

A C A D E M I C S E N A T E

AGENDA

Wednesday, May 7, 1986

2:00 p.m.

Student Senate Chambers, University Union

CONSENT CALENDAR

AS 86-32/Ex. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS

Search Committee, Director of Institutional Studies:

GEORGE CRAFT, History
ERLINDA CLARK, Accountancy
GARY SPRAY, Education

Search Committee, Associate Dean, School of Education:

OTIS SCOTT, Ethnic Studies
CHIANG WANG, Management

AS 86-33/Ex. COMMENDATION OF WILLIAM R. NEUMAN

Whereas, William R. Neuman has served on the Academic Senate of the California State University from 1971 to 1986, and has compiled the longest period of continuous service of any member of that body, and

Whereas, William R. Neuman has served as chair of the Governmental Relations Committee, Chair of the Educational Policies Committee, as Governmental Liaison Specialist, and as member of Senate and CSU committees ranging from the General Education-Breadth Advisory Committee to the Academic Policies Committee and everything in between, and

Whereas, William R. Neuman has served on the Academic Senate, CSU, Sacramento, as its Chair in 1971-72, and as a long-time member of its Executive Committee, as a member of the Presidential Selection Committee in 1983, and of countless other committees, task forces, study groups, and other campus bodies, and

Whereas, William R. Neuman has also managed to find time for extensive professional activity, ranging from the introduction of new courses in water resources engineering to serving as a National

Director of the American Society of Civil Engineers, all the while compiling an outstanding record as a teacher and an advisor, and

Whereas, William R. Neuman, not content to confine his contributions to the United States, has introduced water resources engineering to the barren lands of New South Wales, in return acquiring a lust for opals, and

Whereas, William R. Neuman has published, every spring, "Neuman's Lumens," a collection of the most egregious gaffes uttered over the years by customarily articulate senators, and

Whereas, William R. Neuman has, during his fifteen-year career in the Academic Senate, attended an average of at least ten out-of-town meetings each semester, to the great pleasure of stockholders in Western, United, Republic, American, and assorted other airlines, and

Whereas, William R. Neuman has brought to the Academic Senate a quiet wisdom, a steadfast reliability, and a determined tenacity, much to the best interest of the faculty of the entire CSU, therefore be it

Resolved, That the Academic Senate of California State University, Sacramento, commend William R. Neuman for his service, express its conviction that he will find ample outlets for his abundant energy, and wish him the best as he continues his academic career.

AS 86-34/Flr. COMMENDATION OF ENRIQUE HERRSCHER

[Resolution to be distributed at meeting.]

*AS 86-35/AA, Ex. SEARCH COMMITTEE, DIRECTOR OF INSTITUTIONAL STUDIES

The Academic Senate recommends that a member of the Affirmative Action Committee serve as an ex officio non-voting member of the search committee for the Director of Institutional Studies.

*AS 86-36/AP, Ex. CLASSROOM SPACE, PRIORITY SCHEDULING OF

The Academic Senate recommends that the existing policy for priority scheduling of classroom space for meetings and events other than classes, as presented in Campus Administrative Manual, be modified as shown and that the priorities be adhered to in future scheduling decisions:

- A. Academic classes (including additional facilities)
- B. Instructionally-related activities
 - 1. Drama and Music: production and rehearsals
 - 2. Athletics: games and practice sessions
- C. Administrative Activities, such as testing, and tutoring programs and orientations
- D. Continuing Education: extension, and summer sessions and intercession
- E. University sponsored activities: PASAR, Creative Arts, CRMS, administrative and departmental meetings, etc.
- F. Activities sponsored by university recognized groups, such as student organizations and intramurals
- G. University co-sponsored activities, such as NYSP, Boys State
- H. Other off-campus groups.

*AS 86-37/GPPC, CC, Ex. CURRICULUM REVIEW, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION

The Academic Senate approves the "Recommendations for Academic Senate Action" in the Academic Program Review for the Department of Health and Physical Education. [See Attachment A for commendations and recommendations; the complete Academic Program Review is available for review in the Academic Senate Office, Adm. 264.]

*AS 86-38/GPPC, FisA, Ex. PROGRAM CHANGE

The Academic Senate, CSUS, recommends approval of the following program change:

Social Work: The Division of Social Work offers a 60 unit, two year, MSW program which includes foundation and specialized content in four areas of concentration. The proposed change involves a new sequence of courses over the last three semesters of the program and a change in the present Social Justice and Justice System concentration to a new concentration entitled Community Organization, Planning, and Administration (COPA) which is intended to meet the need for preparation in indirect practice.

XAS 85-39/GE, Ex. GENERAL EDUCATION - SCHEDULE COPY

The CSUS Class Schedule shall be amended to read: "The 1983 to Present and the CSU System Patterns shall require three units in Physical Sciences and three units in Life Forms."

REGULAR AGENDA

Carried

XAS 86-40/GPPC, CC, FISA, Ex. PROGRAM/COURSE REVIEW PROCEDURES

The Academic Senate approves the "Initiation, Review and Approval of Courses and Academic Programs" (Attachment B).

XAS 86-41/GPPC, Ex. THESES, SPACING OF

defeated

[The Executive Committee forwards this proposed policy to the Senate with a negative recommendation.]

Departments shall be given the option of letting students single space theses.

XAS 86-42/UARTP, Ex. UNIVERSITY ARTP COMMITTEE - MEMBERSHIP

Carried

Section 3.01.A of the University ARTP Policy shall be amended, effective 1986-87, to limit to no more than one the number of members from the same primary unit who may serve on the University ARTP Committee.

AS 86-43/Ex. VOTING ELIGIBILITY, STUDENT SERVICE PROFESSIONALS

Tabled to Sept mtg

Whereas, Student Affairs Officers have been traditionally accorded the right to vote in Academic Senate elections and to serve as faculty representatives on committees and other bodies, and

Whereas, The Chancellor's Office has reclassified the former Student Affairs Officers as Student Service Professionals, and

Whereas, This reclassification has resulted in a number of the former Student Affairs Officers being placed in positions that are not academically related or that are management; therefore be it

Resolved, That the right to vote in Academic Senate elections and to serve as faculty representatives on committees and other bodies be limited to

those persons in Student Affairs who are classified as "academically related student service personnel" (SSP-ARs I, II, and III), and are not included in the Management Personnel Plan; and, be it further

Resolved, That the above proposal become effective on January 1, 1987, and that all former Student Affairs Officers now serving as faculty representatives on committees and other bodies may continue to serve until the end of the 1986-87 academic year.

AS 86-35

carried

After reviewing thoroughly the attached Academic Program Review Report for the Department of Health and Physical Education, prepared by the Review Team jointly appointed by our respective groups, the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee and the Graduate Policies and Programs Committee make the following responses in terms of commendations and recommendations and directs these to the indicated units and administrative heads. (Page references refer to the documentation of the response in the Review Report.)

Commendations to the Department of Health and Physical Education

1. The faculty of Health and Physical Education are to be commended for the cooperative spirit they have displayed in merging Health and Safety Studies and Physical Education into a single department.
2. The faculty of Health and Physical Education are to be commended for their commitment to teaching which has enabled the Department to maintain the quality of its program despite the stress of reorganization and the problems created by inadequate facilities.
3. Health and Safety Studies is to be commended for having deleted some courses and for dropping its graduate program in response to the 1980 Program Review.
4. Dr. Bosco is to be commended for his effective leadership of Health and Physical Education.
5. The graduate program in Physical Education is to be commended for resisting the grade inflation that is so pervasive in the undergraduate classes.
6. The secretarial staff is to be commended for providing support services that have helped maintain the Department through difficult times of reorganization.
7. The Department is to be commended for working to improve relations with Athletics.
8. Physical Education is to be commended for the supervision of student teachers in the public schools.

Recommendations

Recommendations to the Department of Health and Physical Education

It is recommended that

1. HPE investigate the feasibility of retraining faculty from underutilized areas to teach FS 136. (p. 3)
2. in the interest of promoting a more serene relationship, the Chair of HPE and the Athletics Director set up a regular schedule of meetings, perhaps on a monthly basis, in which they can discuss common concerns. (p. 5)

3. FPE evaluate its existing procedures to determine if a more systematic approach is needed in soliciting student opinions on the Department's academic program. (p. 5)
4. the analysis classes (140 series) be examined to eliminate redundancy in unit and lesson planning and to improve consistency of focus among the various faculty who teach the courses. (p. 6)
5. the Dance Option be modified to allow students to choose their electives without the approval of the program advisor. (p. 6)
6. the Department examine the core requirements to determine if they bear a sound relationship to the three areas of study. (p. 6)
7. advising procedures be developed to ensure that undergraduate students know that admission to the graduate program will require C.S. 129 and ED CAP 148.2 in addition to the major in Physical Education. (p. 6)
8. the Department develop and adhere to a two-year cycle of courses, and periodically assess its course offerings to determine if they are adequate to meet student needs. Particular consideration should be given to the question of offering core classes at night. (p. 7)
9. PE 100 be reclassified from C2/C11 to C2/C15 because it is a lecture/lab course which seems to fit into the C2/C15 category. (p. 7)
10. if the Department wishes to pursue reclassification of the 140 series and PE 150, 151, 152, 153, 158, 195.2, 195.3, 250, 258 and 259, it provide a detailed rationale for reclassification of each course. (p. 7)
11. Health and Safety Studies reconsider its request to change the classification of HS 136 from C2 to C4. (p. 7)
12. FPE consider phasing out driver safety courses. (p. 8)
13. Physical Education take steps to bring its undergraduate grading patterns in line with University averages. Furthermore, we recommend that performance courses be graded credit/no credit. (p. 9)
14. Health and Safety Studies monitor its grading practices and attempt to bring them into line with University averages. (p. 9)
15. FPE reconsider its RTP procedures and develop a process that is more satisfactory in appraising teaching performance. (p. 10)
16. the Department develop a three-year plan to determine which areas will need new faculty and how replacements will be made. (p. 10)
17. the Department work with the Library to assure that the acquisition of a comprehensive collection of school health science instructional curriculum guides from school districts, both within the state and from strong programs around the nation, be given a high priority. (p. 10)

18. the Department investigate ways to enable faculty to utilize library and media services more effectively. (p. 10)
19. FPE faculty develop procedures to ensure that students have fulfilled the prerequisites for specific courses. (p. 11)
20. Dean Colen and the Chair of FPE work with Dean Comstock and the Athletic Director to develop a joint budget request to cover the costs of the shared facilities. Further, it is recommended that the department consider the following options to cover the cost of providing services such as towels, clothing, and laundry to the University: a) request budget augmentation, or b) charge for the services, or c) discontinue the services. (p. 12)
21. technicians be reclassified so that their job classifications reflect their actual responsibilities and the cost should be apportioned between the Athletics program and FPE. (p. 12)

Recommendations to the Director of Athletics

It is recommended that

1. in the interest of promoting a more serene relationship, the Chair of FPE and the Athletics Director set up a regular schedule of meetings, perhaps on a monthly basis, in which they can discuss common concerns. (p. 5)

Recommendations to the Dean of the School of Health and Human Services

It is recommended that

1. the Dean take steps to ensure that the Budget Committee's procedures for the allocation of resources, and the constraints under which it operates, are clearly described for departments in the School of Health and Human Services. (p. 5)
2. the relationship between the HHS Budget Committee and the HHS Curriculum Committee be defined so that it is clear that budgetary decisions grow out of the programmatic needs. The final disposition of the School's annual budget should be reported to the Budget Committee. (p. 5)
3. the Academic Vice President and the Dean of the School of Health and Human Services appoint a committee from HHS that will, in consultation with appropriate persons from other schools, draft a comprehensive plan for the University for the development and integration of health care programs on this campus. Particular attention should be given to how Health and Safety Studies will fit into this long range plan. This committee should be in place by the end of this semester. It should make a preliminary report to the Curriculum Committee and to the Graduate Policies and Programs Committee by December 1, 1986. (p. 8)

4. the construction of the new building proceed as rapidly as possible. In the meantime, the addition of central air conditioning to the existing facilities should be a top priority in the School of Health and Human Services. (p. 11)
5. Dean Colen and the Chair of FPE work with Dean Comstock and the Athletic Director to develop a joint budget request to cover the costs of the shared facilities. Further, it is recommended that the department consider the following options to cover the cost of providing services such as towels, clothing, and laundry to the University: a) request budget augmentation, or b) charge for the services, or c) discontinue the services. (p. 12)

Recommendations to the Vice President for Academic Affairs

It is recommended that

1. the Academic Vice President impose a moratorium on all health care proposals throughout the University. (p. 8)
2. the Academic Vice President and the Dean of the School of Health and Human Services appoint a committee from HHS, with appropriate representation from other schools, that will draft a comprehensive plan for the University for the development and integration of health care programs on this campus. Particular attention should be given to how Health and Safety Studies will fit into this long range plan. This committee should be in place by the end of this semester. It should make a preliminary report to the Curriculum Committee and to the Graduate Policies and Programs Committee by December 1, 1986. (p. 8)

Recommendation to the University Curriculum Committee

It is recommended that

1. the University Curriculum Committee examine the effectiveness of the procedures for resolving inter-school jurisdictional questions. (p. 5)

Recommendations for Academic Senate Action

It is recommended that

1. the Bachelor of Science degree program in Health and Safety Studies be reapproved pending completion of the University plan for health care programs.
2. the Bachelor of Science degree program in Physical Education be reapproved for a period of five years or until the next scheduled program review.
3. the Master of Arts degree program in Physical Education be reapproved for a period of five years or until the next scheduled program review.

**INITIATION, REVIEW AND APPROVAL
OF
COURSES AND ACADEMIC PROGRAMS**

I. Guiding Principles

**A. Authority and Responsibility for Approval of
Courses and Academic Programs**

1. The Academic Senate develops and recommends to the President policy related to academic programs and curricular offerings.
2. Decision making in curricular matters is to remain as close to departmental and school faculty as possible.
3. Inherent in the decision making process is the implicit trust that those making curricular decisions will act responsibly and in good faith toward the goal of offering the best academic program possible given existing resources and constraints.
4. Departments and schools are accountable for their curricular decisions and are to offer approved courses and programs regularly.
5. If the offering of courses and programs regularly is not possible within existing resources, departments are to modify offerings or resources.

II. Policies Pertaining to Course Change Proposals

A. At the Department level

1. Course proposals normally are initiated by department faculty.
2. Course proposals are reviewed according to department procedures to determine a) the need for and "fit" within departmental programmatic goals and objectives, b) the appropriateness of content, c) the competence of department faculty, and the possession of the necessary support materials/facilities to offer the course, d) ability of the department to offer the course regularly (or on an experimentation

basis), e) the appropriateness of the recommended course classification.

3. The department is responsible for consultation with other departments or schools affected by the course change proposal.
4. The department proposing a course agrees to offer the course within its current resource allocation unless a specific request for supplemental funding accompanies the proposal through the review process.
5. A course proposal in and of itself does not change program requirements. If a proposal involves a program change, a specific request for the programmatic change is to accompany the course change proposal through the review process.

B. At the School level

1. Course proposals at the School level are reviewed according to school practice to determine that a) the need and fit within the school's programmatic goals and objectives, b) the content is complementary rather than duplicative of other school offerings, c) the department has faithfully discharged its course review responsibility.
2. The Dean assigns the appropriate course classification to the proposal which accompanies it through the University review process.
3. Course change proposals submitted by Schools for university review and approval carry no implicit request for change in program requirements or supplemental funding. If a course change proposal requires either of these, it is the responsibility of the School Dean (or designee) to request the program change or supplemental funding when the course change proposal is conveyed to the next university review level.

C. At the University level

1. Course change proposals are placed on a listing by the Office of the Associate Vice President

and circulated periodically to the campus community (e.g., Deans, Department Chairs, President's Staff, members of the Senate's Executive Committee, Curriculum, Graduate Policies and Programs, and Fiscal Affairs Committees). The circulation of the list is also publicized in the CSUS Bulletin.

Department Chairs are requested to post the listing so that all faculty have access to the list. Faculty who have substantive or jurisdictional concerns about proposed course changes are to notify the Associate Vice President through a dean, department chair, unit head or appropriate Senate Committee Chair within ten days of the posting of the list.

2. Members of the Senate's Curriculum Committee are specifically charged with reviewing and concurring with course change proposals. The review is to ensure 1) adequate review at the departmental and school level, 2) appropriate course classification has been assigned by the Dean, 3) the course content is not unjustifiably duplicative of other University offerings, and that it is consistent with the mission of the University, 4) jurisdictional questions, if any, surrounding the offering of the course have been resolved, 5) programmatic changes, if any, required by the proposed course have been approved according to established University procedures.
3. The Associate Vice President, in consultation with the Senate's Curriculum Committee, as appropriate, mediates substantive and jurisdictional questions and approves (disapproves) change proposals after receiving the recommendation of the Curriculum Committee.
4. Final decision of whether to offer an approved course rests with the School Dean and Department Chair based on a judgment of the impact the change will have on other existing school programs given the resources available to support the change.

III. Policies Pertaining to Proposed Modifications in or Deletion of Existing Programs

A. Program Modifications or Deletions¹

1. Changes in programs normally are initiated at the department level.
2. Modifications or deletions in programs follow established university approval process which includes faculty review at the department and school levels, Academic Senate review as well as administrative review and approval.
3. The programmatic and resource review responsibilities of departments and schools in regard to their program modifications or deletions are essentially the same as those associated with course proposals. See items II.A.2., 3.; II.B.1., 2.
4. Resources to support program changes normally come from the School/Department requesting the change. If the change cannot be accommodated within the School's existing resources, the Dean is to submit along with the course change proposal a supplemental funding request. A statement identifying any likely programmatic or fiscal impact the change will have on another school's program is also to accompany the proposal through the University review process.
5. Non-Substantive² program modification proposals are listed, circulated, and approved with the consent of the Curriculum Committee by the

¹Additions of minors, concentrations, options, specializations, emphases subsumed under existing degree programs and certificate programs which are composed largely of existing course offerings will be treated for review purposes as modifications in existing programs.

²Non-substantive proposals are normally those that do not increase or decrease the required units in a program, carry no supplemental funding request, have no identified fiscal or programmatic impact on another academic unit's offerings.

Associate Vice President in the same manner as course change proposals (see Section II.C., above). Program changes that are challenged through this review process for substantive or jurisdictional reasons are routinely pulled from the Senate's Curriculum Committee consent calendar for further consideration and appropriate recommendation to the Senate.

6. Substantive program modification proposals are directed to the Academic Senate for its Fiscal Affairs Committee for review of the School's analysis of its fiscal impact, including any potential fiscal impact on other academic units. Concurrence or difference in judgment about the School's analysis are noted by the Committee. The findings of the Fiscal Affairs Committee become part of the program change proposal which is then directed by the Senate to its Curriculum Committee and the Graduate Policies and Programs Committee, as appropriate, for review and recommendation.
7. The Senate's Curriculum Committee, in consultation with the Graduate Policies and Programs Committee, as appropriate, recommends to the Senate the approval (or disapproval) of proposed program changes. A recommendation to approve a program change is to be accompanied by a statement from the Curriculum Committee suggesting a funding source to support the change; e.g., existing department/school resources, reallocation of existing university resources, new university resources, other.
8. When the Senate recommends approval of a program change, the President may consult the University Resources and Planning Council concerning the fiscal feasibility of the Senate's recommendation before acting.
9. Final decision of whether to implement an approved program change rests with the School Dean based on a judgment of the impact the change will have on other existing school programs given the resources available to support the change.
10. Only University approved changes in programs will be reflected in the University Catalog.

IV. Policies Pertaining to Projecting New Degree Programs on the CSUS Academic Master Plan

A. Departmental Initiated Programs

1. New degree programs may be proposed by faculty by means of a new degree planning document a) detailing the purpose, scope, and content of the proposed program; b) assessing the need for the new program, as it relates to the CSUS service area, and potential student demand for the program. Both substantial need and demand must exist to justify new degree programs; c) preparing, with the assistance of appropriate administrative personnel, an estimate of the resources (existing and new) required to operate the proposed new program in accord with acceptable academic standards. Proposed sources for funding the program are to be identified, e.g., departmental, school, university or other funds.
2. The sponsoring department's curriculum committee, or other designated body, reviews the new degree planning document and prepares a programmatic impact statement including an assessment of a) the accuracy of the need and demand statements; b) the soundness and adequacy of the proposed curriculum; c) the "fit" of the new program in terms of the department's goals and objectives such as the degree to which the new program will complement or compete with existing programs; d) the relative priority of the new program in relation to existing programs, e.g., high, intermediate, or low priority; e) the extent the department is prepared to use existing resources to support the program; f) competency of existing faculty to offer the proposed program; g) additional resources (faculty, operating expenses, equipment, facilities, space, support services, and other) needed to operate the program in accord with acceptable standards.
3. Based on the programmatic impact statement, the sponsoring department determines whether to request its School to consider placing the proposed new degree on the CSU Academic Master Plan. The departmental action, together with

its programmatic impact statement, becomes part of the planning document.

4. Once each year, the School's Curriculum Committee, or other designated body, examines all new proposals (time to be established by the School to meet University review timetables). The examination will include a review of the planning documents, the department's programmatic impact and endorsing statements. Concurrences or differences in judgment about these items are noted by the School and attached to the planning document.
5. The School determines whether it supports the inclusion of the proposed program on the campus Academic Master Plan. Proposals which are not supported are returned to the sponsoring department with the reasons for the action. Departments may submit the proposal or modifications of the proposal in subsequent years.

B. School Initiated Programs

1. New programs may also be proposed at the school level, generally by the deans and associate deans in consultation with department chairs and/or academic councils or other appropriate review bodies. New program plans are often incorporated in a School Comprehensive Planning Document which includes its goals and objectives for the next three to five years. Although the review route is shorter for new programs proposed at the school level, the same documentation is required. These include a) a statement detailing the purpose, scope and content of the program; b) an assessment of the need and demand for the program; c) an estimate of the resources (new and existing) required to operate the program, including expected sources of funding.

C. University Review of New Degree Programs Proposed for Inclusion on the CSUS Academic Master Plan

1. After a new degree proposal has been endorsed by the School, the Dean, in consultation with appropriate school bodies, prepares a Master Plan Projection Request for each proposed

degree program. The request includes the original planning document as indicated in A.1. or B.1. above. In addition, in reference to the school's goals and objectives within the mission of the University, the request will include a) the importance of the proposed program to the School in relation to existing programs; b) the ranking in relation to other programs proposed by the School, including those which it has projected in prior years but has not yet implemented; c) the additional resources the School and other University units will need to implement and support the on-going operation of the program; d) the estimated impact of the program, if any, on other University programs or units; e) a proposed implementation date not more than five years in the future.

2. The Dean's Master Plan Projection Requests are forwarded to the Vice President for Academic Affairs by way of an annual update of the School's Academic Master Plan or by way of annual revision of its Comprehensive Planning Document. Modifications of prior year plans are appropriate, including changes in proposed program priorities or implementation dates. The Vice President may ask the Dean for additional information or justification. She/he then arranges for each Dean to present requests for revisions in the school's plans to the University Resources and Planning Council for information purposes. Questions or concerns about the School's proposed Master Plan revisions may be conveyed by URPC through its designated Council representatives to appropriate Senate Standing Committees or Executive Committee for consideration in making related recommendations to the Academic Senate. (Representatives from the Executive, Curriculum, Graduate Policies and Programs, and Fiscal Affairs Committees hold seats on URPC.)
3. After the Deans have presented their proposed revisions to URPC, the Vice President for Academic Affairs, or designee, conveys each School's Master Plan Projection Requests to the Academic Senate for its normal review and recommendations.

4. It is the Senate Curriculum Committee's responsibility to recommend, in consultation as appropriate with the Graduate Policies and Programs Committee, to the Senate changes in the CSUS Academic Master Plan. In formulating its recommendations on these matters, the Curriculum Committee considers the questions, concerns and comments directed to them by URPC, the Graduate Policies and Programs and Fiscal Affairs Committees.
5. The Senate takes action on the Curriculum Committee's recommendation and forwards its actions to the President. The Senate acts each year on Master Plan revisions no later than at its April meeting.
6. Campus requests for changes in its Master Plan are due in the Chancellor's Office yearly by June 30th. The Board of Trustees acts on the Chancellor's recommendations for revisions to the CSU Academic Master Plan at its January meeting.
7. Projection on the CSUS Academic Master Plan does not carry with it a commitment of the campus to implement the proposed programs, nor does it carry campus or Chancellor's Office approval of program content. Projected programs may be subsequently removed from the Master Plan or their targeted implementation dates moved to later years.

V. Policies Pertaining to Approval for Implementing New Degree Programs

1. Normally, new degree programs are projected on the CSUS Academic Master Plan one to five years in advance. The Chancellor's Staff does not approve the curriculum until the degree program has been projected on the Master Plan.
2. At least six months, and preferably a full year before, before the University plans to implement a new program, the President submits a full program proposal for review and approval by the Chancellor. After the Chancellor's review and tentative approval, the California Postsecondary Education Commission is notified of the campus' intent to implement the program. The Commission

has sixty days to comment on the plan. If no questions are raised within the allowed time period by the Commission, the Chancellor approves the program and determines an effective date for program implementation.

3. Campus initiatives to implement new degree programs follow the established university approval process which includes faculty review at the department and/or school levels (depending on where the proposal originates), Academic Senate review, as well as administrative review and approval. All proposals are to conform with the Chancellor's Office format for submitting proposals. (Forms are available in the Associate Vice President's or School Dean's offices.)
4. Resources needed to support the new program are identified clearly in the new degree proposal. In transmitting the proposal for university review, the Dean indicates the source from which he/she proposes the resources to come.
5. New degree proposals are directed to the Academic Senate for its Fiscal Affairs Committee to review the School's analysis of the program's resource needs, including any impact funding the program as proposed by the School may have on other academic units. Concurrence or differences with the School's analysis will be noted by the Committee.
6. The findings of the Fiscal Affairs Committee become part of the degree proposal as it is directed to the Senate's Curriculum Committee and, where appropriate, the Graduate Policies and Programs Committee for review and recommendation.
7. The Senate's Curriculum Committee, in consultation with the Graduate Policies and Programs Committee, as appropriate, recommends to the Senate the approval (or disapproval) of the proposed new degree. A recommendation to approve a new degree is to be accompanied by a statement from the Curriculum Committee suggesting a funding source to support the new degree; e.g., existing department/school resources, reallocation of existing or new university resources.
8. When the Senate recommends the approval of a new degree proposal, the President may consult the University Resources and Planning Council

concerning the fiscal feasibility of the Senate's recommendation before taking further action on the proposed program or directing it to the Chancellor's Office for review and approval.

9. After the Chancellor's Office approves the campus offering the degree, final decision to implement rests with the School Dean based on a judgment of the impact the new degree will have on other existing school programs given the resources available to support the new program.

3-14-86



California State University, Sacramento

6000 J STREET, SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95819-2694

ACADEMIC SENATE



RESOLUTION OF COMMENDATION FOR ENRIQUE G. HERRSCHER

Whereas, Professor Enrique G. Herrscher of the Universidad de Belgrano, in Buenos Aires, has spent the Spring Semester of 1986 at California State University, Sacramento, as the campus's first Senior Fulbright-Scholar-in-Residence, and *redone*

Whereas, Professor Herrscher brought with him an extensive and impressive record of education and achievement, compiled in Argentina and around the world, and

Whereas, Professor Herrscher shared his knowledge and wisdom not only with the students and faculty of the Department of Management, but also with other departments and programs on campus as well as with the Sacramento community, and

Whereas, Professor Herrscher has combined an incisive analysis of economic issues with clarity of expression and a ready wit, and

Whereas, Professor Herrscher has added immensely to the horizons and perspectives of our university community, therefore be it

Resolved, That the Academic Senate, California State University, Sacramento, express the gratitude of the campus to Professor Enrique G. Herrscher, wish him well as he returns to Argentina, and hope that his next visit to Sacramento will be soon.

Adopted May 7, 1986

Peter H. Shattuck, Chair
Academic Senate

Donald R. Gerth, President
CSU, Sacramento



California State University, Sacramento

6000 J STREET, SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95819-2694

ACADEMIC SENATE



M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: April 30, 1986

TO: Academic Senate

FROM: Richard Ortega, Chair
ad hoc Committee on Hispanic Underrepresentation

Peter Shattuck, Chair
Academic Senate

Keith Pailthorp, of the California Postsecondary Education Commission, has prepared a significant presentation on expected demographic changes in California in the near future. He has agreed to visit us on Wednesday, May 7, at 1:30 in the Student Senate Chambers, University Union, immediately before our regularly scheduled meeting. What he has to say is of the utmost importance for the future of our university and for the state. His information will provide graphic context for the necessity of the educational equity program described to us by Vice Chancellor Herb Carter. We urge you to attend.