

ACADEMIC SENATE

AGENDA

Wednesday, May 11, 1983

2:00 p.m. Psych-153

INFORMATION

1. Report on May 5-6, 1983, meeting of CSU Academic Senate
2. Referendum results

CONSENT CALENDAR

AS 83-37/Ex. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS

Administration/Business Affairs Budget Committee: JAMES HILL
(repl. for L. Heidecker)

ad hoc Committee to Select Candidates for Acting Dean, School
of Business and Public Administration: ROBERT CURRY,
At-large

AS 83-38/Ex. REFERENDUM ON AD HOC COMMITTEE ON CONTINGENCY PLANS
FOR INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

The ad hoc Committee on Contingency Plans for Instructional Programs has submitted its report and been discharged. In the event the Senate must convene a similar committee next year, the referendum results will be used as a guideline in constituting the committee.

AS 83-39/Ex. ACADEMIC CLOSELY-RELATED LAYOFF COMMITTEE

The Academic Senate approves amendment of the Faculty Manual section 5.24.02 as follows:

5.24.02, fifth paragraph

An Academic Closely-Related Layoff Committee composed of three academic closely-related employees shall be nominated by the Academic Senate Executive Committee and appointed by the Academic Senate. The Academic Closely-Related Layoff Committee shall monitor and review the academic closely-related layoff processes and procedures and may make recommendations to the President on the modification of layoff procedures and their future implementation. The Committee shall also make recommendations to the President on the breaking of ties in length of service of tenured employees within a class. (See Section 5.24.04.)

*Doney
agreed
4-14-83*

AS 83-40/Ex. FACULTY MAINTENANCE AND STAFFING POLICY RESOLUTION
(Reconsideration of AS 83-22)

The Academic Senate, CSU, Sacramento, approves the following resolution:

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate, CSU, Sacramento, request that in hiring decisions the Executive Vice President require schools and departments to adhere to the policies in Section 5.22.00 (Faculty Maintenance and Staffing Policy) of the Faculty Manual.

REGULAR AGENDA

AS 83-36/Flr. MINUTES

Approval of Minutes of meeting of April 13, 1983.

AS 83-41/GPPC, Ex. POLICY ON WRITING PROFICIENCY FOR FOREIGN GRADUATE STUDENTS

The Academic Senate approves the following policy relating to writing proficiency for graduate students (sections 3, 4, and 5). [Sections 1 and 2, approved April 13, 1983, are included here for clarity]:

Policy Relating to Writing Proficiency for Graduate Students

All entering graduate students (those classified in degree programs effective Fall Semester, 1982, and thereafter) are expected to have demonstrated writing proficiency at the undergraduate level as prescribed by California State University. Students applying for admission to graduate programs who have not fulfilled this requirement because of having graduated from a non-CSU institution or having completed undergraduate degree requirements prior to the imposition of the writing standard shall be required to demonstrate writing proficiency as an admission requirement or before becoming fully classified in a graduate degree program. The University's writing proficiency requirement for graduates may be met by one of the methods described below:

- 1) Passing the CSUS Writing Proficiency Examination with a score of three or better, or passing an equivalent standard, as approved by the appropriate committee of the English Department and by the Dean of Graduate Studies. (Equivalent standards will apply only to those students who are admitted with baccalaureate degrees from non-CSU institutions, and have demonstrated writing proficiency at the former University.)

Refer to GPPC - cancelled

2) achieving a satisfactory score on the CLEP General Examination in English Composition (Essay Edition), or achieving a satisfactory score (as determined by the Graduate Policies and Programs Committee and the appropriate committee of the English Department) on an equivalent standardized test as recommended by the Graduate Policies and Programs Committee and approved by the Dean of Graduate Studies and the appropriate committee of the English Department.

Any department may, with concurrence of the Graduate Policies and Programs Committee, require other evidence of writing proficiency in addition to the minimum prescribed in either 1 or 2 above.

3) Foreign students, including permanent residents, who are continuing CSUS students or transfer students from another accredited United States college, university, or post-secondary institution where English is the principal language of instruction, must satisfy the writing proficiency requirement through one of the provisions enumerated above or achieve a score of 550 or above on the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL).

4) Foreign students, including permanent residents, who have not graduated from CSUS or from another accredited United States college, university, or post-secondary institution where English is the principal language of instruction, must satisfy the writing proficiency requirement as a condition of admission by achieving a satisfactory score of 550 or higher on the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL). If this admission requirement is waived under Section 41040, Article 8, of Title V, the affected student must meet requirement 5 below.

5) Foreign students, including permanent residents, who are admitted as a CSU admission exception, will be required to take the CSUS English Diagnostic Test in order that appropriate language remediation may be prescribed if necessary to assist the student to meet the CSUS writing proficiency requirement. Writing proficiency must be achieved before the student becomes a fully classified graduate student.

AS 83-42/Ex. PRESIDENTIAL SELECTION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Upon nomination by the Academic Senate of ~~two~~³ faculty from Arts and Sciences, ~~two~~³ faculty from the professional schools, and ~~two~~³ faculty at large, one faculty member will be elected from each of the three areas by all eligible voting faculty. The person receiving the ~~majority~~^{plurality} vote in each area will be elected. The nomination-election to be conducted by the Academic Senate on May 11, 1983 will be by secret ballot, under the auspices of the Senate Election Committee. Faculty members must have consented to serve prior to being nominated.

AS 83-43/CC,GPPC,Ex. REPORT OF THE GRADUATE POLICIES AND PROGRAMS COMMITTEE AND THE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE ON CONTINGENCY PLANS FOR INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

The Academic Senate, CSU, Sacramento, approves and transmits to the University Planning Committee the "Report of the Graduate Policies and Programs Committee and the Curriculum Committee on Contingency Plans for Instructional Programs" as follows:

April 27, 1983

TO: Alan Wade, Presiding Member
Academic Senate

FROM: Marsha J. Dillon, Presiding Member
Ad Hoc Committee on Contingency Plans for Instructional Programs

SUBJ: Report of the Graduate Policies and Programs Committee and the Curriculum Committee regarding Contingency Plans for Instructional Programs

Pursuant to Academic Senate resolutions AS-15 through AS-18, approved on March 9, 1983, the Graduate Policies and Programs Committee and the Curriculum Committee have met and adopted the following report. I am writing to transmit it to the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate.

On April 6, 1983, the Senate approved a statement of program priorities and of criteria and process to govern program evaluation. By this act, it authorized the Ad Hoc Committee on Contingency Plans for Instructional Programs to evaluate academic programs and to develop recommendations to the Graduate Policies and Programs Committee and the Curriculum Committee to govern identification and implementation of possible budgetary reductions for 1983-84. These two committees had established the Ad Hoc Committee and appointed several of their members to it as follows: Marsha Dillon, Richard Fish, Otis Scott, Marilyn Thompson, Pennie Provo, Anne-Louise Radimsky, David Weinerth. At their respective meetings on April 25, 1983, the Graduate Policies and Programs Committee (by a vote of 9-0-1) and the Curriculum Committee (by a vote of 10-0-0) approved the report of the Ad Hoc Committee.

The Ad Hoc Committee began its work by summarizing and evaluating pertinent information about program need, student enrollment, faculty positions, and program quality. It found this

information in the existing program review documents, program representatives' reports of significant subsequent changes in program quality, and the most recent quantitative data supplied by the office of Academic Affairs Research.

While going about its work, the Committee discovered that it could not complete it as originally specified for the following reasons:

- a. Information about program need is sketchy at best. Further investigation of appropriate sources is necessary to discover sufficient information about program need.
- b. Data revealing student enrollment and faculty positions are readily available under the categories of FTES, FTEF, and SFR by level, degrees completed, faculty status and utilization, number of majors, average enrollment in sections, and number of courses and sections. The Committee did not have time to do more than summarize recent trends in some of these categories.
- c. Existing program review documents discuss the quality of academic units, but not the quality of individual programs in detail.

The Committee has been able to identify some of the management tools that are needed if budgetary decisions are to take into account the relative quality of academic programs. The Committee is presently preparing a separate set of recommendations designed to refine the regular program review process to elicit more specific information about academic programs.

As a consequence of the limitations imposed by the nature of the available information and the shortage of time to complete the work, the Ad Hoc Committee has not been able to evaluate individual programs to the extent necessary to recommend specific budgetary reductions. Instead, the Committee has developed several recommendations of a more general nature to guide anyone who may in future have to identify and effectuate such reductions.

1. The Committee recommends that academic program priorities used for the purpose of budgetary reductions be those contained in the University Planning Committee's "University Planning Profiles for Academic Units" (April 18, 1980) and subsequent "Program Planning and Budgeting" documents from the Academic Affairs Budget Committee and that they be modified as necessary to reflect University Planning Committee action on the most recent school and department requests for changes in existing priorities.

Rationale: The Committee recommends against a general effort to establish new academic priorities in a time of budgetary constraint, not only because such a task is extremely difficult in a threatening situation, but also because the existing priorities have in part shaped the University's present character. Nevertheless, the Committee recognizes that the existing statement of priorities is incomplete in some cases (e.g., for programs in the School of Education) and ambiguous in others (e.g., BS programs). An opportunity should therefore be given to representatives of such programs to make a case for adjustment or clarification of their placement within the University's priorities.

2. The Committee recommends:
 - a. that the criteria to be used in evaluating academic programs for the purpose of budgetary reductions include program need, student enrollment, faculty positions, and program quality;
 - b. that these criteria be assessed concurrently in an effort to identify patterns of strength, adequacy, or weakness;
 - c. that reductions be justified in terms of these criteria.

Rationale: The criteria are those used in the existing statements of program priorities. Because these priorities make some programs subject to one or more of the criteria, program evaluation must integrate the priorities and criteria. The criteria should be assessed concurrently to reduce the likelihood that any one of them, such as student enrollment, will be given disproportionate weight in the decision.

3. The Committee recommends:
 - a. that budgetary reductions be made so as to distribute the burden of the reductions among the schools in a way that would not significantly change the current balance between liberal arts and professional programs in the University;
 - b. that the people making reductions assess as accurately as possible the effect that changes in FTES in particular disciplines produce in enrollment in General Education and service courses in other departments.

Rationale: This recommendation embodies the general concern to preserve the mix and diversity of offerings proper to a University. It also reflects the desire to preserve as far as possible the array

of programs that comprises this particular University. Reductions should not so distort the University that departments in Arts and Sciences become merely sources of General Education and service courses for the professional schools or that significant portions of the professional curricula are lost.

4. The Committee recommends that the people making budgetary reductions decide whether to continue to fund
 - a. courses which are explicitly remedial in nature;
 - b. courses having as their primary function the satisfaction of requirements in older General Education programs;
 - c. courses in different departments that satisfy essentially the same requirement;
 - d. other courses which appear relatively less central to the mission, goals, and priorities of individual departments and the University.

Rationale: While the integration of priorities and criteria of evaluation is a means of identifying programs that may be candidates for reductions, some means is also needed to identify individual courses that may be candidates for deletion or consolidation. The Committee suggests the above categories as useful to identifying such courses.

5. The Committee recommends that the appropriate committees be especially careful to assess the need, likely quality, and availability of new resources before approving new programs or changes in existing programs.

Rationale: In a context of declining resources, the burden of proof of the value of new programs and changes in programs should rest with the proponents. They must demonstrate a need, quality, and contribution to the University's mission sufficient to preserve an existing program from the budget reductions contemplated by this report.

6. The Committee recommends that before the administration gives effect to a reduced budget, departments be given the opportunity
 - a. to present evidence and argument about the appropriateness of targeted FTES and SFR;
 - b. to present evidence and argument about the importance of specific programs to the mission, goals, and priorities of the department and University;

- c. to present evidence and argument about the importance of specific courses to the mission, goals, and priorities of the department and University.

Rationale: If the University's administrators are to take advantage of the faculty's familiarity with its respective programs, they must create opportunities for the program representatives to submit evidence and arguments bearing on the design of proposed reductions. Creating these opportunities assures that such reductions will be made in a manner most likely to recognize the programmatic consequences of particular actions.

###