

SPECIAL MEETING

1987-88  
ACADEMIC SENATE  
California State University, Sacramento

AGENDA

Thursday, March 24, 1988  
2:30 p.m.  
Anthropology 209

REGULAR AGENDA

AS 88-29/G.E., Ex. GENERAL EDUCATION PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS

GENERAL EDUCATION PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS

The General Education Program Review shall include the following elements: (a) an internal self-study, (b) surveys and interviews with constituents, (c) an external review, and (d) a final report of findings and recommendations.

In order to achieve a comprehensive review and evaluation of the General Education Program, the following bodies in addition to the General Education Committee shall be constituted: a General Education Review Team and an External Review Group.

INTERNAL SELF-STUDY

The General Education Committee shall be responsible for the internal self-study, which is to follow the General Education Review Outline included herein and is to be further elaborated by the General Education Review Team. The General Education Committee shall prepare a written report of its self-study. A member of the General Education Committee shall be designated by the Committee to serve as principal author of the report of the self-study. The Vice-President for Academic Affairs shall provide 3 units of assigned time to the principal author for Fall semester, 1988. The final report of the internal self-study shall be submitted no later than December 15, 1988.

SURVEYS AND INTERVIEWS

Surveys and interviews shall be conducted in order to elicit opinion on the effectiveness of the General Education Program in such areas as advising, content and structure, standards, teaching effectiveness, accessibility to courses, and relationship of courses to area criteria. In addition, information shall be sought to determine the profile of faculty teaching General Education courses (e.g., ratio of part-time to

full-time faculty), and students might be asked to identify specific General Education courses that they found particularly "good" or "bad."

Groups to be surveyed shall include: students, faculty teaching General Education courses, faculty not teaching General Education courses, current and former faculty advisors in the Advising Center, the Council of Deans, librarians and Student Affairs personnel (including managers, student service professionals and staff in the Advising Center, Evaluations, Admissions, School/College Relations, EOP, and SAA). Alumni shall be surveyed, providing a procedure can be developed to ensure an adequate sample. The Review Team shall have the prerogative to identify and survey other constituents likely to provide useful information.

The Review Team shall hold hearings, conduct interviews, and otherwise obtain information from such committees or committee members, faculty, administrators, staff, students, and others as may be considered pertinent to the evaluation and review process.

Survey instruments and interview protocols shall be developed by the Review Team Chair for Review Team approval. An effort shall be made to use or adapt survey instruments that have been tested and validated in General Education program reviews on other campuses. The Chair of the Review Team shall supervise the administration of surveys. Results of surveys and interviews pertinent to the self-study shall be made available to the General Education Committee. The Review Team shall evaluate the results of all surveys and interviews.

#### EXTERNAL REVIEW

The external review shall be conducted by an External Review Group appointed by the Vice-President for Academic Affairs upon recommendation of the Review Team. The responsibilities of the Group shall be delineated by the Review Team. The report of the External Review Group shall reflect the charge to the Group as determined by the Review Team.

#### FINAL REPORT

The Review Team's Final Report shall be organized according to the outline for the Internal Self-study. The Chair of the Review Team shall be responsible for writing the report in consultation with and assistance from Review Team members. The Final Report shall be subject to approval by the Review Team. Dissenting opinions, if any, shall be appended. The Report shall be forwarded to the Academic Senate and the Vice-President for Academic Affairs for appropriate action.

## GENERAL EDUCATION REVIEW OUTLINE

In order to assess the goals and objectives of the General Education Program as well as evaluate program effectiveness, the Internal Program Review is to include but not be limited to the topics listed below. The General Education Review Team shall be responsible for expanding the outline to include other topics if necessary and to identify the questions under each topic needing to be addressed.

- I. Overview of the history and current status of the General Education Program
- II. Objectives of the General Education Program
- III. Policy Making and Administration
- IV. Program Content
  - A. Coherence, Currency, and Sequencing
  - B. Scheduling, Regularity of Offerings, Accessibility
  - C. Standards
  - D. Campus Exceptions
  - E. Double Counting
- V. Summer and Intersessions
- VI. Learning Resources--Library, Media Centers, Computer Center
- VII. Advising
- VIII. Physical Resources
- IX. Fiscal Resources
- X. Recommendations for Change and Improvement

## GENERAL EDUCATION REVIEW TEAM

Composition

The General Education Review Team shall consist of 11 members and a chair.

The 11 members shall include the following:

- a. Four faculty from the School of Arts and Sciences--one each from the sciences, the arts and humanities, and the social sciences, and one additional at-large member
- b. Four faculty--one each from the four professional schools
- c. One faculty member from the Library
- d. One Student Affairs professional
- e. One student

The student member shall be appointed by the President of ASI. Other members shall be appointed by the Academic Senate in consultation with the appropriate deans. The student member shall be appointed by the President of ASI.

The Review Team Chair shall be selected by the following process. The Vice-President for Academic Affairs and the Chair of the Academic Senate shall prepare a list of candidates for review by the Executive Committee and the Instructional Deans. Each of these groups shall have the opportunity to add names to the list and to select three to five candidates to be interviewed. The Vice-President for Academic Affairs and the Chair of the Senate shall interview the candidates selected by the Executive Committee and the Instructional Deans and present to the Executive Committee the name(s) of individuals recommended for the position of Chair of the Review Team. The Executive Committee, on behalf of the Senate, shall consider the recommendations and select the individual to be recommended to the President for appointment.

The Vice-President for Academic Affairs shall provide the Chair of the Review Team with 3 units of assigned time for Fall semester, 1988, and 6 units of assigned time for Spring semester, 1989.

#### Responsibilities of the General Education Review Team

The Review Team shall be responsible for further development of the Internal Self-study Outline, including identifying additional topics and setting forth the questions under each topic needing to be answered.

The Review Team shall be responsible for developing the charge to the External Review Group, soliciting nominations of candidates for the Group, recommending Group membership to the

Vice-President for Academic Affairs, and planning and coordinating the details of the site visit.

The Review Team shall approve the surveys developed by the Review Team Chair and evaluate the results of the surveys when they are completed.

Upon receipt of the Internal Review Report, the Review Team shall determine what additional hearings and interviews are needed and conduct them as well as identify additional data or materials that are needed and obtain them.

The Review Team shall deliberate on the content of the Final Report and provide consultation and assistance to the Chair in the preparation of the Report. The Review Team shall approve the Final Report and attach dissenting opinions, if any, thereto.

#### Responsibilities of the Review Team Chair

The Review Team Chair shall have the same responsibilities as any committee chair for convening and conducting meetings of the Team. In addition, the Review Team Chair shall be responsible for developing surveys of students, faculty, the Council of Deans, Advising Center personnel, librarians, and alumni if a procedure can be developed to obtain an adequate sample. The survey instruments shall be subject to approval by the Review Team. The Chair shall be responsible for conducting the surveys.

The Review Team Chair shall be responsible for preparing the Final Report based on consultation with and assistance from the Review Team. The Chair shall be responsible for distributing the Final Report to the Academic Senate and the Vice-President for Academic Affairs for appropriate action.

#### EXTERNAL REVIEW GROUP

The External Review Group shall consist of three members, at least one of whom shall be from out-of-state.

The Review Team shall solicit nominations from the Vice-President for Academic Affairs, members of the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate, members of the General Education Committee, the Council of Deans, and interested faculty. Members of the Group shall be appointed by the Vice-President for Academic Affairs upon recommendation of the Review Team. Only nominees for whom vitae are available shall be considered.

One member of the Group shall be designated by the Vice-President for Academic Affairs to serve as Group Leader. The Group Leader shall be responsible for coordinating the on-site activities of the Group and preparing a consolidated report of the external review, based on written reports and discussion with other Group members. The consolidated report shall address those issues identified in the charge to the External Review Group formulated by the Review Team, as well as other matters deemed significant by the Group as a result of the external review.

Members of the External Review Group shall receive copies of the report of the internal review and such other materials the Review Team considers important, sufficiently in advance of the site visit that members have time to study them before arriving on campus.

The site visit shall be a full three-day visit. The site-visit schedule shall include time for the Group members to confer and deliberate about the final report. The report shall be due no later than four weeks following the visit.

The Vice-President for Academic Affairs shall determine the honoraria and expenses to be paid to members of the External Review Group. The Group Leader shall receive additional honoraria, to be determined by the Vice-President for Academic Affairs, for the responsibilities of coordinating activities of the Group during the site visit and preparing a consolidated final report.

#### TIME TABLE FOR THE GENERAL EDUCATION PROGRAM REVIEW

March 24, 1988	Approval of the General Education Program Review Process
April 14, 1988	Appointment of the Review Team Chair and Review Team members
April 18, 1988	Review Team begins work on Internal Self-study Outline and content of survey instruments
May 16, 1988	Review Team completes the Internal Self-study Outline and forwards to the General Education Committee
July 1, 1988	Review Team Chair completes survey instruments
August 24, 1988	General Education Committee begins Internal Self-study

September 2, 1988	Review Team gives final approval of survey instruments prepared by Review Team Chair.
September 9, 1988	Review Team begins soliciting nominees for External Review Group
September 15, 1988	Review Team Chair disseminates survey instruments
October 10, 1988	Completed surveys returned to Review Team
October 21, 1988	Review Team completes charge to External Review Group
October 28, 1988	Review Team completes details of External Review Group site visit
November 28, 1988	Review Team recommends External Review Group members to Vice-President for Academic Affairs
December 5, 1988	Review Team establishes site-visit dates in consultation with External Review Group members
December 15, 1988	Internal Self-study Report is completed and distributed to Review Team
Mid February, 1989	External Review Group site visit
Mid march, 1989	External Review Report due
May 15, 1988 <sup>9</sup>	Review Team completes Final Report and forwards to Senate and Vice-President for Academic Affairs

AS 88-30/Ex. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE ACADEMIC SENATE AND URPC  
(AD HOC COMMITTEE REPORT)

The Academic Senate commends the members of the ad hoc Committee on Senate Relations with URPC for their thorough and timely completion of the Committee's charge. The Academic Senate accepts the Committee's report, endorses the recommendations contained therein, and forwards the report and recommendations to the President for action.

Report of the  
ad hoc Committee on the Relationship Between the  
Academic Senate and the University Resources and Planning Council

A. Introduction

At the Academic Senate Retreat on August 25, 1987, AS 87-55 was passed:

Resolved that during 1987-88 the Academic Senate study the relationship between the Senate and the University Resources and Planning Council in order to improve that relationship and to improve communications between the Council and the faculty at large. In addition, the Academic Senate shall study issues such as longer terms for URPC members, faculty orientation for URPC members, release time for URPC members, and twelve month appointment for URPC members.

To accomplish this task, this ad hoc committee was appointed by the Senate:

Michael Ballard-Campbell, Associate Professor, Teacher Education  
George Craft, Professor, History  
Scott Farrand (chair), Associate Professor, Mathematics and Statistics  
Michael Lewis, Associate Professor, Special Education and Rehabilitation  
Anne-Louise Radimsky, Professor, Computer Science  
Jerry Tobey, Professor, History

In the discussions at the Senate Retreat and at the ad hoc committee meetings, strong support was expressed for the University Resources and Planning Council. The recommendations of this committee are intended to improve the effectiveness of the Council, further manifesting the ideas upon which the Council is founded. Several issues were identified as central to the committee's considerations. We sought means to:

1. Help Council members to be better informed before reaching decisions;
2. Decrease the turnover in membership of the Council;
3. Give faculty members of the Council a clearer notion of their roles and responsibilities;
4. Improve communication between the Academic Senate and URPC;
5. Promote the planning function of the Council.



**B. Recommendations****1. Toward a better-informed Council**

Several actions have already been taken by the Council in this effort. The convention by which action is not regularly taken on an item at its first reading is a great step forward. We recommend several small steps.

To improve the effectiveness of first-year Council members, an orientation session should be held to describe the processes of the Council and its subcommittees, recent major actions of the Council, the next year's agenda for the Council, and the responsibilities of Council members. This meeting should be announced to the University community and open to all interested individuals.

To give the Council members some knowledge of the history of past Council and Senate actions, without further inundating them with papers, a reading room should be maintained, carefully organized and indexed to provide easy access to appropriate documents.

To the extent feasible, the schedule for summer meetings of the Council should be arranged in the spring semester, in consultation with Council members. In order to ensure faculty representation, the Senate Executive Committee's representative to the Council should arrange for knowledgeable faculty members to attend (as guests of the Council) summer meetings in the absence of faculty members of the Council.

A valuable piece of information about past allocations to program centers is missing from the process--how were the resources actually used by the program center? This is a controversial matter, as it intrudes on what some see as the prerogative of the program center heads, and it involves more paperwork. Nonetheless, it is useful information for the Council and might be worth the effort to collect. What would be needed is a format for this data that makes it easy to prepare, does not contain so many details as to be useless, yet reveals the pertinent information. Council staff should consult with program center heads and suggest such a format.

Council members should also receive summaries of Senate actions on program changes and program reviews, and summaries of major reports of Senate committees. Details of this recommendation appear in later sections of this report.

The primary responsibility for a more informed Council lies with the individual Council members. When the information is provided in a timely fashion, council members must simply do their homework. Taken seriously, this requires a significant investment in effort, and must be compensated in overall workload. It is unreasonable to expect the commitment of energy necessary for an informed Council without an adjustment in faculty workload. An appropriate adjustment would be three wtu's per semester of assigned time for each faculty member of the Council. However, in recognition of current budgetary constraints, we recommend an interim allocation of three wtu's per semester for the three representatives of the Senate standing committee and three wtu's per year for the two at-large Council members and for the representative of the Senate's Executive Committee. This would replace the current system of allocating 3 wtu's to those Senate committee representatives who are also chairs of their committees.

#### Specific Recommendations:

- 1.a. The convention by which action is not regularly taken on an item at its first reading should be formalized as a rule of Council procedure.
  - 1.b. An orientation session for new Council members should be held at the beginning of each year.
  - 1.c. A Council reading room should be maintained.
  - 1.d. Summer meetings of the Council should be scheduled in advance, with input from the entire Council.
  - 1.e. Program centers should submit to RAC an annual summary of how center resources were used.
  - 1.f. The three representatives of the Senate's standing committees to the Council should each receive three wtu's per semester in assigned time; other faculty members of the Council should receive three wtu's per year in assigned time.
2. Terms of membership on the Council

In order to decrease the turnover in membership on the Council, at-large faculty members of URPC should serve three year terms, with the terms out of phase. The representatives of the standing committees of the Senate, Curriculum Committee, Graduate Policies and Programs

Committee, and Fiscal Affairs Committee, along with the representative of the Executive Committee of the Senate, should serve two year terms on the Council, with two new terms beginning each year. These committee representatives to the Council should continue to be the designees of the committees, not necessarily the committee chairs. These committee representatives could accept appointment to URPC in the last year of their term on their committee, provided that they plan to seek reappointment to the committee. Similarly, an Executive Committee member should accept appointment to the Council with the understanding that he or she will seek reelection to the Executive committee. If committee representatives to URPC are not reappointed or reelected to their Senate committees, new committee designees would be needed. With cause, an appointment to the Council could be for shorter than the prescribed term.

Specific Recommendations:

- 2.a. At-large faculty members of the Council should serve three year terms.
- 2.b. Representatives of standing committees of the Senate, and the representative of the Senate Executive Committee, should serve two year terms.
3. The roles and responsibilities of faculty members of URPC

The primary responsibility of each Council member is to make decisions based upon adequate information. Faculty members on the Council should also have a clear notion of their responsibilities vis-a-vis the faculty and the Senate.

Those Council members who are the designee of a Senate Committee should consult with their Senate committee on the issues being considered by the Council, and should explain their committee's positions on the issues to URPC, but should vote as their own judgment guides them. The at-large faculty members of the Council are not expected to serve as ombudsmen to the faculty, are not expected to conduct plebiscites on the issues, and are not expected to present the "faculty position" on the issues. Rather, they should consult with appropriate members of the campus community, as should every Council member, and reach their own decision. The Council draws its membership from the breadth of the campus community-- not to bring proportional representation from various constituencies, but to bring broad perspective to the Council.

The Council is an innovative experiment in shared governance, and must be mindful of the boundaries of Council and Senate purview. The faculty members of the Council should remind the Council when issues before it are also issues of Senate concern.

Specific recommendation:

3.a. As a part of their orientation session, new faculty members of the Council should be provided with the above statement on their responsibilities.

4. Communication between the Academic Senate and URPC

URPC should avail itself of the information and analyses generated by Senate committees. Senate committees that are represented on URPC are deeply involved in consideration of academic program changes and academic program reviews. The results of these Senate processes should be summarized and presented to the Council. When a Senate committee prepares a major report on a topic of interest to the Council, the committee should supply a brief summary of the report to URPC members and the complete report to the appropriate subcommittees of URPC and to the Council reading room. The committee should also be prepared to give an oral presentation if the Council desires.

As its operations become more refined, the Council and its committees will need more specific information about program changes and their costs. The Senate's Fiscal Affairs Committee already calculates the resource requirements of academic program changes, and identifies whether the department or school has agreed to meet those expenses from within its current level of funding. At the end of each year, the Council member from the Fiscal Affairs Committee, in cooperation with the office of the Associate Vice President for Program Development and Evaluation, should prepare a concise list of the year's program changes, their costs, and at what level the costs are to be borne. This list should be presented to the Council.

Information about Council activities must also be transmitted to the Senate, the faculty, and the University community. Members of Senate Committees who serve on the Council should keep their committees informed about Council activities. The inclusion of information about Council activities in the CSUS Bulletin should resume. The most significant development toward

involving all segments of the University in the actions of the Council has been the special Senate meeting to discuss the University's budget. This should be an annual event, and there should be other special Senate meetings whenever a University forum on a Council matter is appropriate. Cooperative ventures between the Council and the Senate are a crucial element in the communication between the Senate and Council, and in maintaining a balance of interests.

Specific Recommendations:

- 4.a. Results of Senate consideration of academic program changes, academic program reviews, and other Senate reports of interest to the Council, should be summarized and presented to the Council.
- 4.b. At the end of each year the Council member from the Fiscal Affairs Committee should submit to the Council a list of the year's program changes, their costs, and at what level the costs are to be borne.
- 4.c. A summary of Council activities should regularly appear in the CSUS Bulletin.
- 4.d. The Council and Senate should convene a special Senate meeting each year to discuss the University's budget. When appropriate, other special Senate meetings on Council matters should be held.

5. The planning process

It is apparent that the Senate must play a major role in academic planning for the University. The Senate is already active in some basic aspects of planning-- academic program changes and program reviews, and creation of centers and institutes. The Planning Committee will integrate the results of these processes into University Planning. The Senate also conducts special studies, resulting in reports that should be fundamental to University planning. When the Planning Committee considers major issues of academic planning on which there is no Senate report, they should work in cooperation with the Senate. Ad hoc committees formed jointly by the Planning Committee and the Senate are an appropriate mechanism.

Planning requires a commitment of resources, of energy, of intellect. The coordination of University planning is a momentous task. Accordingly, the President of CSUS and

the Academic Senate Chair should appoint a faculty member, for this report called the Academic Planning Coordinator, to be responsible for facilitating the flow of information and ideas between the Senate and the Council, especially as it supports the academic planning function of the Council. The Coordinator would organize information and the academic perspective for the planning process, promote Council decisions based on adequate, digestible information, and engender cohesion and communication between URPC and the Senate and University community. Thus the creation of the position of Academic Planning Coordinator is a great step toward the accomplishment of all of the major goals of this ad hoc committee.

The Academic Planning Coordinator would:

1. Serve as vice-chair of the Planning Committee. In this role the Coordinator would assist the chair in the consequential task of preparing the agenda for the committee and preparing committee reports. The Coordinator would also help to organize the information passing from the Senate and the University community to the Planning Committee.
2. Assist in the preparation of the Annual University Plan. The Coordinator should enrich the planning function of the Council by clarifying an academic vision for the University.
3. Serve on URPC, giving a brief oral presentation of program reviews, major program changes, and significant Senate reports at the beginning of URPC meetings, and preparing written summaries. The Coordinator would help to organize the flow of information to the Council.
4. Serve as a non-voting, ex-officio member of the Senate and the Senate's Executive Committee, thereby furthering communication between the Senate and the Council. The Coordinator would give occasional reports to the Senate on URPC activities. This could be included in the Senate agenda as an Informational Item, much as the statewide Academic Senate report is.
5. Moderate informational fora for the University on URPC activities, such as the special Senate meeting on the budget.

6. Report on Council activities to the University, by way of the CSUS Bulletin and other appropriate media.
7. Conduct the orientation session for new Council members and interested members of the campus community.

The faculty member chosen for this position would need experience in Senate and Council service, the trust of faculty and administration, and a non-partisan, diplomatic, organized manner. The Coordinators should serve three-year terms, out of phase with the terms of the at-large faculty members of the Council, and would require six wtu's per semester for support of these activities.

Specific Recommendations:

- 5.a. When the Planning Committee considers major academic issues on which there is no useful Senate report, they should work in cooperation with the Senate.
- 5.b. The President and the Senate Chair should appoint a faculty member to be responsible for facilitating the flow of information and ideas between the Senate and the Council, especially as it supports the academic planning function of the Council.
- 5.c. The faculty member holding this position should receive six wtu's per semester in assigned time.