. Advisory Committee. The Advisory Committee will review all courses for the General Education Program.

Cecilia D. Gray
October 25, 1990
Page 2

Advisors/consultants with no voting rights may be used as resources and brought in by the committee for assistance when needed. Two person teams, one member from the general discipline area and another member from the committee, will review courses and make a recommendation to the Advisory Committee.

The General Education Administrator will be an ex-officio non-voting member of the Advisory Committee.


HC/ph

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO

Department of English

November 14, 1990

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

TO: General Education Committee
FROM: Vernon T. Hornback, Jr. 
Member, A & S Curriculum Committee
SUBJECT: Composition of Committee Charged
with Reviewing GE Course Submissions

DEC 14 1990

Academic Senate Received
413

The General Education Committee will vote today, as I understand it, on whether or not to accept the A & S Curriculum Committee's recommendation on the composition of the committee charged with reviewing GE course submissions, and the sentiment on the Committee is running strongly against the recommendation. I am writing in support of our recommendation, and because I would like to see this latest new GE program succeed where so many others have failed--failed despite high hopes, good intentions, and, on paper at least, a rational and workable structure. I think most faculty on this campus who have been around long enough to remember the various permutations and mutations our GE program has endured will agree that, almost without exception, each new program started off fairly well, but each new program more or less quickly degenerated into a political game of FTE distribution, with relatively little concern for the value of the program to the students. Eventually each new program became a grab bag of courses often only marginally relevant to the category in which it was approved. The principal reason for this inevitable deterioration lay in the course review process. In recent versions of Ge, each category of courses has had its own review committee, composed of representatives of departments which had strong self-interest in the category. To gain representation, a department had to have a certain number of courses approved in the category. Then the game became, Protect Out Turf, when it wasn't Enlarge Our Turf. Having served on several of the subcommittees which reviewed new course proposals, and having had a long (and agonizing) concern over General Education, I am only too despairingly aware of how quickly a review committee is politicized, how quickly members appointed as representatives of their departments come to see themselves as responsible first and foremost for protecting their constituency.

In designing a review committee, it was the primary concern of the A&S Curriculum Committee to the greatest degree possible to create a review process which would accomplish three goals: to assure broad University representation; to assure participation of faculty from all four professional schools, and from the three large curricular areas of Arts and Sciences; and to minimize the possibility that individual members would see themselves as representatives--in the sense of narrow self-interest--of any

curricular constituency. This last point is, I believe, crucial if the review process for courses submitted for inclusion in the new GE program is to have credibility and win the respect and consent of the faculty. To this end we adopted provisions governing the selection of members. First, the entire faculty will vote on the membership of the Committee. The "divisions" of A&S and the four professional schools will have their own representatives, but these representatives will be nominated by departments within the school or division, but elected at large. Thus faculty in one school will be able to help shape the selection of representatives from another. Candidates with a reputation for partisanship are less likely to be elected. The kind of candidate who will prove successful is more apt to be seen as fair and impartial, a person considered trustworthy by faculty of all schools and divisions. The perennial complaints that "campus politicos" control everything would not apply here. Elected members would have their mandate from the University faculty, not their department, division, or school.

Since the new GE program will affect only those students whose catalog rights do not entitle them to an earlier one--mostly entering Freshmen--there will be ample time for a thirteen member committee, assisted at their discretion by specialists from curricular areas acting as consultants, to review courses in time for them to be included in the GE program when it is fully "online." I urge your approval.

GENERAL EDUCATION ADMINISTRATION

A. Course Submission Procedures

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

B. Review Process

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

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

C. Appeals Process

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

REVIEW OF COURSES FOR G.E. LISTING

Comparison of Models

| <u>Feature</u> | <u>Current Model</u> | <u>G.E. Committee Model</u> | <u>A&S Curriculum Model</u> |
|-----------------------------|--|--|--|
| Number of review committees | 5 area advisory committees + separate area advisory committees for race and ethnicity and advanced study. | 5 area advisory committees + a separate area advisory committee for race and ethnicity. | A single advisory committee for all areas, with provisions for subcommittee review of area courses and use of "resource" persons. |
| Committee composition | 1 representative from each of the departments, programs and schools assigned to the committee (see below); 2 A&S Curriculum Committee members; 1 G.E. Committee member (non-voting); 1 A&S Associate Dean. | 1 elected professional school representative; 1 member appointed by any department (inside or outside A&S) that has listed or wishes to submit for listing courses in the area; 1 G.E. Committee member; 1 G.E. Administrator. | 9 A&S members (3 each from the divisions in A&S); 4 professional school members (1 from each school); 1 G.E. Administrator (non-voting). |

Note: Race and Ethnicity area committee membership differs from above and is specified by Senate action.

| <u>Feature</u> | <u>Current Model</u> | <u>G.E. Committee Model</u> | <u>A&S Curriculum Model</u> |
|----------------------------|--|---|---|
| Selection process | Department, program and professional school representation is determined by the A&S Curriculum Committee in relation to the number of courses offered in a given area. | Professional school representative elected by and from the professional schools. Departments meeting the specified criteria appoint their own representative. | Nominated by departments, elected at-large. |
| Authority for G.E. listing | Department, program, school representatives elected by the respective unit. | | |
| Appeal process | Recommends to the A&S Curriculum Committee which may accept or reject recommendation. | Approves or rejects courses for G.E. listing. | Not specified. |
| | Made to A&S Academic Council, which shall consult with the G.E. Committee. In addition, other policies provide that a final appeal may be made to the G.E. Committee. | Made directly to G.E. Committee. | Not specified. Other policies provide that appeals shall be made (finally) to the G.E. Committee. |