

ACADEMIC SENATE  
OF  
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY  
SACRAMENTO

Minutes

Issue #12

Wednesday, May 7, 1986

ROLL CALL

Present: Addicott, Alexander, Anderson, Ball, Bess, Chmaj, Colen, Curry, Deaner, Endres, Farrand, Figler, Flemmer, Gelus, Harriman, Juan Hernandez, Holl, Jensen, Kaltenbach, Kneprath (Parliamentarian), Kimenyi, Koester, Kostyrko, Madden, Maxwell, McGillivray, Moulds, Munson, Nelson, Price, Pucci, Radimsky, Shattuck, Snow, Ster, Sullivan, Swanson, Taniguchi, Torcom, Wade, Walther, Wheeler

Absent: Aichele, Beckwith, Christian, Good, James Hernandez, Pettay, Stroumpos, Wilson, Winters

ACTION ITEMS

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

Carried unanimously.

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.

Carried unanimously.

AS 86-34/Flr. COMMENDATION OF ENRIQUE 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

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.

Carried unanimously.

\*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.

Carried.

\*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 intersession
- 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.

Carried unanimously.

\*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:

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.

[The complete Academic Program Review is available for review in the Academic Senate Office, Adm. 264.]

Carried unanimously.

\*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.

Carried unanimously.

\*AS 86-39/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."

Carried unanimously.

\*AS 86-40/GPPC, CC, FisA, Ex. PROGRAM/COURSE REVIEW PROCEDURES

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

Carried.

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

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

Defeated.

\*AS 86-42/UARTP, Ex. UNIVERSITY ARTP COMMITTEE - MEMBERSHIP

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.

Carried.

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

The Academic Senate refers this item to the Executive Committee for further consideration.

Carried.

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

Those Student Service Professionals who were Student Affairs Officers in 1984-85 shall continue to be eligible to vote in Academic Senate elections and serve as members of Senate committees.

Carried.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:05 p.m.

  
Janice McPherson, Secretary

JM

\*President's response requested.

**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 Deletions<sup>1</sup>

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.

---

<sup>1</sup>Additions 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.



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-Substantive<sup>2</sup> program modification proposals are listed, circulated, and approved with the consent of the Curriculum Committee by the 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.

---

<sup>2</sup>Non-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.

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 CSUS 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