

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES December 7, 1999 PRESENT: AbuKhalil, Apodaca, Aronson, Bowers, Clark, Costa, Farrar, Filling, Fisk, Gackowski, Hernandez, Hor, Next Academic Senate Meeting: Keymer, Olivant, Pandell, Peterson, Phillips, Russ, Schulz, Thomas, Thompson, Tordoff, Tuedio, Villanueva, Tuesday, January 25, 2000 Weikart, Wolf, Zarling 2:30-4:30 p.m., South Dining Room PROXIES: Crawford (Hor), Demetrulias (Curry), Filling (Campbell), Grant (Riedmann) Minutes submitted by: ABSENT: Bettencourt, Cartwright, Christopher, Chu, Dinse, Finley, Hilpert, Littlewood, Mayer, Miller-Antonio, Moren GUESTS: Doraz, Hughes, Humphries, Steven Filling, Clerk Jaasma, Klein Recording Secretary: n/a The meeting was called to order at 2:34 pm by Speaker Tordoff. The agenda was approved as submitted. The minutes of November 23, 1999 were then approved by consensus. REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS a. Speaker/SEC (Tordoff) 1. On behalf of the Academic Senate and the entire faculty we extend holiday greetings and wishes for a speedy recovery to Diana Saugstad, our recording secretary. b. University Educational Policies Committee (Aronson) 1. UEPC met last week and will be meeting again this week. The gateway honors program is currently being discussed, and will be brought to Senate in the near future. As an information item - the honors program will be funded by outside sources. c. Faculty Affairs Committee (Schulz) 1. Questionnaires on FMI are trickling in. The deadline for individual questionnaires is Friday. 2. A second draft of Post tenure review policy is being discussed. Work will continue in January. d. Faculty Budget Advisory Committee (Fisk) 1. FBAC met with Vice President Strong, and met again yesterday to discuss a plan of action. e. Graduate Council No report. f. Statewide Academic Senate (Russ/Thompson) 1.K-12 relations subcommittees met on Friday. Basically this is a policy review. SWAS is working on an assessment of the program. g. Associated Students (Cartwright/Villanueva) No report. h. Other ACTION ITEMS Second Reading Item - a. 8/AS/99/UEPC-GC-MA Criminal Justice Doraz noted that the Criminal Justice department has already had this proposal reviewed by 3 external reviewers, all were positively inclined and felt it complemented existing programs in the system. That adds an additional element of acceptability. Russ moved approval of the motion, Costa seconded. The motion passed with two abstentions. First Reading Items a. 9/AS/99/SEC-Resolutions on Community Service Whereas Governor Davis has called for the University of California, the California State Universities and the Community Colleges to institute a mandatory Community Service requirement for all graduates of these institutions; and Whereas the Academic Senate of the California State Universities has requested that each campus Academic Senate consider this issue and respond in general and specifically to a series of questions; Therefore Be it Resolved that the Academic Senate of California State University, Stanislaus endorses the attached general statement and answers to the questions posed by the Academic Senate of the California State Universities. Motion to approve the resolution by Grant, seconded by Weikart. Tordoff reminded senators that this resolution is coming from an ad hoc committee formed last October to respond to an initiative by the Governor. The committee had a number of discussions and sent out surveys to department chairs, particularly looking for input on the effect of academic relation of community service on the department. The committee also considered documents from service-learning offices and other CSUs. As a result they drafted the current document. We stress that as a university we are and have been committed to getting students involved in the community, but strongly feel that a mandated graduation requirement is inappropriate. We list a number of reasons why that is inappropriate. At CSUS we are 'behind' some of our sister institutions which have offices of service-learning. The general thing we looked at was requiring community service, which if from here must be tied to academics. If it's simply a community service act, then it has no place in the university. Bowers suggested that we need to make sure that it is the university that defines community service, not the governor. It must be tied to learning. Grant noted that one of Renner's ideas was that we could make it community service defined as things in concert with 'local sensibilities'. Keymer asserted that this is troublesome because we're backing into service-learning in response to the governor's mandate. The governor should not be telling us what forms an education. Tordoff replied that is indeed a concern. There is a great distinction between community service

and service-learning. The governor has not suggested service-learning, nor has he suggested that the graduation requirement need be academic related. He has said his prime rationale is fostering a service ethic [which this program will wither]. It's a fine line. We are saying we are opposed to a mandated service requirement in any form, but are also speaking to specific questions which SWAS asked us to answer. By answering the questions in terms of what we do we are not implying that we want or approve of this idea. Thompson noted that if it involves an academic relation then we eo ipso have a legislated interference with pedagogy. Tordoff replied we can have community service, related to learning, without having service learning. Asad suggested that we should be truthful. Also - when we try to "outbid" the governor with respect to our reverence for service-learning we are not being smart. Farrar suggested maybe one small change: instead of having engagement of our students say engagement of our citizens. Pandell noted that Keymer is right: he is saying that this is the wrong way to do it. What is interesting is that SWAS passes a resolution asking us. We are responding to something that isn't an issue yet. I think we should start sending recommendations up the other way. How would Davis respond to our advice on his job? Tuedio offered the thought that there is another way we can word it - remove "and strongly supports" from the first line. Olivant - Insofar as we are encouraging students to do community service we are distracting them from improving their minds. I think it is irrelevant to our goals. Our response should be something in line with saying the Governor has no right to be imposing these types of mandates on us. For too long we have tried to be diplomatic and play the game. We need to live with our principles. That explains much of the contradiction in the document. Bowers offered a wording compromise - add a caveat that community service should be connected to learning, and note our opposition to a graduation requirement for community service. Tordoff replied I think we need to keep in mind where this is sitting. The governor has asked the CSU to respond to him. Sometime in the spring the Board of Trustees will be taking this up. And they can mandate that we do this. If they don't receive significant input it will be mandated. Asad stated that we should be very strict in how we respond, expressing our rejection of interference in our academic freedoms. Weikart noted that this document as I read it does oppose the governor's mandate. I concur in that opposition. Thompson stated that what he saw at SWAS meetings was that no one there liked it either, but the consensus feeling was that it is going to happen anyway. Tordoff asked the Senate to consult with their respective constituencies.

b. 10/AS/99/UEPC-Resolution on GE Task Force Recommendation-Goals Whereas; The General Education Task Review Task Force (GERTF) was appointed in fall 1997 to review the General Education Program and make recommendations to the University Educational Policies Committee for a general education curriculum plan and propose a structure for implementation and evaluation; and Whereas; CSU Stanislaus General Education program is guided by the University's mission and goals statement and is committed to developing in its students not only a broad understanding of many subjects, but also the ability to see the essential connections among them; and Whereas; CSU Stanislaus' faculty and students and community advisers stressed the need for these goals in surveys conducted by GERTF; and Whereas; The proposed six goals ranked within the top fifteen responses for each responding group, be it Resolved That the following six goals of Proposal One, developed by GERTF (June 4, 1999) and approved as revised by the University Educational Policies Committee (October 28, 1999) be approved for implementation effective fall 2000: 1. Communication: To provide an educational experience that will enhance the ability to communicate 2. Inquiry and Critical Thinking: To provide an educational experience that will enhance critical thinking skills and will contribute to continuous inquiry and life-long learning 3. Information Retrieval and Evaluation: To provide an educational experience that will enhance the ability to find, understand, examine critically, and use information from various sources 4. Human Experience (Subject Knowledge): To provide an educational experience that will enhance understanding of factors that shape the human experience 5. Global Perspectives: To provide an educational experience that will enhance the ability to look at issues globally or from different perspectives 6. Social Responsibility: To provide an educational experience that helps students develop the basis of ethical judgement and social responsibility; and be it further Resolved that

these goals be phased in, effective Fall 2000, as appropriate, for each new General Education course and for each GE course undergoing its program review; and be it further Resolved that all GE courses will implement, as appropriate, the new goals by Fall 2005. c. 11/AS/99/UEPC-Resolution on GE Task Force Recommendations-Pilot Study Whereas the General Education Review Task Force (GERTF) was appointed in fall 1997 to review the General Education Program and make recommendations to the University Educational Policies Committee for a general education curriculum plan and propose a structure for implementation and evaluation; and Whereas The input solicited by GERTF at two All-University workshops indicated a willingness to experiment with upper division GE; and Whereas The cluster model was preferred as a way to create greater coherence in the upper division General Education program; and Whereas Data presented at the American Association of Higher Education meeting in March 1999 show strong evidence that student persistence and retention as well as attitude toward subject matter improves with linked or clustered courses; be it Resolved That Proposal Two, a pilot cluster model for upper division general education developed by GERTF and approved by the University Educational Policies Committee, be approved for implementation effective fall 2000; and be it further Resolved That the criteria for a pilot program of upper division clusters, contained within the document titled "Recommendations of the General Education Review Task Force" (dated June 4, 1999 and revised by UEPC October 28, 1999) be implemented; and be it further Resolved That the "Recommendations of the General Education Review Task Force" (dated June 4, 1999 and revised by UEPC October 28, 1999) for initiating the pilot program be implemented. Aronson moved that we deal with both resolutions simultaneously, seconded by Russ and approved. Aronson stated that what has been distributed is the results of GE task force over the last three years. The task force reviewed exhaustively what had been going on. Two resolutions are the result of their work. The first is a series of 6 goals that would replace the existing 5 [catalog] goals. The second resolution proposes a U/D cluster of courses as a pilot program. This will run concurrently with existing program for several years until pilot has been tested and implemented and assessed. Crawford noted that what the task force attempted to do was get an understanding of what faculty and students wanted to do/get from GE. We did a lot of surveying: students, faculty, alumni, employers, etc. We also had all-campus workshops to explore the differences between courses in the major, LD GE and UD GE. The first Resolution comes from that effort. The second resolution arose from the all-university forums. The consensus was to experiment with UD but not LD GE. The task force put forth 4 different proposals for different models of UD, the cluster model was closest to what folks wanted and the literature seems to support that. So this is a document developed from your input. Keymer noted that what he heard is that these are respectable standards but we need to focus on resources to meet these standards. Thompson asked Proposal one applies to all GE not just UD right? Crawford replied yes. For cluster courses the cluster will need to meet all six goals. If not in a cluster the GE subcommittee must be shown that the course meets all six goals. Obviously not all to the same degree, but courses will need to speak to these goals in some sense. We asked current GE course instructors to review their courses in light of these goals and most would require some [much] rework. The idea is if we are to strengthen GE we need to strengthen course relation to goals. We are hoping to have students stop saying "I don't know why I take these courses." Thompson asked So this would mean goals should apply to JC courses as well? So rearticulation would need to be redone? Keymer stated that the set of competency themes is sensible, but urges faculty not to apply them to all 6. Would we be better off to just require instructors to be "imaginative". What we are interested in is the GE overall. Crawford replied we had long discussions about this. We say on page 5 that all courses don't have to meet all goals. Keymer responded you need to allow some room for people to do what they think is right. Crawford replied our concern was that if the 5 are requirements and they go to the GE sub, then the course will be fine. What we were concerned about was faculty who would be slackers. We don't want faculty to pick and choose among the goals. As Pandell noted, every GE course will have to change. If its a GE program either they have these goals or they don't. Gackowski expressed similar objections as Keymer. We cannot ask for all 6 goals to be

met in every course. We need to be more flexible. Pandell agreed that no course will meet all six goals. Depending on who looks at the course you could get variant responses as to course suitability. Olivant suggested we might say, "Every course should meet 4 of the 6". Gackowski replied that the subject matter has been completely diluted here in the 6 goals. I am concerned we are losing the content of the course. Zarling noted that 6 are the same as the 5 we've had, I wonder why we're going through this effort if that is the case? Every time we add to a class, we take a week out of what we're already teaching. Time is a resource. Farrar agreed, noting that one of the worst problems we have to deal with concerning GE is redundancy. Crawford replied that the task force differed on that issue. The idea about redundancy is that each discipline requires some basic resource knowledge to engage in the same task. It's through this reinforcement that students "get it". Tuedio stated that it is also interesting that the cluster approach allows for that non-coverage cluster, which indicates the task force's encouragement of the cluster option. Thompson asked if we have goals listed in a resolution which can be altered [which would thwart the will of the committee], what is the intention for next time? Tordoff agreed. A common problem is committees working hard on things and then the Senate alters their work in a very quick manner. It should be the practice that we either adopt or refer back the resolutions in toto. Keymer noted that as it is it is unexceptionable [goals being phased in as appropriate]. Crawford moved to strike that language, which was added by SEC. Peterson agreed. Aronson stated that in an attempt to resolve some of the differences, the task force has done a rethinking of the whole process. 1] Add a number 7 which would reinstate the item from the catalog [providing students with comprehensive overview of discipline] 2] page 2 of the resolution - is it really important for every goal to be met or can 5/7 work? Pandell noted a sense that applying all 6 goals to a course is not easily acceptable. We're not rejecting what the task force has done, merely exercising our global perspective. I see a clear message being sent by the senate. Aronson state that in terms of the existing goals - when courses come to the GE subcommittee the faculty prioritize goals, the GE subcommittee reviews courses in light of those priorities. Fisk stated that one of the problems that could occur is if departments looked at the goals and decided that what they need to accomplish in a specific course is not those goals and thus removed the GE course from GE. This could be problematic in the long run. Tuedio stated his support for the notion that these goals should apply to the curriculum as a whole rather than each course. We should make use of interrelationships. Maybe we can do this for some goals. Tordoff noted that senators have seven weeks to reflect on these things, and offered holiday greetings to all. Meeting adjourned at 4:38 p.m.