

SPECIAL MEETING
1987-88
ACADEMIC SENATE
California State University, Sacramento

AGENDA

Thursday, November 19, 1987
2:30 p.m.
Senate Chambers, University Union

INFORMATION

Guest: Dr. Claudia H. Hampton
Member, Board of Trustees (1974-1994)
The California State University

REGULAR AGENDA

CARRIED AS 87-88/FA, Ex. F12 LOTTERY FUNDS (DISCRETIONARY) FOR CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

The Academic Senate recommends adoption of the following policies and procedures for use of the 1987-88 "discretionary" Lottery Funds (\$60,000) allocated for Curriculum Development.

Curriculum Development Mini-Grants

Program Objective:

The key aim of this grant program is to encourage the development of projects which would improve curriculum or programs in accordance with the mission and goals of the California State University, Sacramento. Proposals must address both current and long-range curricular or programmatic needs and priorities identified by department, school, University or the California State University.¹ In specific terms, it is expected that funded proposals will involve and benefit a program, departmental major, concentration or emphasis, or interdepartmental curricular coordination. These Mini-Grants are not intended to support individual faculty professional development.

¹University priorities are identified in the University Resources and Planning Committee's "Plans and Priorities" statement available in the Dean's Office of each school.

Guidelines and Priorities:

Awards ranging from \$100-~~\$2,500~~^{\$3,024}² may be used for various categories of support: travel, student assistance, materials, conference registration, library research, and up to three units of assigned time (\$1,008/unit). Projects must accomplish one or more the following:

1. Fulfill immediate curricula needs of CSUS mandated by revised CSU admission and high school graduation requirements;
2. Meet changes recommended by departmental curriculum priorities, program reviews, accreditation reports, and/or other professional assessments or documents. (For example, student internship programs; revision and creation of course sequences; updating course content in light of new ideas/applications; and/or undergraduate student research.)
3. Encourage cross-disciplinary cooperation and interaction among faculty. For instance, multicultural curriculum planning; explorations of new theories, methodologies, or practices which are common across disciplines.

Project Administration:

1. Applications may come from individuals or from groups. Given the nature of the aim to emphasize the collective impact of the proposal on the department or other academic unit, applicants shall secure the signatures of the Chair and send an informational copy of the application to the Dean.
2. A Review Committee to screen proposals for both the 1987-88 Curriculum Development Mini-Grants and the Instructional Improvement Workshops will be appointed by the Executive Committee of the Senate. The membership shall include: three faculty members from the School of Arts and Sciences, one faculty member from each of the other four schools, one ex-officio, non-voting member appointed by the Vice President for Academic Affairs, and one ex-officio, non-voting member from the ad hoc Committee on Faculty Professional Development.

*earned -
one non-instructional
faculty member
not applying for
a grant
earned.*

²Amendment made by Senate Chair based on more recent information on the cost of WTU reimbursement (\$1,008/unit).

3. The Review Committee will forward its recommendations regarding funding of the proposals to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. Any recommendation that this committee may have on policies or committee procedures will follow the regular Senate channels and deliberations.

AS 87-89/FA, Ex. ^{FIR} LOTTERY FUNDS FOR INSTRUCTIONAL ENHANCEMENT

The Academic Senate recommends adoption of the following policies and procedures for use of the 1987-88 "Program Improvement" Lottery Funds (\$14,148) allocated for Instructional Enhancement Workshop Programs.

Instructional Enhancement Workshops

Program Objective:

The key aim of this program is to encourage the development of workshops which would enhance the instructional programs of California State University, Sacramento, in accordance with its mission and goals. The objective is to seek faculty who would organize and conduct instructional enhancement workshops. Faculty with specific expertise in the subject areas listed below are invited to submit applications for the preparation and delivery of workshops involving faculty from one or several disciplines.

Guidelines and Priorities:

Awards will be for up to three units of assigned time to the faculty workshop leader. In general, workshops will be planned and conducted during Spring 1988. In special cases awards might be granted to prepare a workshop during the spring which would be held in the summer or fall. The workshops may require a varying number of sessions in a number of possible styles including both group and tutorial formats. The underlying outcome of each workshop(s) should be the development of and experimentation with instructional strategies, the integration of new technology into instructional programs, and/or the promotion of cross-disciplinary interaction and cooperation.

Proposals are sought in the following three areas:

1. Quantitative Analytic Skills
 - discipline-based computer training
 - computer applications to instruction (SPSS set-ups; modeling; simulation games; behavioral research)
 - courses designed to include students as "participants" rather than "observers" with hands-on emphases

2. Non-Quantitative Analytic Skills
 - teaching problem-solving
 - developing skills in reasoning and logic
 - incorporating emphasis on reasoning skills
3. Oral Communication
 - discussion as an instructional method
 - lecturing effectively
 - small group learning methods

Project Administration:

1. Applications may come from individuals or from groups and must contain the signature of the Chair. An informational copy of the application should be sent to the Dean.
2. A Review Committee to screen proposals for both the 1987-88 Curriculum Development Mini-Grants and the Instructional Improvement Workshops will be appointed by the Executive Committee of the Senate. The membership shall include: three faculty members from the School of Arts and Sciences, one faculty member from each of the other four schools, one ex-officio, non-voting person appointed by the Vice President for Academic Affairs, and one ex-officio, non-voting member from the ad hoc Committee on Faculty Professional Development.
3. The Review Committee will forward its recommendations regarding funding of the proposals to the Dean for Faculty and Staff Affairs. Any recommendation that this committee may have on policies or committee procedures will follow the regular Senate channels and deliberations.

Carved AS 87-90/FA, Ex. LOTTERY FUNDS--PROCEDURES

The Academic Senate entrusts the ad hoc Committee on Faculty Professional Development with the following tasks related to the Curriculum Development Mini-Grants Program and the Instructional Improvement Workshop Program:

- preparation of application procedures
- preparation of reviewer rating forms
- preparation of final report forms.

REGULAR AGENDA - FIRST READING

AS 87-91/GE, Ex. GENERAL EDUCATION PROGRAM, RESOLUTION ON

Whereas, CSU, Sacramento is about to begin a program review of General Education, and

Whereas, The CSU, the UC and the CCC are currently negotiating a common transfer G.E. curriculum [see draft attached] that will set standards for all lower division students seeking bachelors degrees from any CSU or UC campus; therefore, be it

Resolved That the Academic Senate recommends:

1. A moratorium on program changes (courses additions or deletions would still be permitted) to General Education until,
 - a) the completion of the review.
 - b) conclusion of intersegmental negotiations,
 - c) the revision of Title V Section 40405 (or the determination that no changes will be made).
2. In order to insure timely and appropriate campus planning and action
 - a) the energetic monitoring of, attendance at and participation in the activities of CSU system and intersegmental committees including but not limited to the CSU G.E. Advisory Committee
 - b) the funding to provide the mentioned monitoring, attendance and participation.
3. Consideration by appropriate school deans and the Academic Vice President of a temporary limitation on tenure track hiring in any department whose enrollment might be substantially reduced or altered by implementation of any proposed core transfer curriculum.
4. Regular reporting at intervals no greater than 60 days by the G.E. administrator and the G.E. Committee chair to the Chair of the Senate and the Academic Vice president on the current status of the program review, and the progress of intersegmental and CSU system initiatives.

October 28, 1987

REPORT OF THE INTERSEGMENTAL DRAFTING COMMITTEE FOR A GENERAL EDUCATION TRANSFER CURRICULUM

Following a careful, extended process of deliberation and analysis of existing criteria and requirements, the Intersegmental Drafting Committee for a General Education Transfer Curriculum is pleased to submit its recommendations. In doing so, it has been attentive both to its specific charge and to the broader concerns of our society with respect to the general education of our postsecondary student population.

The committee believes that the principal role of general education is to develop the students' abilities to think and that an effective way to meet this standard is to emphasize that most general education courses should require significant amounts of writing. General education courses should not merely transmit information, but should require analysis, criticism, and synthesis. One of the most effective tools for achieving these goals is the written essay, evaluated with attention to the quality of its writing as well as the accuracy of its content. In addition, the committee also notes that speaking, listening, and reading are important abilities that a general education course should foster. Participation in the intellectual and cultural life of our society requires sound ability in verbal communication of all kinds.

The committee also believes that courses in the transfer curriculum should be culturally broad in their conception. They should help students understand the nature and richness of human culture and social structures through a comparative approach, and have a pronounced historical perspective.

Similarly, one of the most useful things that students should get from their general education is an understanding of the modes of inquiry that characterize the different areas of human thought: the nature of the questions that can be addressed, the way questions are formulated, the way analysis is conducted and the nature and limitations of the answers obtained.

The preceding comments should make clear the committee's intention that the General Education Transfer Curriculum be intellectually challenging; indeed, it must be to do a responsible job of preparing students for entry into the upper division of our demanding four-year institutions and for full participation in the life of the state. It is equally clear that participation in such a curriculum itself requires adequate preparation. Finally, the committee takes this opportunity to reemphasize the importance of high school preparation, and to caution that poor preparation may require students to take remedial courses prior to entry into the transfer curriculum.

* * * * *

Completion of the General Education Transfer curriculum prior to transfer should be recognized as satisfying all lower division general and breadth education requirements of the receiving institution. Any receiving institutions that insist upon the completion of certain of their general education requirements as a prerequisite for transfer must also accept completion of the full transfer curriculum as satisfying that screening requirement. However, the receiving institution may legitimately insist that transfer students complete any general education requirements that must be taken at the upper division level by non-transfer students, or that must be satisfied by all students by upper division course work. In addition, transfer students must fulfill all other admission requirements.

GENERAL EDUCATION TRANSFER CURRICULUM

Page 2

Both the State University and the University have a specific American Institutions requirement that is separate from their general education requirements. Completion of the General Education Transfer Curriculum may not satisfy those requirements. Similarly, general education requirements are separate from lower division requirements for the major. Students pursuing majors which require extensive lower division preparation may not find the General Education Transfer Curriculum option to be advantageous.

All courses offered towards satisfaction of the requirements of the General Education Transfer Curriculum must be baccalaureate in level and must be acceptable for transfer among all segments of public post-secondary education. Advanced Placement credit that is considered equivalent to a course accepted for credit towards the Transfer Curriculum should also be acceptable.

PROPOSED GENERAL EDUCATION TRANSFER CURRICULUM

Subject Area: English Communication (3 semesters or 4 quarters)

The English Communication requirement shall be fulfilled by completion of three semester or four quarters of lower division courses in English reading, critical thinking, written composition, and oral communication, at least two semesters or three quarters of which must be devoted to written composition. Courses in this area shall include close analysis of a variety of representative texts.

The inclusion of a sequence in English Communication in a program of general education is of basic importance to the remainder of the Curriculum. Ability to read at a mature level, to think critically, to write with clarity, and to speak effectively is fundamental to acquisition of knowledge in other areas of the liberal arts. Transmission and exchange of ideas is an essential part of the activity of a liberally-educated citizen. These courses should enable students to go beyond the level of reception and transmission of information and ideas to the more abstract conceptualization of ideas.

Subject Area: Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning (1 semester or 1 quarter)

The Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning requirement shall be fulfilled by completion of a one-semester or one-quarter course in mathematics or statistics.

Courses on the application of statistics to particular disciplines may not be credited towards satisfaction of the Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning requirement.

The increasingly complex, technological nature of the society in which we live routinely confronts us with a variety of information requiring calculation, comparison, and other forms of analysis for problem solving. In addition, many disciplines require a sound foundation in mathematical concepts. The requirement in Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning is designed to prepare students to respond effectively to these challenges.

Subject Area: Arts and Humanities (3 semesters or 3 quarters)

The Arts and Humanities requirement shall be fulfilled by completion of three semesters or three quarters of coursework which encourages students to analyze and appreciate works of intellectual, literary, aesthetic and cultural importance. At least one course shall be taken in the Arts and one in the Humanities. Courses should provide students with some historical understanding of major civilizations and

cultures, both Western and non-Western, including those of ethnic minorities. In the Arts, students should also learn to develop an independent and critical aesthetic perspective.

Courses that are primarily performance or studio classes in the Arts may not be credited towards satisfaction of the Arts and Humanities requirement.

The Arts and Humanities historically constitute the heart of a liberal arts general education because of the fundamental humanizing perspective that they provide for the development of the whole person. Inclusion of this requirement is, therefore, grounded in the deepest traditions of Western education, with its emphasis on language, literature, and the fine arts. At the same time, the great diversity of contemporary American--especially Californian--society adds a vibrant dimension to our received definition of the Arts and Humanities that opens up great possibilities for expansion of that tradition. To focus on the received traditions of the West and the less familiar traditions of other cultures, including the minority cultures in our own society, is to enrich the education of future generations of Californian citizens.

Subject Area: Social and Behavioral Sciences (3 semesters or 4 quarters)

The Social and Behavioral Sciences requirement shall be fulfilled by completion of three semesters or four quarters of coursework which reflects the integration of human social, political, and economic institutions and behavior. Problems and issues in these areas should be examined in their contemporary and historical setting, as well as present a comparative perspective on both Western and non-Western societies, including those of ethnic minorities. Courses should be presented from a theoretical point of view and focus on core concepts of the discipline rather than on personal, practical, or applied aspects.

(Only one of the courses taken to satisfy the United States History, Constitution, and American Ideals Requirement (Title 5, California Administrative Code, Section 40404) shall be credited towards satisfaction of the Social and Behavioral Sciences Subject Area requirement.)

Each of us is born into, lives, and must function effectively within an environment that includes other individuals. People have, from earliest times, formed social and cultural groups that constitute the framework for the behavior of the individual as well as the group. By taking courses in the Social and Behavioral Sciences students will gain a basic knowledge of the cultural behavior and social organizations in which they exist as well as the cultural behavior and social organizations of other human societies.

Subject Area: Physical and Life Sciences (2 semesters or 3 quarters)

The Physical and Life Sciences requirement shall be fulfilled by two semesters or three quarters of coursework which includes at least one course in the Physical Sciences and one course in the Life Sciences, at least one of which incorporates a laboratory. Courses should emphasize experimental methodology, the testing of hypotheses, and the power of systematic doubt, rather than the recall of "facts." Courses that emphasize the interdependency of the sciences are especially appropriate for non-science majors.

GENERAL EDUCATION TRANSFER CURRICULUM

Page 4

The contemporary world is pervaded by science and its applications, and many of the most difficult choices facing individuals and institutions concern the interface of scientific and technological capability with human values and social goals. To function effectively in such a complex world, students must develop a comprehension of the basic concepts of physical and biological sciences, and a sophisticated understanding of science as a human endeavor, including the limitations as well as the power of scientific inquiry.

Respectfully submitted,

Carmen M. Decker, Committee Chair
Department of English and Spanish
Cypress College

Edward A. Alpers, Dean
Honors and Undergraduate Programs
University of California, Los Angeles

Bernice Biggs
Department of English
San Francisco State University

Brian Federici
Department of Entomology
University of California, Riverside

Ray Geigle
Chair, Academic Senate
The California State University

Theo Mabry
Social Sciences Division (Anthropology)
Orange Coast College

Frieda Stahl
Department of Physics & Anatomy
California State University,
Los Angeles

Maryamber Villa
History Department
Los Angeles Valley College

Mark Wheelis
Department of Bacteriology
University of California, Davis

Connie Anderson
Specialist, Chancellor's Office
California Community Colleges

Carla Ferri, Coordinator
Undergraduate Admissions &
Articulation
University of California, Berkeley

Chuck Lindahl
Office of the Chancellor
The California State University

EAA/bs: 10/30/87

ACADEMIC SENATE
of
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

AS-1772-87/FA
November 5-6, 1987

SCHOLARSHIP, RESEARCH AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY
AND FACULTY PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University endorse the statement, "Research Scholarship and Creative Activity."

ACTION ITEM January 7-8, 1988

RESEARCH, SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY
AND FACULTY PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT:
DEFINITIONS AND EXAMPLES

In light of the recent increased interest in recognizing and supporting these activities in the CSU, the Academic Senate finds it useful to summarize its earlier statements and positions in one document. In particular, it is useful to attempt to separate several overlapping concepts related to the professional lives of faculty.

Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity

Whether the term, research, scholarship or creative activity is used depends more on the academic discipline and on the individual's interests than it does on the specific activity in which one is engaged. Research, scholarly and creative activities encompass formal research, whether in the laboratory, observatory, library, field, or population; creativity, whether composition or performance in visual arts, theater, music, dance or literature; analysis or synthesis, whether in history, geography, philosophy, or criticism. However, these activities all have in common a context in which new learning occurs: discovery of new facts, interpretation or reinterpretation of facts, revision of accepted conclusions, theories or laws, practical applications of such facts and revisions, creation or interpretation of an original work of art or of the imagination. These activities advance knowledge within the discipline or within the profession and they can lead to contributions to the field. They are vital to the undergraduate as well as the graduate teaching mission of the CSU.

Research, scholarship and creative activities are expected to stand up to review and critique by others in the discipline. First of all, public discussion and defense of one's ideas are a necessary part of the intellectual process of developing new knowledge, for both faculty and students. Ideas grow and develop when shared with others investigating similar questions. Secondly, selection by journal editors or exhibition jurors or conference session organizers, all of whom are normally colleagues in the same academic field, indicates objective evaluation of one's contribution. Therefore, these activities often result in publication in professional journals, books, or texts, or presentations at professional meetings. Other relevant activity includes, where appropriate, exhibits or performances, criticism, reviews, and editorial, curatorial or consulting activities as well as direction of student research. Students benefit directly from the model of the teacher-scholar, actively engaged in the life of one's discipline, and involving one's students in its excitement. Not only is the conduct of research, scholarship and creative activities central to teaching, but also the public presentation of ideas as well.

The Relationship to Undergraduate Teaching in the CSU

Student involvement is characteristic of research, scholarship and creative activities in the CSU. Undergraduate students, in particular, are involved in these activities in a variety of ways, ranging from laboratory assistance to playing in performance ensembles to cultural preservation efforts. Through this involvement students learn to ask questions, to marshall existing knowledge, to develop methods of acquiring new knowledge, to evaluate outcomes and to make their achievement comprehensible to others. This learning is the

goal of undergraduate education: to develop independent thinkers, whether as entry-level professionals or as graduate students." It cannot be developed through the passive acquisition of information; rather, it requires that students participate in the process of investigation, discovering how it leads to knowledge in concrete instances. Thus, in the CSU, research, scholarship and creative activity are in the service of the teaching mission; they should not be considered to conflict with it.

Scholarly and Professional Activity in the RTP Process

for the purposes of retention, promotion and tenure decisions, the Academic Senate CSU has urged the campuses to adopt a broad definition of scholarly and professional activity that includes contributions to a faculty member's discipline or professional community. In this context, the Senate includes as "professional activity" not only research, scholarship and creative activity and but also active participation in seminars, conferences, and meetings or other activity leading to growth in the faculty member's area of expertise.** "Professional activity," therefore, combines scholarship and aspects of faculty professional development directly related to one's discipline.

D R A F T D R A F T D R A F T D R A F T

Faculty Professional Development

In the CSU, faculty professional development consists of a broad range of activities in which faculty members engage in order to maintain maximal proficiency and to improve all aspects of their professional lives so that they may adequately address student needs: to maintain currency in their fields, to update instructional skills, to prepare for new academic assignments, to participate in academic governance, and to improve their teaching, advising, and scholarship. Any or all of these goals may, of course, be achieved through research, scholarship and creative activity. Indeed, the CSU has traditionally included these activities in its concept of faculty professional development. Development activities enable the faculty to remain vital and active within the profession of teaching: the profession is not static, disciplines change, the university may change, the students may change and the social environment within which higher education exists is subject to change. Faculty professional development addresses change and the efforts needed to assure that faculty are not left behind when change occurs.

Examples of Faculty Development Activities

Programs and opportunities traditionally designed to keep faculty current in their disciplines include sabbaticals and travel to professional meetings where teachers and scholars can exchange current information about research findings and teaching innovations in their fields.*** Continued study may require attendance at symposia, workshops, exhibits, performances and related events, travel to libraries with specialized collections, fieldwork or participant observation in applied settings. As a subject area evolves,

self-directed learning requires discovery or synthesis which contributes to one's own knowledge or insight, and thus to students' as well, although it may not lead to an original contribution to the field.*

Besides contributing to growth in one's discipline, faculty professional development activities keep course materials, syllabi and the curriculum itself current and responsive to changing needs. On the one hand, faculty must become skilled in new technologies relevant to instruction and research in any discipline such as computer applications. On the other hand, they must develop discipline-specific skills such as new laboratory techniques for the analysis of genetic material. Changes in society require that they learn how to incorporate computer literacy and multi-cultural viewpoints into their courses. Changes in external demands require that they develop expertise in outcome assessment and public service internships. Changes in societal needs and priorities require the implementation of course/program adaptations geared to target student populations: adult learners, ethnic minority students, the disabled.

Faculty professional development encompasses all of this professional growth and learning. It is an indispensable ingredient in the partnership between faculty and student which leads to an enriched contribution by both to our society and culture.

* "The Role of Faculty Scholarship in the Comprehensive University (AS-87/AA & FA)

** Resolution on Scholarly and Professional Activity (AS-1629-86/FA)

*** "Faculty Professional Development: Expensive Frill or Indispensable Investment?" (AS-1725-87/AA & FA)

F. RESEARCH, SCHOLARSHIPS AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY

	Current Program Maintenance Level (Estimate)	Proposed Improvement (Estimate)
Positions	-	-
Amount	\$ -	\$7,500,000

The July 22, 1987 draft of the report, The Master Plan Renewed, issued by the Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education, explicitly indicates:

"Research, scholarship and creative activity in support of the undergraduate and graduate instructional mission is authorized in The California State University, and shall be supported by the State."

The Commission estimated as cost for this activity at \$14.5 million. In 1988/89 we are recommending elsewhere that \$4.0 million be allocated to enhance faculty teaching effectiveness (\$3.0 million for faculty development and \$1.0 million to fund permanently the enhanced sabbatical leave program initiated in 1987/88). In addition, \$2.9 million are requested to enable campuses to recruit competent faculty.

This proposal focuses on one additional aspect of faculty development, the enhancement of the scholarly and creative activity of our faculty. There is widespread agreement in the literature dealing with higher

education that faculty who are actively involved in research, scholarship or creative activity in their disciplines become better and more effective teachers. In this request we seek \$7.5 million to initiate formal programs in support of research, scholarship and creative activity among the faculty. Aspects of such a program will include:

1. Mini-grants (\$ 2.5 million)

Funds would be provided to faculty, on a competitive basis, for mini-grants (\$4,000 to \$5,000 maximum). This program would allow faculty to test promising ideas and obtain preliminary results prior to seeking external support for an activity. They might be perceived as "seed" money. The funds would allow faculty to buy adequate computer time, to pay undergraduate and graduate students to function as research assistants, and to purchase secretarial assistance for typing manuscripts and proposals. Part of these funds would be sequestered to provide start-up dollars to enable new, promising faculty to get scholarly endeavor underway.

2. Summer Fellowships (\$2.5 million)

This program would allow qualified faculty to apply for summer stipends of one or two months to inaugurate, continue or complete a project of creative scholarship or research. According to the

literature, the most important factor in enhancing research, scholarship or creative activity among faculty is time. This program would provide faculty with time.

3. Leaves for Research, Scholarship and
Creative Activity (\$2.5 million)

This program would reinstate one of the most successful faculty development programs ever instituted in The California State University. Faculty, particularly newer faculty, would apply, again on a competitive basis, for leaves of one term duration to develop or complete an appropriate activity related to their academic discipline. Title 5 already contains the policy framework for such a program.

These three programs would provide funds to campuses based on the population of full-time equivalent faculty positions. The funds would be disbursed by a campus committee of faculty and administrators with student representation. This committee would develop an overall policy, within specified systemwide guidelines, and would provide for the allocation, on a competitive basis, of internally generated funds for research, scholarship and creative activity. A broadly representative systemwide committee will develop the systemwide policy framework.

11/19/87
Handout

DRAFT

November XX 1987

To: CSUS Faculty and
Academic Administrators

From: Dick Kornweibel, Chair
General Education Committee

Was it Mark Twain who said that everyone complains about general education but no one does anything about it? Suddenly there are many people doing things about general education. Your GE committee, with perhaps more optimism than sense is preparing itself to energetically and purposefully lead the campus in a review and revision of our program. We hope to carefully develop and foster a university perspective rather than just preside over competing factions. We also intend to promote strong and effective CSUS participation in CSU System and intersegmental forums. Since general education and related graduation requirements apply to all of your students who seek baccalaureate degrees from CSUS and since general education should be one of the major hallmarks of the quality of our educational programs, I would request your careful attention to what follows.

Why must we consider general education now? Is there any urgency? We are not in charge of the GE agenda for the following reasons:

1. The CSU requires each campus to do a periodic review of general education. Most campuses have done reviews, we have not.

2. We have on the table two reports, that of the Committee on Undergraduate Education and that of the Committee on the Internationalization of the Undergraduate Curriculum. We also have a proposal, which the GE committee has endorsed, to add or include an ethnic studies requirement.

3. Through a fairly obscure mechanism, the CSU, the UC and the CCC are moving at breakneck speed to create a common general education transfer structure for all three segments. To quote from a recent draft: "Completion of the GE transfer curriculum ... should be recognized as satisfying all lower division general and breadth education requirements of the receiving institution." Informed opinion holds that a transfer curriculum which will be the model for CSU (and hence CSUS) general education will be approved this academic year and implemented as early as the fall of 1989. Since "native" and "transfer" students must be treated similarly, a common transfer curriculum will become the standard for the lower division portion of our campus GE.

4. Our CSU system GE Advisory Committee should begin meeting as early as January to consider not only the proposed transfer curriculum but also other possible changes in the regulations that govern our general education program.

Let me turn now to some explanation and commentary.

1. Our campus GE review must be efficient but not hurried. We can benefit if we can increase faculty knowledge of GE issues and constraints. We can benefit even more if examination and discussion promote a degree of consensus of what GE does and can

do. That discussion will benefit from reference to the growing body of literature on the subject. Except for the pressure caused by the impending external changes, this is the best moment for examination of GE in more than a decade. We can and must look at general education from the perspective of education objectives and not protection of faculty jobs. Even so, there are problems and constraints. GE must integrate with dozens of major programs and must be part of an intricate structure that links us to the other institutions of higher education in California.

2. The external changes are emerging in the general context of higher education Master Plan reviews but specifically in response to two items: The likelihood of legislatively enacted general education regulations if the CCC, CSU and UC cannot themselves work something out. Second, and perhaps as important, the recent report on the Master Plan argues that one of the best ways to promote educational equity is to facilitate the transfer process since a substantial number of our potential students from underrepresented groups begin at the community colleges. CSUS has been effective in the transfer process. The process has not worked as well statewide.

3. Educational policy in the CSU begins with committees, usually of the Academic Senate. Campus faculty and administrators participate in this process. In the past, CSUS participation in this arena has been uneven, often limited or non-existent. It should be energetic. We should not defer to other campus and other faculty simply because we are five hundred

miles away from Golden Shores Drive. We must participate in formulating changes in our system GE policy.

4. Will changes in GE be radical, cosmetic or in between? First, the transfer curriculum structure will be very similar to what we now have and will maintain at least roughly the present distribution to sciences, humanities, social sciences, etc. Second, the campus GE committee has no preconception on whether we will (a) adjust our current program to new external realities, (b) propose major changes or (c) take a middle course.

5. Because some of our students must move slowly as they complete their education, we have four GE programs in operation. It is imperative that we do so well that we create a fifth without creating the need for a sixth or seventh.