

A C A D E M I C S E N A T E
O F
C A L I F O R N I A S T A T E U N I V E R S I T Y
S A C R A M E N T O

Minutes

Issue #19

April 5, 1990

ROLL CALL

Present: Bach, Barnes, Barrena, Bess, Brackmann, Burger, Cajucum, Campbell, Clark, Cooper, Decious, Dillon (Parliamentarian), Freund, Gonzalez, Hallinan, Hayashigatani, Herman, Holl, Huff, Kando, Kelly, Kho, Kornweibel, Lewis, Low, Marsh, D. Martin, L. Martin, Joan Maxwell, John Maxwell, McClure, McGeary, McGowan, Moore, Nicola, Pacholke, Palmer, Reinelt, G. Shannon, Sullivan, Summers, Swanson, Toder, Tooker, Torcom, Tzakiri, Wade, Wheeler, White, Wright, Yousif

Absent: Amos, Figler, Glovinsky, Harriman, Haq, Jakob, Johnson, Kutchins, Mattos, Meyer, Miller, Pyne, W. Shannon, Shek, Stroumpos, Whitesel, Winters

INFORMATION

Members received an information copy of the CSU Academic Senate Action AS-1917-90 "Qualified Support of a Revised 37-unit General Education Transfer Curriculum" (April 5 Senate Agenda Attachment A).

ACTION ITEMS

*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 rased 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, which 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 course review subcommittee must recommend to the G.E. Committee continuation or termination of listing for each of the courses under review. The G.E. Committee must review the work of the Subcommittee and make a final determination.

Following the 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.

AS 90-48/Ex. COMMENDATION--ENGLISH DEPARTMENT

The Academic Senate expresses its appreciation to the faculty in the English Department for their timely preparation of thoughtful and thorough reports that respond to the Senate's requests in AS 89-80 and 89-90. In addition, the Academic Senate commends the English Department on its long-standing commitment to composition instruction, its leadership in the development and implementation of programs that promote writing across the curriculum, and its efforts to insure that all CSUS graduates achieve, minimally, the level of writing competency specified by the Writing Proficiency Examination.

Carried.

AS 90-52/Ex., Flr. CSU SYSTEMWIDE ADMINISTRATION

- WHEREAS, The Donahoe Act of 1960 established the California State University System to advance the common mission of California's public colleges and regional universities; and
- WHEREAS, The Academic Senate of California State University, Sacramento (CSUS), is dedicated to the mission of the California State University; and
- WHEREAS, Recent actions of the California State University systemwide administration in Long Beach have undermined the Legislature's and the public's confidence in our ability to accomplish this mission; and
- WHEREAS, The present California State University systemwide administration appears to have become an organization unto itself that is isolated from the students, faculty, staff, and academic culture of the twenty campuses that constitute the CSU and is unresponsive to the advice of the campuses; and
- WHEREAS, Wise leadership creates a model and leads by examples, especially in time of austerity; and
- WHEREAS, Wise leadership is openly and honestly consultative; and
- WHEREAS, Wise leadership is fiscally responsible; and
- WHEREAS, Wise leadership recognizes the value of all members of the organization, and treats them with dignity, trust, and respect; and
- WHEREAS, Wise leadership values, actively solicits, and acts upon advice from all segments of the organization; and
- WHEREAS, The CSU systemwide administration has failed to provide the kind of leadership necessary to advance the common mission of the campuses of the CSU; therefore, be it
- RESOLVED, The Academic Senate of CSUS, declares that it has lost confidence in the California State University systemwide administration as it is currently structured, operates, and relates to individual campuses; and, be it further

RESOLVED, The Academic Senate of CSUS requests the Board of Trustees to foster in the systemwide administration of the California State University sensitivity to the needs for leadership by example, consultation, and accountability to the public, students, staff and faculty; and, be it further

RESOLVED, The Academic Senate of CSUS requests the Board of Trustees to establish a broadly representative task force¹ to examine the effectiveness of the current California State University systemwide administration and to evaluate the organization and relationship of the systemwide administration to the individual campuses; and, be it further

RESOLVED, The CSUS Academic Senate requests that the Legislature and the public recognize that the campuses of the CSU remain dedicated to serving the educational needs of the people of California and that inadequate budget support will result in a deterioration of the quality of instructional programs and other educational services provided at the campus level; and, be it further

RESOLVED, The CSUS Academic Senate requests that the Legislature re-examine the proposed budget allocations to the CSU to insure that campus programs are not adversely affected; and, be it further

RESOLVED, The CSUS Academic Senate shall distribute copies of this resolution to other campus senates, the CSU Academic Senate, the Chancellor, members of the Board of Trustees, and members of the Legislature for their consideration.

¹Recommended representatives:

Faculty
Staff
Students
Individual campus administration
Board of Trustees

Carried.

The hour of adjournment having arrived, the following items were postponed to the April 19, 1990, Academic Senate Agenda:

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

AS 90-35/Ex. G.E. ADMINISTRATOR, DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES FOR
THE [responds to AS 89-74]

AS 90-36/Ex. G.E. ADMINISTRATOR, LOCATION AND TITLE [responds to
AS 89-74] [First Reading]

The following items were postponed to the April 26, 1990,
Academic Senate Agenda:

AS 90-49, which was divided follows:

AS 90-49A/Ex., Flr. G.E.--CONTENT REVISION, LOWER DIVISION
WRITING REQUIREMENTS [responds to AS 89-90]

The Academic Senate recommends the following revision of the
General Education program structure and course criteria:

Writing Component in lower division G.E. courses:

1. All lower division courses listed in the G.E. Program shall include several informal and/or formal writing assignments spread over the entire semester. Writing assignments should be designed to encourage students to use writing to think through the concept of the course. Lower division writing assignments instituted to satisfy these G.E. requirements need not be graded, but satisfactory completion of them shall be required for a satisfactory course grade (i.e., "C minus (C-)" in a graded course or "pass" in a "pass/fail" course).
2. The nature of course writing assignments and their relation to the general course goals shall be indicated in the course syllabus submitted to the G.E. area committee.
3. For all courses listed in G.E., an early assignment shall be used to assess whether any students in the course need to be advised concerning appropriate available tutoring or ancillary courses for students with writing difficulties.

AS 90-49B/Ex., Flr. G.E.--CONTENT REVISION, UPPER DIVISION
WRITING REQUIREMENTS [responds to AS 89-90]

Writing Component in upper division G.E. courses:

1. Upper division G.E. courses shall include a minimum of 1500 words of formal, graded, out of class writing assignments (approximately seven typewritten double-spaced pages) that will account for at least 25% of the evaluation for the final grade for the course. Preferably there should be more than one writing assignment. At the upper division level, the writing itself as well as the mastery of content should be assessed. Each formal writing assignment should be due in stages throughout the semester to allow the writer to revise after feedback from the instructor and from peers. Informal writing assignments should be included to move the student forward toward completion of the formal writing assignments. Satisfactory completion of formal and informal writing assignments shall be required for a satisfactory course grade (i.e., "C-" in a graded course or "pass" in a "pass/fail" course).
2. The nature of course writing assignments and their relation to the general course goals shall be indicated in the course syllabus submitted to the G.E. area committee.
3. For all courses listed in G.E., an early assignment shall be used to assess whether any students in the course need to be advised concerning appropriate available tutoring or ancillary courses for students with writing difficulties.
4. All upper division G.E. courses are to require prior completion of Area A coursework.

The amended version of AS 90-50 which was distributed at the meeting, as follows:

AS 90-50/Ex. G.E.--ADDITIONAL COMPOSITION COURSE [responds to AS 89-80]

The Academic Senate recommends adoption of a second semester composition course as a University graduation requirement, effective Fall 1992, subject to agreement upon a funding plan that insures sufficient resources to support the requirement that distributes the cost of implementation of the requirement equally to all schools and departments of the University. All students, including G.E. certified transfer students, shall be held to this requirement. Completion of the a second semester composition course with a C- grade or better or earning the course credit equivalent through the English Equivalency Exam#

*Systemwide policy mandates the use of this exam to give students who score above a certain point six units of college credit for English 1A and 1B. CSU Sacramento now awards these students credit for English 1A and three additional elective units of course credit.

shall be prerequisite for upper division G.E. courses and the Writing Proficiency Examination. Although the requirement is not a G.E. Program requirement, the Academic Senate recommends that, for advising convenience, the requirement be identified, with an appropriate footnote, under Area A of the G.E. Program description in the Schedule of Classes.

Specifically, the Academic Senate recommends that the second semester composition course be a lower division course which focuses on composition writing and on reading.

Generally, the course shall continue instruction and practice in the kinds of writing tasks introduced in English 1A and shall include readings in and writings based on multicultural literature. Course grades shall be assigned primarily on the student's demonstrated writing ability. The curriculum of the course shall emphasize the following:

- a review of composition principles
- continued work on the thesis, organization, development
- continued work on revision
- close reading of texts
- summarizing texts in writing
- reviewing texts in writing
- evaluating texts in writing
- integrating texts of others into students' own prose
- constructing an argument, marshalling evidence, persuading
- research techniques
- writing longer papers than are required in 1A
- refining style
- writing precisely and concisely
- improving use of language

At CSUS, this requirement shall be met by a course developed by the English Department. The English Department shall submit its course proposal and other documents normally required in the G.E. course approval process to the G.E. Committee for G.E. Committee review and approval.

AS 90-51/Ex. UNIVERSITY WRITING COMMITTEE [responds to
AS 89-90]

The meeting was adjourned at 4:32 p.m.


Janice McPherson, Secretary

*Presidential approval requested.