

AS 83-69/G.E., Ex. GENERAL EDUCATION - ADVANCED STUDY

The Academic Senate approves editorial changes in the General Education advising sheet on advanced study requirements as follows:

[Taken from "CSUS G.E. Program approved by the Faculty Senate on October 31, 1979, and the President on November 9, 1979." Editorial changes as shown approved by the General Education Committee on 9/28/83.]

ADVANCED STUDY

At least six of the 48 units must be taken in upper division courses which have been specially designed for General Education students. Considerable attention in these courses must be devoted to the development of students' abilities to reason logically and to write clearly and effectively.

The courses are listed in categories II-7, III-7, and IV-7 in all areas except category I and are marked for easy identification by students. The units earned in these courses may be placed either in the categories from which the courses are chosen or in the electives.

Students must have upper division status, and must have completed their requirements in English composition and reasoning critical thinking and must have passed the Writing Proficiency Examination before enrolling in these courses. They are not permitted to meet the Advanced Study requirement in their major field. Advanced Study courses must be taken on the CSUS campus.

ADVANCED STUDY CRITERIA

General Education courses in this category build on the basic skills and knowledge acquired by students in their General Education foundations courses. These courses are to expand students' knowledge in the liberal arts by examining complex issues of significance to mankind, humanity and they are to advance students' abilities to reason logically and to write clearly English prose.

Some Advanced Study courses may explore more specialized topics and may thus require prerequisites, but they are also to be courses of a broader nature that require no formal preparation. These courses may be offered in any topic acceptable in categories II-7, III-7, and IV-7 in all areas except

category I, and students are to take them outside their major field.

Students are required to write not less than 5000 words of clear and logical English prose in Advanced Study courses. An important aspect of the task of instructors is working actively with students to sharpen their analytical abilities and to improve their writing styles. Because of the composition requirement, enrollment will be limited to 30 students.

AS 83-70/Ex. SCHEDULE FOR REVISION OF ARTP DOCUMENTS

[AS 83-59/Ex., revised by Executive Committee at request of Academic Senate on 10/11/83.]

The Academic Senate approves the following schedule for revision of retention, tenure, and promotion policies to be effective 1984-85:

- a) November 11, 1983 -- University ARTP Committee draft document ready to be submitted to departments, divisions, and schools.
- b) November 14-23, 1983 -- Hearings on Draft University Document (November 18 deadline for written responses).
- c) December 7, 1983 -- Final draft of university document to Senate Executive Committee.
- d) December 14, 1983 -- Academic Senate action on revised document, with recommendation to President.
- e) December 21, 1983 -- President's decision on UARTP guidelines.
- f) February 24, 1984 -- School policies recommended to University ARTP Committee and President.
- g) March 16, 1984 -- University ARTP recommendations regarding school policies to President.
- h) March 23, 1984 -- President's decision regarding school policies.
- i) April 13, 1984 -- Department/division policies recommended to University ARTP Committee.
- j) May 11, 1984 -- University ARTP Committee recommendations regarding department/division policies to President.
- k) June 15, 1984 -- President's decisions regarding department/division policies.

*To Review
attached*

To Regular Calendar
AS 83-71/Ex. ACADEMIC CALENDARS, 1984-85 AND 1985-86

[AS 83-60/AP, Ex. resubmitted to the Academic Senate without change after reconsideration by the Executive Committee.]

The Academic Senate approves the academic calendars for 1984-85 and 1985-86 (see Attachment A).

To Regular Calendar
AS 83-72/Ex. ACADEMIC CALENDARS - DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINES

[AS 83-64/AP, Ex. resubmitted to the Academic Senate without change after reconsideration by the Executive Committee.]

The Academic Senate recommends the following guidelines for the development of academic calendars:

1. That each semester be 15 weeks long. [Note: In the draft presented by Acting President Gerber, fall semester 1984 was 16 weeks long and spring semester 1985 was 14 weeks long.]
2. That each fall semester end well before Christmas to allow grades to be turned in before the Christmas break.
3. That if it becomes necessary to make adjustments to allow for the 12-week break between the end of spring semester and the beginning of fall semester, in order to accommodate summer session, these adjustments be made by beginning spring semester a week earlier rather than by beginning fall semester a week later.
4. That in the future the Academic Policies Committee be presented with a complete calendar package for the year, including dates for summer sessions and winter and spring intersessions.
5. That the Academic Policies Committee be advised as to any pertinent restrictions on the calendar caused by pay periods, problems in overlapping between regular semesters and summer sessions, etc.

AS 83-73/AP, Ex. CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE TRANSFERS

The Academic Senate approves the following catalog language describing catalog rights of California Community College transfer students:

CCC/CSU Transfer Catalog:

Students who transfer directly from California Community Colleges or California State University campuses may use the

CSUS catalog in effect when they first entered the prior institution provided:

- (a) that the transfer was not delayed for more than one semester;
- (b) that no break in enrollment at the CCC or CSU campus was of more than one semester's duration;
- (c) that the student does not attend a school other than another CSU campus or a California Community College during the break in enrollment.

AS 83-74/CC, Ex. WAIVER PROGRAM - HEALTH SCIENCE

*Called
Latta*

The Academic Senate approves the Health Science Waiver Program as approved by the Curriculum Committee on May 2, 1983 (copy of approved program available in Academic Senate Office for review).

AS 83-75/CC, Ex. WAIVER PROGRAM - LIBERAL STUDIES

*Called
Yamanaka*

The Academic Senate approves the Liberal Studies Waiver Program as approved by the Curriculum Committee on May 2, 1983 (copy of approved program available in Academic Senate Office for review).

REGULAR AGENDA

AS 83-65/Flr. MINUTES

Approval of Minutes of meeting of October 12, 1983.

AS 83-70

AS 83-76/FacA, Ex. PROFESSIONAL LEAVE COMMITTEE - INTERIM GUIDELINES

The Academic Senate approves the following interim guidelines for the Professional Leave Committee:

PROFESSIONAL LEAVE COMMITTEE GUIDELINES
1983-84

Interim guidelines for the Professional Leave Committee's consideration of question of quality of proposed projects for sabbatical and differential leaves, 1983-84:

1. Guidelines should include questions of the appropriateness of the substance of the proposal and an assessment of the benefits which would ensue from its being undertaken.
 - a. Appropriateness: Consideration by the committee of questions of quality shall include the appropriateness of

the proposed activity. Some examples of appropriate activity approved in the past follow:

1. A course of study
2. Professionally relevant travel plans
3. Professional development
4. Pursuit of a scholarly or research project
5. Study or experience designed to improve teaching effectiveness
6. Study or experience designed to improve professional practice
7. Professional retraining that meets university curricular need

- b. Benefit: Consideration by the committee of the quality of the project should also include judging whether the proposed activity as outlined in the application would have results which would be beneficial to the students, to the development of the profession or discipline, to the university, and/or to the faculty member as a teacher, scholar, or professional practitioner. (The committee may consider it necessary to ask applicants for supplemental information regarding the beneficial effects of the proposal.)

2. Ranking

- a. Differential leave: All applicants whose projects, in the committee's judgment, meet the above considerations of quality will be recommended for presidential approval but will be unranked, since in this case fiscal impact has to be a matter of administrative judgment relating to the curricular and budgetary requirements of specific schools and departments.
- b. Sabbatical leave: All applicants whose projects, in the committee's judgment, meet the above considerations of quality will be recommended for presidential approval and ranked in order of accrued service since the establishment of initial eligibility for sabbatical or differential leave (M.O.U. articles 27.2 and 28.4). The counting of part-time and other professional leave service shall follow the practice of the Faculty Affairs Committee, 1982-83*; a tie in rank order will be broken by lot.

*For details, see Academic Senate Compilation Book, 1974-75, pp. 68ff.

AS 83-77/Ex. FOREIGN LANGUAGE - PROPOSED REQUIREMENT

The Academic Senate approves the following resolution for transmittal to the CSU Academic Senate:

WHEREAS, The CSU Task Force on Foreign Language Requirement is to be commended for its endorsement of the principle and concept of competency in a foreign language for our graduates; and

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate of California State University, Sacramento, supports the central conclusion of the Task Force, i.e., that "...the study of foreign languages is sufficiently important to the intellectual and cultural maturity of the student and to society as to warrant formal inclusion in the CSU curriculum as an exit (i.e., graduation) requirement;" and

WHEREAS, The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and the Statewide Academic Senate have asked for consultation from this Senate on the impact of the recommended requirement on this campus; and

WHEREAS, A carefully prepared response has been submitted to this Senate for its consideration by the Foreign Language Department; and

WHEREAS, The Director of Admissions of this campus has also prepared and submitted a response to the Report based on the experience and projections of his office; and

WHEREAS, Both of the above reports conclude that the lack of sufficient financial and instructional resources now or in the foreseeable future make it impossible to implement the proposal at this time; and

WHEREAS, The addition of one more mandated program without sufficient resources for support is contrary to the best interest of our campus and its mission in the community; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Academic Senate of CSUS must reluctantly oppose the implementation of the foreign language requirement until the resources for its proper development are assured.

[See Attachment B: --Conclusions of the CSU Report of the Task Force on Foreign Language Requirement
--CSUS Foreign Language Department Response to Task Force Report
--Response to Task Force Report by the CSUS Director of Admissions.]

AS 83-71

COMMENDATION OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE DEPT

FALL SEMESTER 1984

	Computer Assisted Registration Deadline for Fall Semester
Aug. 22, 1984 (Wed)	Academic Year Begins
Aug. 22-24, 1984 (Wed-Fri)	Add/Drop & In-Person Registration
Aug. 27, 1984 (Mon)	Instruction Begins
Sept. 3, 1984 (Mon)	Labor Day (Holiday)
Sept. 10, 1984 (Mon)	Admission Day Observance (Campus Open, Classes Held)
Oct. 8, 1984 (Mon)	Columbus Day Observance (Campus Open, Classes Held)
Nov. 12, 1984 (Mon)	Veterans Day Observance (Campus Open, Classes Held)
Nov. 22-23, 1984 (Thurs-Fri)	Thanksgiving Recess
Dec. 3-7, 1984 (Mon-Fri)	Dead Week
Dec. 7, 1984 (Fri)	Last Day of Instruction
Dec. 10-14, 1984 (Mon-Fri)	Final Examinations
Dec. 17-21, 1984 (Mon-Fri)	Fall Term Grades Due
Dec. 21, 1984 (Fri)	Last Day of Fall Semester
Dec. 17, 1984 - *Jan. 22, 1985 (Mon-Tues)	Winter Recess (Students)
Dec. 24, 1984 - Jan. 1, 1985 (Mon-Tues)	Christmas/New Year's Recess (Campus Closed)
Dec. 24, 1984 - *Jan. 22, 1985 (Mon-Tues)	Winter Recess (Faculty)

*If it becomes necessary to make adjustments to allow for the 12-week break between the end of spring semester and the beginning of fall semester, in order to accommodate summer session, these adjustments shall be made by beginning spring semester a week earlier rather than by beginning fall semester a week later.

SPRING SEMESTER 1985

	Computer Assisted Registration Deadline for Spring Semester
Jan. 23, 1985 (Wed)	Spring Semester Begins
Jan. 23-25, 1985 (Wed-Fri)	Add/Drop and In-Person Registration
Jan. 28, 1985 (Mon)	Instruction Begins
Feb. 12, 1985 (Tues)	Lincoln's Birthday (Campus Open, Classes Held)
Feb. 18, 1985 (Mon)	Washington's Birthday (Campus Open, Classes Held)
April 1-5, 1985 (Mon-Fri)	Spring Recess
May 13-17, 1985 (Mon-Fri)	Dead Week
May 17, 1985 (Fri)	Last Day of Instruction
May 20-24, 1985 (Mon-Fri)	Final Examinations
May 25, 1985 (Sat)	Commencement
May 27, 1985 (Mon)	Memorial Day Observance (Holiday)
May 28-30, 1985 (Tues-Thur)	Spring Grades Due
May 30, 1985 (Thur)	Last Day of Academic Year

ACADEMIC HOLIDAYS 1984-85

		<u>Campus Open/Closed</u>
Labor Day	September 3, 1984 (Monday)	X
*Admission Day Observance	September 10, 1984 (Monday)	X
**Columbus Day Observance	October 8, 1984 (Monday)	X
**Veterans Day Observance	November 12, 1984 (Monday)	X
Thanksgiving	November 22-23, 1984 (Thurs-Fri)	X
Christmas/New Years	December 24, 1984 - January 1, 1985 (Tues-Tues)	X
**Lincoln's Birthday	February 12, 1985 (Tuesday)	X
**Washington's Birthday Observance	February 18, 1985 (Monday)	X
Spring Recess	April 1-5, 1985 (Mon-Fri)	X
Memorial Day Observance	May 27, 1985 (Monday)	X
*Admission Day to be observed day after Thanksgiving		
**Columbus Day, Veterans' Day, Lincoln's Birthday, and Washington's Birthd to be observed December 24 & 26-31, 1984		

1984-85 ACADEMIC CALENDAR

<u>Fall 1984</u>	<u>Pay Periods</u>	<u>Instr. Days</u>	<u>Exams</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Total Work Days</u>
September	(8/22-9/30)	24		3 (Registration & Orientation)	27
October	(10/1-30)	22			22
November	(10/31-11/29)	20			20
December	(11/30-12/31)	6	5		16
January	(1/1-1/7)	<u>---</u>	<u>---</u>	5 (Grades)	<u>4</u>
	Fall Total	72	5	8	89

#####

Spring
1985

February	(1/23-2/28)	24		3 (Registraton & Orientation)	27
March	(3/1-3/31)	21			21
April	(4/1-4/30)	17			17
May	(5/1-5/30)	13	<u>5</u>	4 (Commencement & Grades)	<u>19</u>
	Spring Total	<u>75</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>84</u>
ACADEMIC YEAR TOTAL		147	10	15	173

Last day of Fall = 12/21/84

Commencement = 5/25/85

Last day of Spring = 5/30/85

FALL SEMESTER 1985

	Computer Assisted Registration Deadline for Fall Semester
Aug. 21, 1985 (Wed)	Academic Year Begins
Aug. 21-23, 1985 (Wed-Fri)	Add/Drop & In-Person Registration
Aug. 26, 1985 (Mon)	Instruction Begins
Sept. 2, 1985 (Mon)	Labor Day (Holiday)
Sept. 9, 1985 (Mon)	Admission Day (Campus Open, Classes Held)
Oct. 14, 1985 (Mon)	Columbus Day Observance (Campus Open, Classes Held)
Nov. 11, 1985 (Mon)	Veterans Day (Campus Open, Classes Held)
Nov. 28-29, 1985 (Thurs-Fri)	Thanksgiving Recess
Dec. 2-6, 1985 (Mon-Fri)	Dead Week
Dec. 6, 1985 (Fri)	Last Day of Instruction
Dec. 9-13, 1985 (Mon-Fri)	Final Exams
Dec. 16-20, 1985 (Mon-Fri)	Fall Term Grades Due
Dec. 20, 1985 (Fri)	Last Day of Fall Semester
*Dec. 23, 1985 - Jan. 3, 1986 (Mon-Fri)	Christmas and New Years' (Campus Closed)
Dec. 16, 1985 - Jan. 21, 1986 (Mon-Tues)	Winter Recess (Student)
Dec. 23, 1985 - Jan. 21, 1986 (Mon-Tues)	Winter Recess (Faculty)

*Revise, if necessary, to conform to staff policies

SPRING SEMESTER 1986

	Computer Assisted Registration Deadline for Spring Semester
Jan. 22, 1986 (Wed)	Spring Semester Begins
Jan. 22-24, 1986 (Wed-Fri)	Add/Drop & In-Person Registration
Jan. 27, 1986 (Mon)	Instruction Begins
Feb. 12, 1986 (Wed)	Lincoln's Birthday (Campus Open, Classes Held)
Feb. 17, 1986 (Mon)	Washington's Birthday (Campus Open, Classes Held)
Mar. 24-28, 1986 (Mon-Fri)	Spring Recess
May 12-16, 1986 (Mon-Fri)	Dead Week
May 16, 1986 (Fri)	Last Day of Instruction
May 19-23, 1986 (Mon-Fri)	Final Examinations
May 24, 1986 (Sat)	Commencement
May 26, 1986 (Mon)	Memorial Day Observance (Campus Closed)
May 27-30, 1986 (Tues-Fri)	Spring Grades Due
May 30, 1986 (Fri)	Last Day of Academic Year

ACADEMIC HOLIDAYS 1985-86

		<u>Campus</u> <u>Open/Closed</u>
Labor Day	September 2, 1985 (Monday)	X
*Admission Day Observance	September 9, 1985 (Monday)	X
**Columbus Day Observance	October 14, 1985 (Monday)	X
**Veterans Day	November 11, 1985 (Monday)	X
Thanksgiving	November 28-29, 1985 (Thurs-Fri)	X
***Christmas	December 25, 1985 (Wednesday)	X
***New Years	December 30, 1985 - January 3, 1986 (Mon-Fri)	X
**Lincoln's Birthday	February 12, 1986 (Wednesday)	X
**Washington's Birthday Observance	February 17, 1986 (Monday)	X
Spring Recess	March 24-28, 1986 (Mon-Fri)	X
Memorial Day Observance	May 26, 1986 (Monday)	X

*Admission Day to be observed day after Thanksgiving

**Columbus Day, Veterans' Day, Lincoln's Birthday, and Washington's Birthday to be observed December 30-31 1985, and January 2-3, 1983

***Revise, if necessary, to conform to staff policies.

1985-86 ACADEMIC CALENDAR

<u>Fall 1985</u>	<u>Pay Periods</u>	<u>Instr. Days</u>	<u>Exams</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Total Work Days</u>
September	(8/28-9/30)	20		3 (Registration & Orientation)	23
October	(10/1-10/30)	22			22
November	(10/31-11/30)	20			20
December	(12/1-12/31)	<u>10</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>5</u> (Grades)	<u>19</u>
Fall Total		72	5	8	84

#####

<u>Spring 1986</u>					
February	(1/22-2/28)	25		3 (Registration & Orientation)	28
March	(3/1-3/31)	16			16
April	(4/1-4/30)	22			22
May	(5/1-5/30)	<u>12</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>5</u> (Grades & Commencement)	<u>22</u>
Spring Total		75	5	8	88
ACADEMIC YEAR TOTAL		147	10	16	172

Last day of Fall = 12/20/85

Commencement = 5/24/86

Last day of Spring = 5/30/86

Conclusions of "The California State University Report of the Task Force on Foreign Language Requirement, May 1983."

Conclusions

To summarize the discussions above, the Task Force concludes:

1. The study of foreign languages is sufficiently important to the intellectual and cultural maturity of the student and to society as to warrant formal inclusion in the CSU curriculum as an exit (i.e., graduation) requirement.
2. Foreign languages, as defined, include classical languages but not computer languages, artificial languages, sign languages, or dialects of English.
3. Any language requirement should be stated in terms of competency attained rather than solely in terms of instruction completed. The competency scale devised by the Foreign Language Liaison Committee of the California Articulation Council should be adopted systemwide for this purpose.
4. Sample test items and formats are being prepared by the Liaison Committee. When available, they should be considered for systemwide adoption. In the interim it may be necessary to rely on a combination of locally prepared qualifying examinations and assessed equivalency of previous language study.
5. The desired level of competency should be set no lower than Level II on the Liaison Committee's scale (usually attained after two semesters of college level study). When and if resources permit, an increase to Level III (usually attained after three semesters of college level study) is recommended.

6. Students should demonstrate the attainment of the prescribed level of competency by passing a qualifying examination. Administration of this examination may be independent of coursework (in which case a fee will be assessed) or as an integral part of the language instruction program.
7. If appropriate assessment procedures are not yet available when the requirement takes effect, it may be necessary as an interim measure to assess competency by means of locally devised procedures or on the basis of study completed. If resources allow, the study-completed assessment should be made by equating the first two years of secondary foreign language instruction to one semester of postsecondary instruction and each year thereafter of secondary instruction to one semester of postsecondary instruction.

At a minimum, however, one year of secondary language study should be equated to one semester of postsecondary study. Each semester of foreign language instruction at another postsecondary institution should be equated directly to one semester at the receiving institution.

8. Any student who is a native speaker of and educated principally in a language other than English should be exempt from the requirement.
9. The requirement should not be limited by discipline, i.e., no specific majors should be exempted.
10. No more than 6 semester units of foreign language study taken in fulfillment of the requirement should be credited towards the General Education — Breadth requirement. It may be desirable to reduce this maximum to 4-5 semester units.
11. Sufficient instructional resources currently are available in the CSU as a whole to support a Level II requirement, although special support or adjustments may be required on individual campuses.
12. A new committee should be established to assist in implementing the requirement. The committee should consist primarily of faculty, with strong representation of language teaching professionals and measurement specialists, plus representatives from students and staff. It should be clearly understood that the charge to this committee is not to reopen the questions addressed by the Task Force but to address the details and adjustments needed to implement the recommended requirement the most efficiently and expeditiously.
13. Early consultation should be held with the articulation agencies of the California high schools and community colleges in order to assist these institutions in meeting possible impacts on them arising from adoption of the foreign language requirement.

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO

FOREIGN LANGUAGE DEPARTMENT'S

RESPONSE TO THE CSU REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE ON FOREIGN LANGUAGE REQUIREMENT

Upon receipt of the report of the Task Force on the foreign language requirement, I appointed an ad hoc committee composed of three full time faculty members of the Department of Foreign Languages. The committee evaluated the report and estimated the immediate impact of the proposed foreign language requirement on the Department. A general meeting of the foreign language faculty was held with further discussion and analysis for the purposes of defining the Department's stand.

The following comments address the recommendations of the Task Force report found on pages 17 and 18. Each recommendation is addressed by number and the comments which follow represent the position of the Foreign Language Department.

Rationale

The Department concurs with conclusions 1 and 2 of the report, namely that the study of foreign languages is of sufficient importance to warrant inclusion in the CSU curriculum as a requirement, and with the Task Force's definition of foreign language.

Competency

Recommendations 3 through 7, which address themselves to competency and assessed equivalency of previous foreign language study, are of particular concern to the Department.

First, we agree that competency demonstrated through examination would be ideal and that achievement of competency "Level II" seems reasonable. However, no one in the Department has any knowledge of either the California Articulation Conference or of the Foreign Language Liaison Committee of that Conference. We have serious and abiding reservations concerning the examination being prepared by the Liaison Committee as we have not been consulted nor have we been asked to offer any input into the formulation of that examination.

Secondly, if a qualifying examination is to be required, the Department is unanimous in its assertion that careful evaluation by placement examination of students with any previous language study would also be essential. We reject the Task Force's suggestion that two years of high school foreign language training can automatically be equated with one year of post-secondary language study in order to meet the competency level desired. Experience has shown us that rarely do such equivalencies hold true. Of all the students entering our Department with two years of high school foreign language study, less than 10 percent qualify above the 2nd semester of college level foreign language. The Task Force's recommendation that one year of secondary school language training be equated to one semester of post-secondary study runs completely counter to its other recommendation that demonstrated competency be the ultimate goal of any foreign language requirement. Therefore, the Department of Foreign Languages believes that, as an interim procedure and until the development of an acceptable standardized competency exam is achieved, students entering CSUS with no college language experience should be given the departmental placement examination of the

language they have studied, provided, of course, that that language is offered at our institution. Students who place at the 2A level or above will be considered to have exhibited the competency required for graduation. Those students placing at a level below 2A will demonstrate competency by completing 1B. Students with no language background must take both 1A and 1B but will be exempt from any placement examination.

Exemption of Special Groups

With respect to Task Force recommendation number 8, the Department agrees with the conclusion of the report (p. 13) that students required to take the TOEFL examination (native speakers of languages other than English) should be exempt from the foreign language requirement. All other students, however, would have to demonstrate the prescribed level of competency in a foreign language by passing the qualifying examination.

Requirement and General Education

The Department concurs with recommendations 9 and 10 of the report; that the requirement not be limited by discipline, that is, no specific major be exempt, and that 6 units of foreign language study be credited toward the University's General Education requirements. The Department, however, recognizes and is very sensitive to the needs of other units within the same G.E. groups as foreign languages.

Resources

The issue of sufficient instructional resources currently available in CSU (conclusion number 11 of the Task Force report) is indeed of the gravest concern to the Department of Foreign Languages. Based on enrollment statistics and data obtained from the University Admissions Office, the School of Arts and Sciences and the Department of Foreign Languages, it can be concluded that CSUS does not have sufficient instructional resources available at this time to implement the requirement. In order to meet initial demand in foreign language courses 1A and 1B for incoming freshmen only (about 1,500 a year at CSUS), the Foreign Language Department would have to add 10 to 15 more sections of 1A and 1B per year, more than half of which would be in French and Spanish. Those sections would accommodate 300 to 500 entering freshmen who, through placement examination, demonstrate a need for additional course work at the 1A and 1B level. It should be emphasized that this is a very conservative estimate and one which does not include additional sections needed for transfer students entering CSUS without sufficient foreign language study to meet the requirement.

The following statistics, using approximate figures based upon 1983-84 entering freshmen enrollments, illustrate the immediate partial impact (transfer students not included) on 1st year foreign language classes at CSUS. The figures are representative of the past 5 semesters.

Incoming Freshmen (1983-1984): 1500

		number of students
1.	15% 0-1 year of high school foreign language	225
2.	60-65% 2 years of high school foreign language	925-975
3.	20-25% 3 or more years of high school foreign language	300-375
Category 1 (above)	All of these students would need to take 1A and 1B	225
Category 2 (above)	Less than 10% of these students have in the past been able to pass Level II competency and would definitely need additional course work in 1A and/or 1B	850
Category 3 (above)	About 75% of these students should be able to pass the proficiency test and therefore would be exempt from additional course work	75-100

About 1100 students out of 1500 will need 1A and/or 1B in order to meet the foreign language requirement. Completion of 1B would be considered a minimal amount of study necessary to prepare the student to pass the qualifying examination.

Out of those 1100 freshmen needing a foreign language, 500 to 600 enroll annually in a foreign language class out of personal choice. For example, in fall '83, 342 students out of 746 in 1A and 1B classes are freshmen. We estimate that in spring '84, 250 out of 600 students in those classes will be freshmen.

Given the fact that every year there are approximately 200 seats available (i.e., a particular section may not be full to capacity) in 1A and 1B for the high demand languages (Spanish, French, German, Italian and Japanese), there would still be no decrease in the number of additional sections required because at least half of those 500 to 600 students will have to complete both 1A and 1B.

At an absolute maximum enrollment of 35 students per class, it is not unrealistic to envisage 15 more sections of 1A/1B for the academic year. Estimated breakdown of additional 1A/1B sections based upon usual foreign language preference and demand would be approximately as follows:

	additional sections per year
Spanish	6
French	4
German	2
Italian	1
Japanese	1
Russian	1

Again, it must be stressed that the preceding statistics refer to incoming freshmen only and do not take into account in any way the problems to be posed by the high number of transfer students entering CSUS on an annual basis (4000-5000).

Without having complete information on the University's present resources, the Foreign Language Department is nevertheless able to identify a number of obvious needs and concerns, both logistic and academic, relevant to the implementation of the foreign language requirement.

1. Additional teaching personnel, part-time and/or full-time, as well as the retraining of minimally qualified faculty from other disciplines.

2. Supervision and evaluation of an increasingly large part-time staff by full-time faculty, and the amount of release time this would entail.

3. Coordination of the 1A/1B sections by full-time faculty in at least Spanish, French and German.

4. Liaison work of a highly time and energy consuming nature involving consultation, coordination and articulation with impacted feeder schools such as the high schools and community colleges. This would, again, necessitate release time for the full-time faculty.

5. Coordination of both placement and qualifying examinations in all languages taught, including administration and correction of at least the placement exam.

6. Tutorial and learning skills assistance for students with foreign language learning problems (easily one quarter of any elementary language class) and the hiring of students and/or part-time staff in the Learning Skills Center of this campus or in such a center sponsored by the Foreign Language Department. Students facing qualifying examinations in any field routinely require the aid of such facilities more than do students who have simply to complete class work requirements.

7. Additional prime time classroom allocations. We are presently under-allocated, misusing our two language laboratories and dangerously overcrowding our very small seminar/reading rooms. No concern is more generalized at CSUS than the lack of classroom space, and the introduction of some 15 new sections of 1A/1B language classes might well turn out to be impossible.

8. Restoration and modernization of our now sadly inadequate language laboratories to provide monitored and/or individual practice for elementary students.

9. Class size for 1A/1B must be maintained at a 30 maximum level (20-25 recommended highly) to provide efficient language teaching and learning to achieve desired competency levels.

10. Additional office space for increased teaching staff. At present, our office space situation, even for full-time faculty, is desperate.

11. Proportional increases in O.E. allocations.

12. Assistance in obtaining grants and/or assigned time for full-time faculty to develop Summer Intensive Language Programs and Computed Assisted Language Programs for the specific attainment of Level II competency.

13. Strict adherence to full-time faculty maximum teaching load of 15 (12 + 3) in accordance with the Memorandum of Understanding--collective bargaining contract (1983-1986).

14. Preservation of all necessary graduate and upper division courses for the M.A. programs and majors and minors. No diversion of qualified full-time faculty from upper division and graduate courses into 1A and 1B. It should be pointed out that, in fact, the implementation of a foreign language requirement would eventually have the effect of increasing enrollments in upper-division courses by generating new majors and minors.

Implementation Committee

The Foreign Language Department strongly agrees with the Task Force's recommendation number 12 that a new committee should be established to assist in the implementation of the requirement, with particular attention to a realistic approach to the issue of resources. We agree with the proviso that this committee consist primarily of foreign language teaching professionals. We were dismayed at the low level of foreign language representation on the Task Force.

Articulation

The Foreign Language Department agrees with the Task Force's conclusion number 13 that a CSU foreign language requirement will have an enormous and immediate impact on California high schools and community colleges. Our rapport and articulation with feeder schools continues to be good. We would gladly increase our coordination and consultation with these institutions to assist them in meeting the challenges resulting from the adoption of a foreign language requirement in our system.

CONCLUSIONS

The Foreign Language Department of California State University, draws the following conclusions concerning the Task Force's report on the proposed foreign language requirement:

1. The Department endorses the concept of a foreign language requirement, is satisfied with the proposal of Level II proficiency, and supports the ideal that such competency should be demonstrated through examination. But it remains the Department's position that steps toward such an ideal cannot even be initiated at present due to budgetary restraints and generally insufficient resources as outlined heretofore in this report.
2. At least insofar as the CSUS campus is concerned, there are simply not at present sufficient financial and instructional resources available to implement the requirement. The Department rejects the Task Force's assertion that "under-strength" upper-division and graduate courses and/or "under-utilized" foreign language faculty can or should be the source of personnel necessary for increasing the number of 1A and 1B sections crucial to implementation of the requirement. The Department would call the following fact to the attention of the Task Force: All foreign language faculty serving full-time at CSUS were hired, tenured and promoted on the basis of their specialized expertise (Ph. D. level) in advanced language, literature and civilization for upper-division and graduate level courses as well as demonstrated ability to teach lower division courses. Present faculty is essential, and in some case (Spanish), even lacking, to maintain adequate course offering for major, minor and graduate requirements.
3. Implementation of the requirement would be highly unwise without assurances from the system that adequate resources would be allocated in the immediate future.
4. The statistical tables presented in the Task Force report (See Report Annex C, pp. 23-39), which would justify the feasibility of immediate implementation of the requirement, are faulty. Although they attempt to be representative of the entire system, they fail to consider the need for evaluating students with previous language study by placement examination rather than by granting automatic equivalencies (1 year of high school study equated to 1 semester of post-secondary work).
5. Given the fact that the foreign language requirement cannot be implemented in the near future on this campus according to the specifications of the Task Force Report, the only approach which could be attempted with the minimum amount of additional resources is an "instruction-completed" formula--2 years of high school or 1 year of college level foreign language without proficiency testing. This approach, however, has not been endorsed by the Foreign Language Department.

The Foreign Language Department of CSUS, while endorsing in principle a CSU Foreign Language Requirement, welcomes any additional communication and is ready to provide assistance and input on the issue.



California State University, Sacramento

6000 J STREET, SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95819

MEMORANDUM

TO: Alan Wade, Chair
Academic Senate

FROM: Duane L. Anderson, Director
Admissions, Records, and
School/College Relations

DATE: October 25, 1983

SUBJ: Foreign Language
Requirement

Someone is kidding us. "The Task Force concluded that a two semester requirement is supportable within currently available resources". The quote is from Dr. Vandament's cover letter describing the Task Force recommendations. There is no way we can obtain the two semester level competency from all students with existing resources.

I will start my comments by admitting that I do not understand all the formulae that accompany the Task Force Report.

Under Interpretation on page 38 the report concludes "there is ample instructional capacity available...". The most charitable way of looking at the equation and assumptions is to say they over estimate the ability of students who had a foreign language in high school (usually during the freshman and sophomore years) to pass a college level II proficiency examination. They under estimate the difficulty of such tests and ignore evidence from existing placement tests which show most college freshmen, regardless of prior courses, start with the 1A level language courses.

After talking with Claude Duval, Chair of our Foreign Language Department, I estimate that no less than 60 percent of our freshmen would need two semesters of language coursework here, some more than that, to pass the level II proficiency exam. The number of transfers needing language coursework is difficult to guess since there is no way of predicting how well community colleges could respond to such an overwhelming coursework demand. While the Task Force abstract states that "high schools and community colleges doubtless will have made adjustments as well", there is nothing but hope to support such a statement. I don't think those educational segments feel as strongly about foreign languages as the Task Force does. Nor do I see where they can obtain the resources necessary to meet such expectations. The Task Force acknowledges "it is highly doubtful that new resources will be forthcoming to support a new foreign language requirement", but yet goes on undeterred using tenuous assumptions to build a mathematical model which does not require new resources to support their view.

A couple brief comments and concerns:

1. including classical languages, as in paragraph 2 of the abstract, is antithetical to the prior sentence, "a foreign language is a natural, spoken language other than English, used by speakers sharing a common culture". Where is Latin spoken? Ancient Greek? or such? It sounds to me like the old theory, "the brain is a muscle which grows when exercised properly", at least number 3 of the rationale on page 3 seems to lean that way. The explanation on page 4 is educational jargon to obscure the issue.

2. Under Rationale, on page 3, reasons 1 and 2 speak of sensitivity and understanding cultures and cultural differences. Cannot these goals be met in high school language classes? Why is level II language proficiency necessary to be culturally aware and sensitive?
3. If coursework is required to meet the foreign language requirement, many high unit discipline graduates will not be able to complete the units within four years without summer sessions, extension or gross course overloads. Several majors already require more than four years, for all practical purposes and for most students, i.e., Nursing, various Engineering programs, Business Administration and Physical Sciences. The report takes note of this but ignores the implications for students and parents completely.
4. There is an assumption that native speakers of languages other than English can pass competency tests in their language. How many languages will we offer tests for? How expensive will it be for all concerned? I don't think many professionals share the Task Force's opinion. The implication is that these people could become exempt by taking a "qualifying exam" but other, english speaking students could not become exempt (unless qualifying exam = proficiency level II exam).
5. The statistics which show fewer than 1% of CSU undergraduates majoring in foreign languages make it sound like a precipitous drop has occurred. The fact that foreign language majors usually go into teaching and the demand for foreign language teachers has declined for many years is overlooked. The percent of CSU degrees in foreign languages rose from less than 1% in 1957-58; to 1.1% in 1962-63; to 2.6% in 1967-68; and fell gradually to 1.8% in 1975; and 1.1% in 1980. The percent and number of majors has declined since 1970 from 3583 to 1916 in 1980 (in the CSU system). The comments on page 2 lamenting the decline but marveling it wasn't even more drastic, fail to consider the cyclical nature of many disciplines such as the social sciences which have dropped far more significantly than languages. Contrary to the background statement, there are records of enrollment which go back into the fifties, if not before.
6. The institutions listed on page 2, which have reinstated the foreign language requirement, are not typical or comparable to CSU. While some people aspire to emulate Duke, New York University, Indiana, Stanford and Yale, that is really not our role in California. If we can find a reasonable way to include the benefits of foreign language and cross cultural studies within our degree programs, fine! Lets do it! But don't try to operate on elitist philosophical positions. I seriously doubt the accuracy of the statement that nearly half of the 256 state universities require foreign language for graduation. Unless you generalize that since some of our programs require a language, CSUS should be listed as requiring a language. It seems likely to be a gross overgeneralization.
7. The net effect of including 6 units of language as a requirement within Group III B of the General Education pattern will be to take units from departments which are already under-demanded, e.g., Art, Drama, Humanities, and Music. The suggestion to count only part of a course for General Education is impractical. The net result of requiring 2 courses (8 units in our case) of a foreign language but not counting all the units in G.E. would be to add to the minimum total required for graduation.

The goals espoused are commendable. Every College Graduate (if not everyone) should have an appreciation of other cultures and social organizations. The issue is not the goal but the means. If we must persist in standards and graduation requirements in a piecemeal fashion, as disciplines or programs come to the public's eye, we are going to self destruct. Among the verities governing academic programs is the tendency to reinvent the wheel on a regular cycle. We change general education cyclically, but seemingly cannot bring our ideals and goals into congruence with F.T.E. issues, faculty layoff problems and campus politics. We change admission requirements because students coming to us from high school are not as well prepared as we would like them to be but the level of preparation and the subjects change over the years. Maybe consistency is too much to ask, but I can see an upcoming demand for computer proficiency, nationalistic goals proficiency, home and family training programs, ethnic studies, and other emerging issues.

The difficulty in changing back and forth is that resources don't immediately appear as the changes are made and there never is a universal appreciation of the new and untried ideas. Perhaps a more gradual approach beginning with the acceptance of two years of secondary foreign language or the equivalent in college could be an exit requirement. It is much less than what is requested and deals with "seat time" rather than competency. Over a period of years, maybe as many as eight years, the requirement could be gradually strengthened to reach the Task Force's desired level. Rigid requirements have a tendency to generate student opposition and hostility. A moderate approach and appeal to reason may preclude this unfortunate result.