

1990-91
ACADEMIC SENATE
California State University, Sacramento

AGENDA

Thursday, April 4, 1991
2:30 - 4:30 p.m.

CLS 1003 (New Classroom Building--Mendocino Hall)

NOTE ↓

INFORMATION

Spring 1991 Academic Senate Meetings (Tentative Schedule)
Thursdays, 2:30-4:30 p.m.
Forest Suite, University Union (unless noted otherwise)

April 11
April 25 *new April 18th*

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

AS 91-24 from page 8.

AS 91-21/Ex.

G.E. REVISION--PROCEDURES FOR REVIEW OF COURSES
FOR G.E. LISTING

Carried
The Academic Senate recommends adoption of the following Procedures for Review of Courses for G.E. Listing. [Note: If adopted, this action amends AS 90-31, AS 90-33, and AS 90-34, as shown in Attachment A (reproduced on GREEN), and, together with AS 90-31 and AS 90-33, supersedes AS 82-57 (Section IV.A, pages 14-15, of the 1989 Statement on General Education--Breadth Requirements--shown in Attachment B) and the current review procedures prescribed in the Arts and Sciences approved policies on "General Education Administration" and "General Education Advisory Committee Policies and Procedures" (Attachment C).]

PROCEDURES FOR REVIEW OF COURSES FOR G.E. LISTING

I. G.E. COURSE REVIEW COMMITTEE

A. Charge

A G.E. Course Review Committee shall be established which shall have the primary responsibility for determining which courses shall be included in the G.E. Program. Specifically, the charge of the Committee shall be as follows:

2. Evaluation of courses for G.E. listing (see section II.C).
3. Approval of courses for G.E. listing (see section II.C).
4. Periodic review of area or subarea criteria, definitions and evaluation standards (see section II.A).
5. Periodic review of courses (see section III).

B. Membership

The G.E. Course Review Committee shall have the following membership:

- 17 voting members, nominated by departments and elected at large, which shall include:
 - 12 faculty members from the School of Arts and Sciences (4 each from science and mathematics, behavioral and social sciences, and humanities and fine arts)
 - 5 faculty members from the professional schools (1 each from Business Administration, Education, Health and Human Services, Engineering and Computer Science, and 1 at-large)

Note: No more than one member of a department may serve as a voting member. No member of the university General Education Committee or the Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee may serve as a voting member. Voting members shall serve three-year staggered terms.*

- 3 non-voting members, which shall include:
 - 1 member selected annually by and from the University General Education Committee
 - 1 member selected annually by and from the Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee

The General Education Administrator

The Committee chair shall be elected annually by and from the voting membership.

*[Note: Initially staggered so that one-third of the Committee is elected each year.]

II. OPERATING PROCEDURES

A. Definitions and Evaluation Standards

The G.E. Course Review Committee shall develop, as necessary, definitions and evaluation standards that further explicate and translate area criteria into operational terms.^a Definitions and evaluation standards shall normally take the form of a "Criteria Check List" which shall be used as the basis for determining whether or not a course shall be listed in the G.E. Program. Departments submitting courses shall be provided copies of criteria check lists and all other information on which course approval shall be based.

Definitions and evaluation standards developed by the G.E. Course Review Committee shall be subject to modification and approval by the university General Education Committee and the G.E. Administrator. Disagreement between committees or between a committee and the G.E. Administrator regarding the intent of provisions of the G.E. program shall be brought to the attention of the Academic Senate. Definitions and evaluation standards shall be reviewed annually.

B. Course Submission Procedures

1. The G.E. Administrator, in consultation with the G.E. Course Review Committee, shall establish deadlines for submission of courses to be considered for listing in the G.E. Program. In order to maintain a reasonable work schedule for the Committee, it may be necessary to limit the number of courses that a department may submit in a given academic year for listing in a particular area. Additional submissions may be invited to ensure that a sufficient number of course sections in each area are offered.
2. The G.E. Course Review Committee shall develop guidelines and necessary forms for departmental requests for course listing in the G.E. Program, which shall include a requirement for departmental justification for listing of the course in a particular area.^a

^a To expedite initiation of course review at the beginning of Fall 1991, the General Education Committee and the University Writing Committee (in the case of the newly adopted writing requirements) have been assigned this task for the Spring 1991 semester.

3. All courses submitted for G.E. listing must be courses that have been approved through the regular course approval process (i.e., approved by the home department, school committees and school dean, university Curriculum Committee and Vice President for Academic Affairs) for inclusion in the University's catalog of course offerings. Departments seeking to list approved courses in the G.E. Program shall submit the request to the G.E. Administrator (when a call for submissions has been made) along with the required justification for course inclusion and other necessary forms and materials. Departments are encouraged to seek the advice of the Committee in developing courses for G.E. listing and in preparing requests for submission of existing courses.

C. Course Review and Approval Procedures

1. Each semester the G.E. Course Review Committee shall establish area subcommittees from its voting membership to conduct an initial review of courses submitted for G.E. listing in the area of subcommittee concern. A minimum of five area subcommittees shall be established (at least one for each of the G.E. areas A - E). In addition, separate subcommittees may be established for supervenient requirements (e.g., race and ethnicity, writing). Each subcommittee shall consist of no fewer than three voting members. A Committee member may serve on more than one subcommittee. Committee members may not serve on the same area subcommittee for more than two consecutive semesters and may not be reappointed to that area subcommittee until two semesters have elapsed since the last semester of appointment to that area subcommittee.
2. Area subcommittees shall evaluate courses using the approved "criteria check list" (see section II.A). In its deliberations, the subcommittee may seek the assistance of advisors/consultants with expertise in the area and may invite departments that submitted a course to attend a meeting or provide additional written information to assist in understanding the course proposal and/or how the course meets specified criteria and standards. Based on its evaluation, the area subcommittee shall make a recommendation to the full Committee on whether or not a course should be listed and shall provide the Committee justification for the recommendation. Members of the department submitting the course,

including any subcommittee member who is a member of that department, shall be excused from a meeting or portion of a meeting during which the subcommittee makes its recommendation decision.

3. The G.E. Course Review Committee, considering the recommendation of the appropriate area subcommittee, shall decide whether or not a course shall be listed in the G.E. Program. In the case of a negative decision, the Committee shall state its reasons in writing. The Committee's decision shall be conveyed to the submitting department by the G.E. Administrator. In the case of negative decisions, the Committee's written reasons shall also be conveyed. Members of the department submitting the course, including any Committee member who is a member of that department, shall be excused from a meeting or portion of a meeting during which the Committee makes its decision.

4. Ordinarily, G.E. Course Review Committee decisions to list a course in the G.E. Program shall be accepted by the G.E. Administrator who shall convey the decision to the submitting department. If, in rare and compelling circumstances, the G.E. Administrator overturns the decision of the G.E. Course Review Committee (i.e., disapproves the course for G.E. listing), the G.E. Administrator shall communicate his/her decision and reasons in writing to the submitting department, the G.E. Course Review Committee and the university General Education Committee. In the case of G.E. Administrator disapproval of a positive G.E. Course Review Committee decision, the submitting department may initiate an appeal under the provisions of section D.5 of this policy. In the case of a G.E. Course Review Committee decision to deny a department's request for listing, the G.E. Administrator shall defer making an administrative decision until avenues for appeal (see section D.4) have been exhausted and shall merely convey the Committee's decision and its reasons to the submitting department.

D. Appeal Process

1. Departments may appeal actions of the G.E. Course Review Committee and/or the G.E. Administrator to the University General Education Committee. Appeals may be made only by:

- a. the department which requested its course(s) for inclusion in the G.E. Program and was denied by the G.E. Course Review Committee and/or the G.E. Administrator; or
 - b. departments, other than the department whose course was approved in the review process, on the ground that the approved course does not comply with the criteria.
2. The department making the appeal must submit in writing to the General Education Committee its reasons for the appeal. The General Education Committee shall also be provided a copy of the G.E. Course Review Committee's and/or G.E. Administrator's reasons for the decision.
 3. A meeting of the General Education Committee shall be held to which a representative of the appealing department, the G.E. Course Review Committee and the G.E. Administrator shall be invited to discuss the matter. In the case of an appeal initiated by a department other than the department offering the course, the latter shall also be invited. Additional meetings of this type may be called by the General Education Committee if deemed necessary. The General Education Committee shall not act on appeals in the presence of designated representatives of the appealing department, the G.E. Course Review Committee or the G.E. Administrator. The General Education Committee member who serves as the General Education Committee liaison to the G.E. Course Review Committee and any member of the General Education Committee who is a member of the appealing department shall be excused from a meeting or portion of a meeting during which an appeal is to be decided. In the case of an appeal initiated by a department other than the department offering the course, the latter shall also be excused. The decision of the General Education Committee and its reasons shall be placed in writing.
 4. In cases where the decision of the G.E. Course Review Committee is under appeal, the appeal decision of the General Education Committee shall be conveyed to the G.E. Administrator who shall have final authority in deciding whether or not the course under appeal is listed in the G.E. Program. In reaching a decision, the G.E. Administrator shall consider reasons for the G.E. Course Review

Committee's original decision and the reasons for the General Education Committee's appeal decision. Ordinarily, the appeal decision of the General Education Committee shall be accepted by the G.E. Administrator who shall convey the decision to the appealing department (and the department offering the course, if different from the appealing department), and the G.E. Course Review Committee. If, in rare and compelling circumstances, the G.E. Administrator overturns the decision of the General Education Committee, the G.E. Administrator shall communicate his/her decision and reasons in writing to the department making the appeal, the department offering the course (if different from the appealing department), the G.E. Course Review Committee, and the General Education Committee.

5. In cases where the G.E. Administrator's decision to disapprove a positive decision of the G.E. Course Review Committee is under appeal, the appeal decision of the General Education Committee and its reasons shall be conveyed to the Vice President for Academic Affairs who shall have final authority in deciding whether the course under appeal is listed in the G.E. Program. In reaching a decision, the Vice President for Academic Affairs shall consider the decisions and reasons of the G.E. Course Review Committee, the G.E. Administrator, and the General Education Committee. Ordinarily the appeal decision of the General Education Committee shall be accepted by the Vice President for Academic Affairs who shall convey the decision to all parties involved. If, in rare and compelling circumstances, the Vice President for Academic Affairs overturns the decision of the General Education Committee, the Vice President for Academic Affairs shall communicate his/her decision and reasons in writing to all parties involved.

III. PERIODIC REVIEW OF COURSES

In accordance with the policy on Procedures for Periodic Review of G.E. Courses (AS 90-33), the G.E. Course Review Committee shall conduct periodic reviews of courses for continuation or termination of listing in the G.E. Program.

Carried AS 91-22/GE, Ex. G.E. CONTENT REVISION--UPPER DIVISION UNIT
REQUIREMENT

[Attachments D-1 and D-2]

The Academic Senate, based on recommendations of the General Education Committee, recommends adoption of the following program regulation pertaining to the nine upper division unit requirement in the General Education Program.

Systemwide policy (Executive Order 338) specifies that at least nine of the total number of semester units required in the General Education Program must be upper division level. At CSU, Sacramento, all students, including transfer students who have completed the intersegmental transfer curriculum, may select coursework from any area of the G.E. Program to satisfy this requirement, but may not use upper division coursework offered by their major department to satisfy the requirement.

Carried AS 91-23/GE, Ex. G.E. CONTENT REVISION--TRANSFER EVALUATIONS

[Attachment D-2]

The Academic Senate, based upon the recommendations of the G.E. Committee, recommends that current practices pertaining to General Education transfer evaluations be applied to the 1991-92 transitional program and to the fully revised program to be implemented in Fall 1992, with the addition of the requirement that all transfer students, including those who complete the intersegmental transfer program, be held to satisfying the race and ethnicity requirement. (Note: In accordance with AS 90-132, the race and ethnicity requirement may be satisfied prior to transfer.)

Carried AS 91-24/UWC, Ex. G.E. CONTENT REVISION--ADVANCED STUDY
REQUIREMENT, DELETION OF

[Responds to AS 90-51, part 1.b (initial tasks assigned to the University Writing Committee), specifically "Evaluation of the Advanced Study requirement in relation to other writing requirements and consideration of the English Department's recommendation to satisfy the Advanced Study requirement in the major."]

The Academic Senate, based on recommendations of the University Writing Committee (Attachment E), recommends the following:

1. That the G.E. Program be revised to delete the Advanced Study Requirement [Note: This action rescinds AS 82-59, AS 83-14, and AS 83-69 that are incorporated into the 1989 compilation of General Education--Breadth Requirements in sections III.B (page 13) and IV.B.5 (page 16).]

2. That the "Policy Relating to Undergraduate and Graduate Degree Programs" (Fall 1990 compilation of Policies and Procedures for Initiation, Modification, Review and Approval of Courses and Academic Programs, section IX, pages 27-29) be amended to require that undergraduate degree programs include at least one upper division course in the major/discipline which assigns writing tasks appropriate to that discipline, and that departments identify which course(s) meet the requirement. Specifically, the Academic Senate recommends that the last paragraph of the policy statement that appears on page 28 of the referenced document (i.e., "blue book") be amended to read [underscore=addition]:

required

"Undergraduate degree programs are expected to include at least five courses with no fewer than fifteen units that are common to the degree program. In addition, undergraduate degree programs are expected to include at least one upper division course in the major/discipline which assigns writing tasks appropriate to that discipline. Departments shall identify which course(s) meet the specified writing requirement. Graduate degree programs are expected..."

3. That the University continue to offer the support necessary for faculty to develop and include substantial writing assignments in their courses.

RE: AS 91-21

Attachment A
Academic Senate Agenda
April 4, 1991

Adoption of AS 91-21 will require amendments to previously adopted Senate actions AS 90-31, AS 90-33 and AS 90-34, as follows [~~strikeover=deletion~~; underscore=addition]:

*AS 90-31/G.E., Ex., Flr. G.E. COURSES, POLICY ON SELECTION AND REVIEW OF [responds to AS 89-75 and AS 89-79C.2]

The Academic Senate adopts the following Policy on Selection and Review of G.E. Courses. By adoption of this action, the Senate rescinds previous Senate action 82-57 [General Education Policy (on review and selection of G.E. Courses)].

Policy on Selection and Review of G.E. Courses

1. The statement of G.E. Rationale and Objectives shall inform the design and instructional goals of G.E. courses and shall inform the course review and approval process for inclusion of courses in the program.
2. The G.E. Committee and other committees, departments, or groups, as appropriate, shall may propose to the Academic Senate criteria, based on the "Statement of Rationale and Objectives of the G.E. Program," for all categories/requirements of the G.E. Program.
3. The Academic Senate shall forward approved criteria to the ~~School of Arts and Sciences Curriculum~~ General Education Course Review Committee which shall have responsibility for recommending to the G.E. Administrator courses for listing in the G.E. Program (in accordance with the policy on Procedures for Review of Courses for G.E. Listing, AS 91-21).
4. ~~Under procedures developed by the School of Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee and approved by the Academic Senate following review and recommendation by the General Education Committee, initial course evaluation shall be conducted by appropriate subcommittees (membership defined elsewhere) and reviewed by the Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee to determine their conformity to criteria.~~
5. ~~The Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee shall recommend to the G.E. administrator courses for listing in the G.E. Program.~~

64. In accordance with procedures specified in the Policy on Procedures for Review of Courses for G.E. Listing (AS 91-21), Departments/Schools may appeal a decision of the Arts and Sciences Curriculum G.E. Course Review Committee or the G.E. Administrator to the General Education Committee.
75. The General Education Committee shall make the final recommendations regarding each appeal. This recommendation shall be transmitted to the G.E. Administrator with copies to the Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee, Arts and Sciences Academic Council, and the Academic Senate Executive Committee. Final authority for deciding whether or not a course is listed rests with the G.E. Administrator or the Vice President for Academic Affairs as specified in the Policy on Procedures for Review of Courses for G.E. Listing. Ordinarily, the appeal decision of the G.E. Committee shall be accepted by the designated administrator.
8. Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee recommendations for course inclusion (or, in the case of appeals, G.E. Committee recommendations) shall normally be approved by the G.E. Administrator. If, in rare and compelling circumstances, the recommendations are not approved, the G.E. Administrator shall communicate the reasons, in writing, to the Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee, the G.E. Committee, and the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate.
96. Under procedures developed by the G.E. Committee and approved by the Academic Senate, G.E. courses and area criteria will be reviewed periodically (see AS 90-33 on Procedures for Periodic Review of G.E. Courses).

Carried. (3/15/90)

*AS 90-33/G.E., Ex., Flr. G.E. COURSES, PROCEDURES FOR PERIODIC REVIEW OF [responds to AS 89-75 and AS 89-79C.2]

The Academic Senate adopts the following procedures for periodic review of G.E. courses.

1. Every five years there will be a comprehensive review of courses in G.E. and area criteria. The reviews will begin with a comprehensive review of Area B. In subsequent years one area will undergo a comprehensive review each year until all in turn have been reviewed. The cycle will then begin again.

2. The Comprehensive Review of General Education Areas.

Departments will report to the G.E. Administrator on each of their offerings in the area being reviewed. The department shall submit course syllabi, sample assignments, and student course assessment data* for all sections of G.E. courses offered in the most recent semester preceding the review. If concerns are raised by the G.E. Administrator following review of the above, the department shall be asked to address those concerns.

Departmental reports will be forwarded by the G.E. Administrator to the ~~appropriate course review subcommittee~~ G.E. Course Review Committee, which, in accordance with the policy on Procedures for Review of Courses for G.E. Listing (AS 91-21), will review all courses listed in the area for fidelity to approved standards and criteria.

*The G.E. Committee will develop a multiple choice questionnaire for each G.E. sub-area or area if undivided. This instrument will be designed to assess whether a course is attempting to meet the objectives of the G.E. area. It will not be designed for use in the RTP process but could be administered at the same time as departmental instruments.

The G.E. eCourse Review subCommittee must recommend to the G.E. Committee Administrator continuation or termination of listing for each of the courses under review. Appeals may be filed in accordance with the policy on Procedures for Review of Courses for G.E. Listing (AS 91-21). Final authority for the continuation or termination of listings rests with the G.E. Administrator and decisions of the G.E. Administrator or the Vice President for Academic Affairs as specified in the referenced policy (AS 91-21). The G.E. Committee ~~must~~ shall review the work of the Subcommittee and make a final determination completed list of courses to be continued and terminated. Following ~~theis~~ their review of courses the G.E. Committee will formally consider the overall condition of the area and, if appropriate, make recommendations for change to the Academic Senate.

Carried. (4/5/90)

*AS 90-34/G.E., Ex., Flr. G.E. COMMITTEE, MEMBERSHIP AND CHARGE
[responds to AS 89-75]

The Academic Senate adopts the following revision of Senate statute 3.07.01 on the General Education Committee. By adoption of this action, the Senate nullifies preceding Senate actions 76-92, 77-61, 77-62, 82-11, 83-03, and 83-27.

3.07.01 General Education Committee

Consistent with CSU regulations, particularly E.O. 338 and 342, the University shall establish the aims, distribution of units, total number of units, and the administrative structure of the General Education Program. The General Education Committee may propose policy for consideration by the Academic Senate and the President. In addition, the General Education Committee may propose policy on other university-wide degree requirements.

a. Membership

The General Education Committee is a standing committee of the Academic Senate. Its membership shall be composed of an appropriate academic administrator designated by the Vice President for Academic Affairs, as a non-voting ex officio member; the general education administrator as a non-voting ex officio member; six faculty members elected by and from the School of Arts and Sciences: two from arts and humanities, two from social science, and two from science and mathematics; four faculty members elected by and from the other schools of the University (i.e., one by and from each of the four professional schools); two senators, appointed by the Academic Senate; a faculty member appointed by and from the University Curriculum Committee; and three students selected by A.S.I. All elected faculty members must be from different departments. Appointed faculty members should also be chosen, as often as possible, from departments not otherwise represented on the committee. If there are two faculty members from the same department only one will have a vote.

Elected faculty members for election to the committee shall be self-nominated or shall have consented to having their names placed in nomination by one or more of their colleagues. Elected faculty membership on the committee is for three years, with overlapping terms of service, to ensure that a core of experienced members provide continuity in the committee's work. Replacements to fill unexpired terms will be elected in an appropriate school election at the same time as the annual elections for expired terms. The Academic Senate may select replacement

members to serve until the next annual election. The terms of senators will be for two years or the remainder of the senator's term in the Senate. The liaison member will have a one year term.

b. Committee Responsibilities

1. Recommends to the Academic Senate changes in the G.E. Program as well as changes in other non-major degree requirements.
2. Recommends to the G.E. administrator on general goals related to resource allocation and administrative procedure in the areas of student orientation and advising, special tutorial and remedial course offerings, student and faculty awareness of the G.E. Program, diagnostic testing, outcome assessment and any other university non-major graduation requirements.
3. Recommends to the G.E. administrator concerning the desirability of seeking future increases or decreases in section offerings by area, based on program objectives and perceived student needs. Outcome assessment instruments, if appropriate and reliable, should be among the criteria used in making these kinds of recommendations.
4. Hears appeals on course listing or review decisions and may recommend revised action to the G.E. Administrator or the Vice President for Academic Affairs as specified in AS 91-21, Procedures for Review of Courses for G.E. Listing; AS 90-31, Policy on Selection and Review of G.E. Courses; and AS 90-33, Procedures for Periodic Review of G.E. Courses.
5. Conducts a periodic review of courses which are listed in the G.E. Program following procedures approved by the Academic Senate (~~to be specified elsewhere~~ see AS 90-33, Procedures for Periodic Review of G.E. Courses).
6. Proposes to the G.E. Administrator and reviews with the G.E. administrator studies, research and research agendas relating to all aspects of G.E.
7. Monitors (through liaison membership and/or annual reports) the procedures and criteria used by other faculty committees (such as ~~Arts and Sciences Curriculum and University Curriculum~~ the G.E. Course Review Committee and University Writing Committee) or

departments (e.g., Department of Foreign Languages and the English Department) which may take actions which substantially affect course offerings in the G.E. Program or other non-major graduation requirements, to insure that these conform to existing policies and procedures the implementation of which are the responsibility of the G.E. Committee. Recommendations for changes in the procedures are to be made to that committee or to the appropriate constituting authority for the committee.

Carried. (4/19/90)

IV. PROGRAM POLICY AND REGULATIONS

A. POLICY STATEMENT

GENERAL EDUCATION POLICY STATEMENT

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

Review Process:

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

Appeal Process:

1. Departments shall direct appeals to the General Education Committee.
2. Appeals may be made only by:
 - a. the department which requested its course(s) for inclusion in the G.E. program and was denied in the review process, and
 - b. departments, other than the department whose course(s) has been approved in the review process, on the ground that the approved course does not comply with the criteria.
3. The General Education Committee shall make the final recommendation regarding each appeal. This recommendation shall be transmitted to the Dean of Arts and Sciences with copies to the A&S Curriculum Committee, the A&S Academic Council, and the Academic Senate Executive Committee.

This recommendation shall be adopted except in rare and compelling circumstances. If, in such cases, the Dean does not adopt the recommendation of the General Education Committee, the Dean shall communicate the reasons in writing to the General Education Committee.

11/10/82 Carried.
1/27/83 Approved by the President.

Note: AS 82-57/GE, Ex. (1-27-83).

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.

GENERAL EDUCATION ADVISORY COMMITTEES POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

1. Courses submitted for inclusion in the CSUS General Education program must first be sent to the Associate Dean of the School of Arts and Sciences so that accurate records can be kept of where courses are in the review process. Courses will only be accepted directly from the department office with the chair's signature.
2. Review of courses proposed for General Education shall be based on course materials; therefore, all courses submitted for consideration must include the following:
 - a. a course approval form with catalog description
 - b. a cover sheet indicating which G.E. category the department wishes the course to be considered for review (see attached)
 - c. a memo indicating how the course meets the criteria for the category
 - d. a recent (within the last two years) course syllabus or outline which includes the course objectives, requirements and reading assignments.
3. The advisory committee chair, elected at the first meeting, is responsible for keeping accurate records of courses received and their disposition after review by the committee and for insuring that the review policies and procedures are followed.

All course materials should be initially reviewed by two committee members one week prior to consideration by the whole committee. These members shall carefully review the course to determine if it meets criteria for the category and report at the advisory committee meeting briefly describing the course and recommending approval or disapproval. Final review will be the responsibility of the committee. When additional information is needed, the Dean's Office will invite department chairs to send a representative to the advisory committee meeting at which a course from their department will be reviewed. Committee members cannot review courses submitted by their respective disciplines.

A quorum of the committee membership is necessary to consider courses. All committee members including the committee chair are voting members except the G.E. Committee liaison member. A simple majority of the total voting committee membership (not to be confused with merely those present) is required for the course to be forwarded to the A & S Curriculum Committee with a recommendation for approval or disapproval. Records of committee action must be kept by the committee chair.

4. Each advisory committee will be provided with a criteria check list to be used in reviewing courses for inclusion in a specific category. The check list must reflect the committee's operational interpretation of the general education criteria and must be approved by the Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee before courses are reviewed. The committee shall evaluate each course against the criteria. In this way departments can be informed of the basis for inclusion or exclusion of a specific course. After advisory committee decisions are made, all course materials including the check list must be returned to the Associate Dean's Office by the committee chair. The A & S Curriculum Committee will act on advisory committee recommendations and the Dean's Office will notify affected departments.



California State University, Sacramento

SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95819-0036

ACADEMIC SENATE



M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: November 27, 1990

TO: Richard Kornweibel, Chair
General Education Committee

FROM: Juanita Barrena, Chair
Academic Senate (x6593)

SUBJECT: Coded Memorandum AAP 90-24 (Implementation of the
Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum)

=====
I am forwarding a copy of the subject memorandum for review by the General Education Committee. Although we are unlikely to be able to submit comments to the President for transmittal to the Chancellor's Office by the date indicated in the memorandum, it would still be useful to submit comments to the Statewide Academic Senate.

In addition to attending to the specifics of the subject memorandum, I request that the General Education Committee take up the matter of the upper division requirement for students who have completed the IGETC. It is my understanding that students who complete the IGETC will not be held to total unit or area unit requirements specified in E.O. 338, but will be held to the nine upper division unit requirement. Hence, we must specify how the nine upper division unit requirement should be met. Among the possibilities that may be considered are:

1. Any nine upper division units in G.E.;
2. designate areas (i.e., 3 units each in Area E, Area C, and Area D);
3. designate unique CSUS requirements (e.g., Race and Ethnicity, Major Social Issues, World Cultures).

Certainly there are other possibilities. Since the plan is to implement the IGETC in 1991, it is important that the Senate take up the matter early in the Spring semester.

JB:dp

Attachment

cc: Donald Gerth
Mary Burger
Cecilia Gray



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

MAR 11 1991

M E M O R A N D U M

Academic Senate Agenda
413

March 7, 1991

TO: Juanita Barrera, Chair
Academic Senate

FROM: Richard Kornweibel, Chair
General Education Committee

SUBJECT: Upper division General Education

By formal motion, the General Education Committee recommends that CSUS continue its current practice of permitting students (transfer and native) to take their nine units of upper division General Education in any area. This policy would apply to all transfer students including those who complete an intersegmental transfer program. The Committee proposes one change: that students not be permitted to satisfy their upper division requirement by taking courses from the department that offers their major.

By formal action the General Education Committee also recommends that current evaluation practices continue without change in the new program except that consistent with policy all students including those who complete the intersegmental transfer program be held to the race and ethnicity requirement.

Commentary: It is CSU System Policy that all native and transfer students must complete at least nine units of upper division G.E. and at least nine units of G.E. in residence. These two requirements often overlap but need not do so. There is no mandated distribution so that in theory all nine upper division units could be taken in area B (or C or D). Three could be in area E, none could be in area A because there are no upper division courses in area A. At the same time, each student must have minimum units in each area as follows: A-9, B-12, C-12, D-15 and E-3. Students coming from a California community college can have completed all or part of a G.E. program which has the following distribution: A-9, B-9, C-9, D-12 and E-3.

If a transfer student brings a "completed" community college G.E., then in theory she should take one course each in areas B, C and D of upper division G.E. as the most efficient way of completing the program. Some students do this while others do not. There are few upper division courses in area B and we permit students to complete both subject matter and unit requirements in all areas with lower division courses from either a community college or from CSUS. Perhaps the most comprehensive statement would be that for G.E. to be complete a student must take at least A-9, B-12, C-12, D-15 and E-3 with a least nine units in upper division and at least nine units in residence. The system is hard to explain and since transfer students don't have a transfer evaluation when they register for the first time there is some confusion and no doubt students take "extra" courses. On the other hand this system provides maximum flexibility for the almost infinite variation of student situations. It also gives us flexibility. A more rigid system would require more careful planning and scheduling to ensure the precise availability of courses.

The above speaks to conventional transfer students. What of the new intersegmental transfers? They will come to us with a package (no partials) of A-9, B-9, C-9, D-9 [does not count American Institutions which still must be done]. There is no E. Under the new transfer agreement, anyone who completes the whole package must take an additional nine units of upper division G.E. There is no requirement that they be forced to complete the distribution presented above: A-9, B-12, C-12, D-15 and E-3. We should hold them to the race and ethnicity requirement (which could be done here or before transfer).

Allowing students to take their upper division G.E. in any area is consistent with current and past campus practice. Revisions to date of the G.E. program do not include any that would define a specific role for upper division general education. In the absence then of any very strong, coherent and developed campus philosophy on the use of the upper division we should continue current practice. While it theoretically possible for students to take all nine units from one area, our representatives from the Advising Center and Evaluations consider that to be rare and so there is no expectation that we would see any difference among those who use the intersegmental transfer pattern.

To: Academic Senate, Executive Committee

From: University Writing Committee

Date: March 11, 1991

After review of the Advanced Studies program, the University Writing Committee makes the following recommendation to the Academic Senate:

1. Eliminate the Advanced Studies Requirement
2. Require that students take at least one upper division course in their major/discipline which assigns writing tasks appropriate to that discipline, and that departments identify which course(s) meet the requirement
3. Encourage the university to offer support to faculty including writing in their courses

RATIONALE

CONTEXT:

Our intention in making this recommendation is to provide a way for departments and disciplines to build on the solid foundation of sequenced writing courses and requirements: 1A, 1B, required writing (informal) in lower division GE courses, the Writing Proficiency Exam, required writing (formal) in upper division GE courses. This recommendation will enable disciplines to help their majors carry forward the writing skills necessary to all writing situations, into the kind of writing tasks and conventions dictated by a particular discipline.

This sequencing will be effective only if departments develop discipline specific writing classes. As a result, we feel that the elimination of the Advanced Study requirement must necessarily be accompanied by a mandate that departments develop a course(s) and/or identify a course(s) that will help prepare their students to write after graduation within the scope of their chosen careers.

BACKGROUND:

When the university instituted the Advanced Study program, it had two goals in mind: to assure that students take an upper division GE course outside their major; and to assure that students have an intensive writing experience in at least one upper division course.

Initially, the Advanced Study Program was a six-unit requirement, and faculty who taught those courses received training in designing effective writing assignments, responding to student writing, and incorporating some writing instruction into their courses.

As time passed, several changes occurred which added to the requirement's original pedagogical challenge. The Advanced Study requirement was reduced from six to three units. This left the entire burden of the two-pronged charge to be carried by a single, three-unit course. Furthermore, the training and guidance originally provided for Advanced Study instructors was no longer offered. Consequently, some who now teach Advanced Study courses are not those faculty who designed the courses or who received training in dealing effectively with the 5,000 word requirement. Finally, logic, experience, and testimony from practitioners in the business world, accrediting teams, and graduate school coordinators have led to the realization that students need and would benefit from additional writing instruction within their major/discipline, rather than outside it as the Advanced Study requirement mandates.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS:

The university has made substantial curriculum changes which promise to address the issue of student writing from a pedagogically sound position and, therefore, to diminish the need for an Advanced Study requirement. For example, new GE requirements approved by the Academic Senate mandate that all upper division GE courses include formal, graded writing assignments as well as opportunities for informal writing. These requirements thereby ensure that students write in all their upper division GE courses, within and outside their majors. Additionally, students will be required, as of 1992, to take a second semester of formal writing instruction.

These GE and university writing requirements assure that students will have experience writing outside their major. Eliminating the Advanced Studies requirement and instead requiring writing within the major/discipline assures some practice writing within the discipline. Students will thereby have the opportunity to use the language, structure, and other conventions particular to their discipline, while exploring and articulating ideas of the discipline in formal writing assignments.

RELATED RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. The committee recommends that departments encourage their students to pass the Writing Proficiency Exam prior to enrolling in upper division courses that require writing in order to ensure that writing skills are such that students will reap the greatest possible benefits from the course.
2. The committee recommends that students be granted "graduating senior" status only after they have passed the Writing Proficiency Exam.
3. The committee recommends that the university provide support and guidance in the form of the Writing in the Disciplines Program and/or other writing instruction opportunities designed to help faculty respond to the challenge of incorporating formal and informal writing assignments into their courses.
4. The committee recommends that the university provide adjunct or other tutorial support for ESL students enrolled in upper division courses that require writing in the discipline.

April 4, 1991

Substitute motion for AS 91-24

That the Advanced Study requirement become a graduation requirement rather than a general education requirement that can be satisfied in one of two ways:

1. By taking a ge course designated as satisfying the advanced study requirement *that has been*

or

2. By completing a course in the student's major that has been designated by the department and [approved by the University Writing Committee as satisfying the advanced study requirement] [no standards or criteria now exist they would have to be developed].

failed