

1987-88  
ACADEMIC SENATE  
California State University, Sacramento

AGENDA

Thursday, May 12, 1988  
2:30 p.m.  
Senate Chambers, University Union

**INFORMATION**

1. Special Senate meeting May 19, 1988.
2. Reception for past College Council/Academic Senate Chairs - May 12, 1988 (4:30-6:30, Alumni Grove)

**CONSENT CALENDAR**

AS 88-47/Ex. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS

Board of Inquiry for Student Election: WALLACE ETTERBEEK,  
At-large, 1988

General Education Review Team: (Staggered three-year terms to be determined when Review Team convenes)  
DONALD TARANTO, Arts and Sciences/Sciences  
LINDA PALMER, Arts and Sciences/Arts and Humanities  
SUSAN MCGOWAN, Arts and Sciences/Social Sciences  
ROBERT PLATZNER, Arts and Sciences/At-large  
CRAIG KELLEY, Business and Public Administration  
RENEE GOLANTY-KOEL, Education  
ISAAC GHANSAH, Engineering and Computer Sciences  
THOMAS PHELPS, Health and Human Services  
LINDA GOFF - Library  
BOOKER BANKS - Student Affairs

GE Review Team Chair: ROBERT FOREMAN

Lottery Fund Allocation Committee:

PAUL NOBLE, Arts and Sciences  
GERALD McDAVIE ~~JERRY WILSON~~, Arts and Sciences  
HAMID AHMADI, Business and Public Administration  
TOMA COTTINGHAM ~~MICHAEL LEWIS~~, Education  
WARREN SMITH, Engineering and Computer Science  
PRISCILLA ALEXANDER, Health and Human Services  
LES KONG, Library  
CRETIA MARTINSON, Student Affairs

Meritorious Performance and Professional Promise Committee:

JEAN TORCOM, At-large, 1988 (repl. M. Gelus)

Scholarship Selection Committee: JUANITA BARRENA, At-large,  
1988

Search Committee, Assistant Vice President for Academic  
Affairs: STEPHANIE TUCKER, At-large (repl. L. Bomstad)

Search Committee, Director of Admissions and Records:  
CHARLOTTE COOK, At-large  
WAYNE MULLER, At-large

Search Committee, Student Health Center Director:  
JOSEPH HELLER, At-large

Teacher/Scholar Summer Institute Application Review Panel:  
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBERS shall serve, if necessary, as an  
application review committee if the number of applicants for  
specific workshops exceeds the number of slots available to  
the campus

AS 88-48/CC, GPPC, Ex. CURRICULUM REVIEW--DEPARTMENT OF  
MECHANICAL ENGINEERING

The Academic Senate recommends that

1. the Bachelor of Science degree in Mechanical Engineering be approved for a period of five years or until the next program review.
2. the Bachelor of Science degree in Mechanical Engineering Technology be approved for a period of five years or until the next program review.
3. the Master of Science degree in Mechanical Engineering be conditionally approved until May 1, 1990, subject to a satisfactory progress report by March 1, 1989, regarding the plans the Department has to address concerns in the body of the report. The conditional approval is recommended in order to give the Department time to address the concerns expressed in the body of the report regarding the graduate program.

[Refer to Attachment A for "Commendations and Recommendations"; the complete Academic Program Review is available in the Academic Senate Office, Adm. 264.]

AS 88-49/CC, GPPC, Ex. CURRICULUM REVIEW--DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

The Academic Senate recommends that:

1. the Bachelor of Arts degree in History be approved for a period of five years or until the next program review providing that the Department presents a report to the

Curriculum Committee and the Graduate Policies and Programs Committee by March 1, 1990, demonstrating satisfactory resolution of the problems of either the lack of structure in the major as suggested by the consultant or lack of advising tracks for the major (see Recommendation #2 to the Department of History).

2. the History Waiver Program for the Teaching Credential be approved for a period of five years or until the next program review.
3. the History Minor be approved for a period of five years or until the next program review.
4. the Master of Arts degree in History, Standard Program, be approved for a period of five years or until the next program review.
5. action on the Master of Arts degree in History, Public History Option, be postponed until the revised option has completed the approval process at which time it will be reviewed for recommendation.

[Refer to Attachment B for "Commendations and Recommendations"; the complete Academic Program Review is available in the Academic Senate Office, Adm. 264.]

AS 88-50/CC, GPPC, Ex. CURRICULUM REVIEW--BIOMEDICAL ENGINEERING PROGRAM

The Academic Senate recommends that the Master of Science degree in Biomedical Engineering be approved for a period of five years or until the next program review.

[Refer to Attachment C for "Commendations and Recommendations"; the complete Academic Program Review is available in the Academic Senate Office, Adm. 264.]

AS 88-51/UARTP, Ex. UNIVERSITY ARTP POLICY--AMEND SECTIONS 9.03.A, 9.03.B AND 9.07.K

Amend Sections 9.03.A, 9.03.B and 9.07.K of the statement of University ARTP policy as follows (strikeover = deletion; underscore = addition):

9.03 Periodic Evaluation

- A. "A periodic evaluation of a faculty unit employee shall normally be required for the following purposes:

- "1. Evaluation of temporary faculty unit employees. (see 15.20 - 15.23)

- "2. Evaluation of probationary faculty unit employees who are not subject to a Performance Review. (see 15.24 - 15.27)
- "3. Evaluation of tenured faculty unit employees who are not subject to a Performance Review for promotion." (see 15.28 - 15.30) (M.O.U. 15.17)

Note: Evaluation of faculty unit employees in this category is governed by a separate campus policy, "Periodic Review of Tenured Faculty - Guidelines."

B. ...

Each primary unit may choose one of the following alternatives to govern the role of the chair in both the connection with periodic and performance evaluation processes ~~(the initial determination must be made prior to the file closure date for retention cases in the Fall 1987 semester)~~ of full-time temporary faculty and probationary faculty not subject to performance review:

1. The department chair shall serve as a voting member of the primary committee and shall not submit a separate recommendation evaluation.
- OR
2. The department chair shall not serve on nor meet with the primary committee but ~~will~~ shall conduct an independent evaluation review and submit a separate recommendation evaluation.

For periodic evaluation of part-time faculty, the department chair shall conduct an independent review and submit a separate evaluation.

#### 9.07 Recommendation Process for Performance Review

...  
K. ...

Each primary unit may choose one of the following alternatives to govern the role of the chair in both the periodic and connection with performance evaluation processes ~~(the initial determination must be made prior to the file closure date for retention cases in the Fall 1987 semester)~~:

1. The department chair shall serve as a voting member of the primary committee and shall not submit a separate recommendation.
- OR
2. The department chair shall not serve on nor meet with the primary committee but ~~will~~ shall conduct an independent evaluation and submit a separate recommendation.

AS 88-52/UARTP, Ex. UNIVERSITY ARTP POLICY--AMEND SECTIONS 6.06  
AND 9.07.D

Amend Sections 6.06 and 9.07.D of the statement of University ARTP policy as follows (strikeover = deletion; underscore = addition):

6.06 Probationary Appointments

...

- E. Each unit intending to make a joint appointment shall agree with the other unit or units involved regarding the appointment procedures to be used. The agreement shall be made and approved by the units in advance of publishing the vacancy announcement associated with the appointment.

9.07 Recommendation Process for Performance Review

...

- D. The primary level ARTP committee is responsible for evaluating all personnel under its jurisdiction, including those faculty members who are on joint appointments, those faculty on limited or non-teaching assignments, and those faculty on leave.

In the case of joint appointments each primary unit, party to the appointment, shall evaluate a faculty unit employee's performance of his or her assignment in that unit. If the primary units are in different secondary units, each secondary unit shall evaluate the faculty member's performance of his or her assignment in the primary unit whose members are otherwise subject to its evaluation. Every final recommendation made in connection with a joint appointment shall be included in the working personnel action file. But no primary unit shall incorporate into its basis of evaluation the final recommendation of another primary unit or a secondary unit. Nor shall any secondary unit incorporate into its basis of evaluation the final recommendation of another secondary unit or of a primary unit whose members are not otherwise subject to its evaluation. Differences between final recommendations shall be resolved by the President.

AS 88-53/UARTP, Ex. UNIVERSITY ARTP POLICY--AMEND SECTION 4.03.D

Amend Section 4.03.D of the statement of University ARTP policy as follows (strikeover = deletion; underscore = addition):

4.00 PERSONNEL ACTION FILE

...

4.03 Submissions

...

- D. "A specific deadline before the recommendation is made at the first level of evaluation shall be established by

campus policy at which time the Personnel Action File is declared complete with respect to documentation of performance for the purpose of evaluation. Insertion of material after the date of this declaration must have the approval of a peer review committee designated by the campus and shall be limited to items that became accessible after this declaration. Material inserted in this fashion shall be returned to the initial evaluation committee for review, evaluation and comment before consideration at subsequent levels of review." (M.O.U. 15.12.b) On this campus, the peer review committee for purposes of this procedure shall consist of one member from each secondary committee, chosen by the secondary committee. The review committee shall approve the insertion only of material which became accessible after the declaration date and which in its judgment is significant. This decision shall be limited in its effect to the question of admissibility and shall not extend to the question of the weight or value which shall be given to the evidence by the evaluation committee(s). The decision of the review committee to admit evidence under this section shall be final. For periodic evaluation and performance review, each primary committee shall establish a deadline for the candidate's submission of materials for inclusion in the Working Personnel Action File. ~~The deadline shall be no sooner than three (3) weeks prior to the beginning of the primary committee's deliberations.~~ There shall be no more than a three week interval between the deadline and the beginning of the committee's deliberations.

AS 88-54/UARTP, Ex. UNIVERSITY ARTP POLICY--AMEND SECTION 6.04

The Academic Senate recommends that Section 5.03.01.F of the Faculty Manual be amended as follows [underscore = addition]:

1. A part-time faculty member shall normally be employed by the University for no more than twelve (12) teaching units per semester. Exceptions to this limitation may be made by the school deans on a case-by-case basis.

and

2. Section 5.03.01.F as amended be removed from the Faculty Manual and relocated within the statement of University ARTP policy as a new section 6.04.C.4, renumbering the following parts of that section appropriately.

AS 88-55/GPPC, Ex. GRADUATE POLICIES

The Academic Senate recommends the following policy pertaining to graduate students accepted into more than one master's degree program:

"Graduate students accepted into two or more masters degree programs at CSUS must decide which degree they intend to pursue first. They may pursue a second degree only upon the completion of or withdrawal from the first. Any exception to this policy will require the special permission of the Dean of Graduate Studies."

AS 88-56/GPPC, Ex. GRADUATE POLICIES

The Academic Senate recommends that the current policy of allowing nine units from one masters degree to be credited toward a second be revised to state that: "Graduate transfer credit toward a Master's degree at CSUS may be considered only if the coursework has not been used previously to complete another post-baccalaureate degree."

CONSENT - INFORMATION

AS 88-43/Ex. CONDITIONAL ADMISSIONS

The Executive Committee, on behalf of the Senate, recommends that the policy on Conditional Admissions adopted by the Senate (AS 88-21) be revised as follows (strikeover = deletion; underscore = addition):

If you were admitted "on condition" ~~with a subject deficiency as a first-time or transfer Freshman~~, you will be granted early registration ~~privilege in courses needed to make up the deficiencies for four consecutive semesters so that you will be able to enroll~~ priority which will assist you in enrolling in appropriate courses for the removal of ~~these~~ high school subject deficiencies.

If you have Sophomore standing at CSUS, whether as a continuing student or by transfer to CSUS, and if you still have deficiencies remaining, you will receive early registration privilege provided you are making continuous progress in the removal of your high school subject deficiencies.

All subject deficiencies should be made up by the end of your Sophomore year.

AS 88-44/Ex. CONVOCATION

The Executive Committee, on behalf of the Senate, recommends that a convocation be called on May 21, 1988, to hear Dr. Robert Atwell, President of the American Council on Education in Washington, D.C., speak on "National Politics of Higher Education."

AS 88-45/Ex. SALARY SCHEDULE

The Executive Committee, on behalf of the Senate, receives the March 18, 1988, report of the University ARTP Committee responding to concerns raised about potential salary inequities which may occur because of the new salary schedule and forwards it (Attachment D) to the Senate for information.

**REGULAR AGENDA**AS 88-46/Flr. MINUTES

*Carried.*  
Approval of Minutes of the special meetings of March 24 and April 21, 1988 [Note: Minutes of the regular meeting of April 14 will be distributed prior to May 19 meeting].

AS 88-57/Ex. RESOLUTION OF COMMENDATION, PAST COLLEGE COUNCIL AND ACADEMIC SENATE CHAIRS

*Carried  
unanimously*

RESOLUTION OF COMMENDATION  
FOR  
PAST COLLEGE COUNCIL/ACADEMIC SENATE CHAIRS

WHEREAS, the University is celebrating the first forty years of its history; and

WHEREAS, the College Council and the Academic Senate of California State University, Sacramento, have been an integral part of the University's history; and

WHEREAS, since 1965, faculty members serving as Chairs of the College Council/Academic Senate have provided leadership and service characterized by wisdom, integrity, and vision; and

WHEREAS, the Academic Senate and University have been the beneficiaries of their distinguished, inspiring, and effective leadership; therefore be it

RESOLVED: that the Academic Senate acknowledge the distinguished leadership and extraordinary service provided by each of the following individuals during his tenure as Council/Senate Chair:

Austin J. Gerber	1965-66
Marcus R. Tool	1966-67
Robert G. Thompson	1967-68
Robert C. Donaldson	1968-69
William R. Neuman	1969-70
John C. Livingston*	1970-71
Kenneth L. Berger	1971-72
Peter H. Shattuck	1972-73, 1984-87



Richard A. Cleveland	1973-74
Baqar A. Zaidi*	1974-75
Christopher Dyer-Bennet*	1975-76
Erwin L. Kelly	1976-77
Alan D. Wade	1977-78, 1981-84
Patrick J. McGillivray	1978-79
Jerry L. Tobey	1979-81

; and, be it further

RESOLVED: that, on behalf of the faculty and the University community generally, the Academic Senate acknowledge and express appreciation to past Council/Senate Chairs for their contributions to the Academic Senate and the University.

AS 88-63 SENATE ORGANIZATION (CHATTUCK RESOLUTION) \*Deceased

AS 88-36/FA, Ex. PERIODIC REVIEW OF TENURED FACULTY, POLICY ON

The Academic Senate recommends that the policy on Periodic Review of Tenured Faculty be amended (strikeover = deletion; underscore = addition):

#### PERIODIC REVIEW OF TENURED FACULTY

1. Purpose of Evaluation: To assist tenured faculty members to maintain or improve their teaching effectiveness.
2. Frequency of Evaluation of Instructional Performance: Tenured faculty shall be evaluated at least-once-every intervals of no greater than five years. An evaluation for purposes of retention, tenure or promotion shall fulfill the requirement.
3. Procedures:
  - a. ~~For this evaluation a~~ Each faculty member subject to review shall be evaluated by an elected peer review committee consisting of a minimum of at least three tenured full-time faculty shall be elected annually from the tenured faculty of the department faculty of equal or greater rank. A department member scheduled for this evaluation may not serve on this any periodic review of tenured faculty committee during the year in which he/she is subject to review.
  - b. The department <sup>peer review</sup> chair shall not serve on nor meet with the ~~primary~~ committee but will conduct an independent review and submit a separate evaluation.
  - bc. The department shall develop a schedule of those faculty to be reviewed, in what order and in which year.

*Council  
as  
amended*

- ed. State law and university policy guarantee to faculty the right of confidentiality. Consequently, substantive deliberations having to do with periodic review of post tenure faculty unit employees are open only to committee members.
- de. The peer review committee and the department chair shall consider the following subject matter in conducting the reviews:
1. Student evaluations taken since the last review of the faculty member's performance.
  2. Signed, written statements from students, and other signed, written statements concerning the faculty member's teaching effectiveness only if the faculty member has been provided an exact copy of each statement at least five days before the review.
  3. Material submitted by the faculty member being evaluated. This evidence may include, but not be limited to, the following:
    - Teaching materials
    - Curriculum development
    - Participation in professional meetings
    - Professional lectures, seminars, workshops
    - Consultant work
    - Publications and
    - Leave activities
- ef. The faculty member being evaluated shall have the right to meet with the peer review committee prior to the submission of the committee's report.
- space -*
- g. The faculty member being evaluated shall have the right to meet with the department chair prior to submission of his/her evaluation.
- fh. The committee shall prepare a written, signed evaluation report containing an assessment of the evidence. It shall provide a written copy of this report to the faculty member at least five days before the custodian places it in the Personnel Action File.
- g. ~~The appropriate administrator, normally and whenever possible the department chair, shall provide the faculty member with a written copy of the evaluation at least five days before placing it in the file.~~

i. The department chair shall prepare a written, signed evaluation report containing an assessment of the evidence. He/she shall provide a written copy of this report to the faculty member at least five days before the custodian places it in the Personnel Action File.

*Swanson (14)  
throughout  
delete  
Carried*

j. Prior to placing the evaluations in the Personnel Action File, the Dean as custodian of that file shall indicate his concurrence/nonconcurrence with the findings. In the event of nonconcurrence, the Dean shall place a written statement of the reason(s) for nonconcurrence in the Personnel Action File.

hk. The appropriate administrator, normally and whenever possible the department chair, and the chair of the peer review committee shall meet with the faculty member to discuss his/her strengths and weaknesses along with suggestions, if any, for his/her improvement. ~~The faculty member being evaluated shall also have the right to meet with the Dean prior to submission of his/her evaluation.~~

*Radomski (17)  
delete  
Carried*

il. The evaluation statements shall be placed in the Personnel Action File. The faculty member has the right to submit a written rebuttals to ~~it~~ them and ~~this~~ these rebuttals shall also be placed in the Personnel Action File.

*+ Resolution  
Carried*

AS 88-39/Ex. BLACK RESOURCE CENTER IN THE SCIENCES

The Academic Senate recommends approval of the proposal to establish a Black Resource Center in the Sciences [see Attachment D, April 14 Agenda].

*Carried  
man.*

AS 88-58/FA, Ex. REMOVAL OF DEPARTMENT CHAIR [AMEND POLICY ON "ROLE AND RESPONSIBILITY OF THE DEPARTMENT/DIVISION CHAIR"]

*Carried  
man.*

← ...  
REPLACEMENT

...  
2. Removal

a. For serious and compelling reasons, submitted in writing, and in accordance with department policies and procedures, a department may recommend to the President via the dean or division chair and the Academic Vice President that the incumbent chair be recalled. If the President concurs with the recommendations, the department shall be notified. If the President does not concur, the President shall meet with the department and present his reasons request that the

incumbent Chair be recalled through the following procedure:

- 1) A written request containing the compelling reasons for recall of the incumbent Chair, signed by at least 1/3 (rounded upwards to the nearest whole number) of those eligible to vote in chair-nominating elections, shall be submitted to the School Dean. The incumbent Chair will receive notification of the request together with a statement of reasons.
- 2) The School Dean will meet with the signatories and the Department Chair to make every effort to reach an informal resolution of the recall request.
- 3) If an informal resolution of the recall request fails, the Dean shall conduct a meeting of those department faculty eligible to vote in Chair-nominating elections. A quorum of 2/3 of those eligible to vote must be present at the meeting whose purpose is ascertaining the will of the department regarding the recall request. The incumbent Chair will have the opportunity to respond to the recall request at this meeting, either orally, in person, or by writing, to be read by the Dean. A vote of "confidence/no confidence" will be taken by written ballot at that meeting. A majority of all those eligible to vote in Chair-nominating elections is required for a department recommendation of "no confidence."
- 4) In the event of a "no confidence" recommendation, the Dean shall forward to the President via the Vice President for Academic Affairs:
  - the department's vote and reasons for recall, expressed as a recommendation, and
  - the Dean's independent recommendation, including reasons, and
  - the incumbent Chair's response to the recall request, if any.

The incumbent Chair shall be notified of the department's and dean's recommendations.
- 5) The final decision will be made by the President. The decision, including reasons, will be transmitted to the department.

6) Under normal circumstances, a vote of "confidence/no confidence" can be held only once during an academic year.

b. For Upon receipt of compelling reasons, submitted received in writing from sources other than department faculty, the President may ~~conclude that~~, having consulted with the department, may consider whether the effectiveness of ~~the administration~~ & the department is impaired by the continued incumbency of the chair. ~~When such a conclusion is reached,~~ In these circumstances, the President shall confer with the incumbent chair, the and department faculty, the Dean and the Academic Vice President to discuss the advisability of and the reasons for removal.

The final decision will be made by the President. The decision, including reasons, will be transmitted to the department.

*Carried over*  
AS 88-59/CC, Ex. BACHELOR'S DEGREES, POLICY ON BREADTH AND SPECIALIZATION

The Academic Senate recommends adoption of the following policy for evaluating proposals to establish separate major degree designation for specializations contained within a single discipline or drawn from a combination of disciplines:

CSUS POLICY ON BREADTH AND SPECIALIZATION IN BACHELOR'S DEGREES

CSU, Sacramento offers within its baccalaureate programs broadly based undergraduate majors that are flexible to allow for the orderly introduction of new materials and for specialization within disciplinary areas. Specializations, whether contained within a single discipline or drawn from a combination of disciplines, may be considered for separate degree designation when a base of knowledge is sufficient to sustain independent inquiry that is grounded in theory and methodology, and to generate broad application of subject matter.

In determining whether a specialized undergraduate area of study should be elevated to degree major, CSUS will consider questions adapted from suggested guidelines developed for this purpose by the Chancellor's staff within the Division of Educational Programs and Resources, August, 1984 (revised February, 1985), and other related questions deemed important to this campus. These considerations include:

1. Are there alternative curricular structures that would better serve the purposes proposed?--i.e., should the subject be offered as a certificate, a minor, or an option or concentration? Is the subject matter sufficiently

complex to consider offering the program as a master's degree only? Might it be appropriate as a post-baccalaureate certificate?

2. Is there a body of knowledge broad enough to support baccalaureate degree status for this program?
3. If the proposed degree program is preparatory to a specific occupation:
  - a. Is the occupation likely to exist over the lifetime of the student?
  - b. What is the probable lifetime of the knowledge or information that will be imparted in this major?
4. Is the preparation narrowly conceived? If so, are there ways that preparation (and title) can be broadened?
5. Is the major accurately named?--i.e., is the title so narrow that it unnecessarily restricts employment opportunities and mobility?
6. Does the major use as its foundation or prerequisites the methods, processes, skills and knowledge of a basic academic discipline or core course of study drawn from interdisciplinary fields?
7. Is the size of the major and degree of specialization going to be such as to call into question the broadly based nature of the bachelor's degree itself?
8. Are there precedents within the system and throughout the country for the degree designation requested?
9. Is there sufficient need and demand for the degree program within the region to justify its offering?
10. Will the change in degree designation have a significant programmatic or fiscal impact on other existing university programs, particularly upon other specializations subsumed under the current degree designation under which this specialization is offered?
11. Is there a distinct education or professional advantage in creating a separate degree category for this program?

The responses to these questions will guide the faculty and its governance bodies in judging the advisability of recommending the elevation of a specialized area of study to a degree major.

*Carried over*AS 88-60/GPPC, Ex. JOINT DOCTORAL PROGRAMS--CRITERIA FOR REQUESTS TO NEGOTIATE [responds to AS 87-70]

The Academic Senate recommends adoption of the following criteria for evaluating requests to negotiate joint doctoral programs:

JOINT DOCTORAL PROGRAMS  
Criteria for Evaluating Requests to Negotiate

Permission to negotiate formally the establishing of a joint doctoral program with another institution in no way implies approval of the program which eventually emerges. For that reason, such requests need not be elaborate documents, and the criteria for evaluating them are relatively simple.

1. NEED: The envisioned program should not duplicate existing programs in the region. There should exist an evident population to be served. There should exist an evident social need and career opportunities for the graduates of such a program.

2. CSUS CAPABILITY: The CSUS department should possess *prima facie* a faculty with extensive experience with master's programming and master's theses, highly articulated, cohesive, and relevant research experience and interests, and demonstrated potential for obtaining needed funding for research. The department should append degree programs offered and of theses completed and number of degrees awarded.

3. COLLABORATING INSTITUTION CAPABILITY: If the collaborating institution already has a doctoral program in the field information on degree programs offered and number of doctoral degrees awarded must be provided. If the institution does not have such a program, evidence of the general capability of the faculty along the lines indicated in #2 will need to be provided. In both cases, a rationale for the selection of the collaborating institution shall be provided.

In all cases it is presumed that these criteria will be applied in a spirit of collegiality.

AS 88-61/GPPC, Ex. JOINT DOCTORAL PROGRAMS, REVIEW CRITERIA AND GUIDELINES FOR [responds to AS 87-70]

The Academic Senate recommends adoption of the following criteria and guidelines for establishing a joint doctoral program at CSUS:

CSUS JOINT DOCTORAL PROGRAMS  
REVIEW CRITERIA AND GUIDELINES

1. Rationale for Doctoral Program:

- a. The proposal should specify how the program grows out of the intellectual life of the department and what its purpose is. Conversely, it will need to show how the proposed program furthers the department's goals and objectives. It will also need to show how the proposed program will be integrated with the programming already in place.
- b. The proposal should show how the program will interact with and affect undergraduate and other graduate programming at CSUS.
- c. The proposal should indicate how the CSUS program compares with regionally and nationally recognized programs in the field. The proposal should indicate what features, specialties, or lines of inquiry it may possess which are unique to the discipline.
- d. The proposal should indicate how the program responds to the needs of the region, needs which are not currently being met. The proposal should also describe what new constituencies the program is expected to attract, as well as the competition it will encounter.

2. Rationale for Collaboration:

- a. The proposal will need to indicate why the department has chosen to collaborate with its counterpart at the external institution. It will need to delineate the interests and purposes to be served by the program at each institution.
- b. The intellectual connection with the other department will need to be developed: how do the areas of research, methodologies, and intellectual concerns of the two faculties complement and interface with each other?

3. Faculty:

- a. The proposal will need to provide a list of all the faculty who teach in the program indicating their research, publications, grants, etc. Full CVs of all these faculty will be appended to the proposal. The review will be both individual and collective.
- b. The proposal will list all participating faculty from the collaborating institution in the same way and with similar materials. These faculty will be similarly



Refer to May 12, 1988, Academic Senate Agenda, page 17:

AS 88-61/GPPC, Ex. JOINT DOCTORAL PROGRAMS, REVIEW CRITERIA AND GUIDELINES FOR

At its meeting of May 10, 1988, the Executive Committee considered a request from the Library Faculty to amend AS 88-61. The Executive Committee agreed to amend AS 88-61 as follows (underline = addition):

6. Internal Funding and Resources

- a. The proposal will describe existing facilities at CSUS indicating whether they will be adequate to the proposed program. Part of the proposal will be a report on the result of consultation with the appropriate library faculty regarding library resource requirements needed to support the proposed program. What further ...

Refer to May 12, 1988, Academic Senate Agenda, page 17:

AS 88-61/GPPC, Ex. JOINT DOCTORAL PROGRAMS, REVIEW CRITERIA AND GUIDELINES FOR

At its meeting of May 10, 1988, the Executive Committee considered a request from the Library Faculty to amend AS 88-61. The Executive Committee agreed to amend AS 88-61 as follows (underline = addition):

6. Internal Funding and Resources

- a. The proposal will describe existing facilities at CSUS indicating whether they will be adequate to the proposed program. Part of the proposal will be a report on the result of consultation with the appropriate library faculty regarding library resource requirements needed to support the proposed program. What further ...

reviewed to ensure that they meet CSUS standards. No faculty member from either institution will subsequently teach in the program without being first reviewed and approved.<sup>1</sup>

4. Students:

- a. The proposal should review the character and standards of the department's current graduate students. It will analyze the department's productivity in terms of its students during the past five years, answering questions like: How many theses were produced during this period? What is their significance? How many resulted in publications? A list of their titles should be appended to the proposal.
- b. The proposal should also analyze the department's productivity in terms of graduate student placement: Where have the last 10-20 graduates found employment or continued their studies. Would any of these be likely to return for doctoral study at CSUS?
- c. The proposal should indicate the numbers of full and part-time students the department anticipates attracting to its program. What proportion of these students does the department anticipate supporting?<sup>2</sup>
- d. The proposal should discuss the employment prospects of graduates from the new program and what placement mechanisms it intends to establish.

5. External Funding:

- a. The proposal will need to provide a table which lists and describes what grants, contracts, fellowships, etc., the faculty have (a) applied for an (b) won during the past five years.
- b. The proposal will describe what funding objectives are now on line.
- c. The proposal will indicate the number of graduate students the department anticipates funding through these awards and the level of their support.

6. Internal Funding and Resources:

- a. The proposal will describe existing facilities at CSUS indicating whether they will be adequate to the proposed program. What further expenditure on library, technical facilities, equipment, space, etc., is anticipated within the next five years to ensure that the program meets

quality standards? Will these costs be one-time or recurring?<sup>3</sup> (see section 8)

- b. The proposal will need to indicate what additional faculty appointments are envisioned over the next five years to ensure the program meets quality standards. (see section 8)
- c. The proposal shall include a five year budget projection indicating enrollments, direct and indirect costs, and budget request to the state.

7. Admission Standards

The proposal will compare its admissions standards with those of the strongest programs nationally. How does the department justify its standards?

8. The Program:

The outline of the program should include the following features:

- a. joint governing mechanisms
- b. core courses, options, special areas of emphasis
- c. course descriptions, syllabi, examinations, etc.
- d. qualifying examinations: samples, when administered, how evaluated.
- e. special requirements: foreign language, etc.
- f. residence requirements at each institution.

9. External Evaluation:

The proposal should have appended to it at least one letter from a qualified individual (chair of department at another institution, figure in the field, member of an accrediting board, etc.), discussing both the proposal and its potential constituencies.

10. Appendices:

- a. faculty curriculum vitae
- b. thesis titles from the department for the past five years
- c. syllabi or proposed syllabi, sample qualifying examinations, sample doctoral thesis topics, etc.

- d. accrediting body criteria
- e. external comment

Endnotes

1. Faculty teaching in doctoral programs and serving on doctoral committees will inherently be participating in educational experiences of a high level and quality. It is therefore essential these faculty meet standards appropriate to such an undertaking. These standards include:
  - a. Have specific expertise (theoretical, methodological, or topical) in the area(s) of the doctoral program
  - b. Exhibit a strong, continuous professional record of published research through monographs refereed journal articles, chapters in edited volumes, grants, and presentations at national and international conferences of relevant professional associations
  - c. Possess a doctoral degree in an appropriate discipline
  - d. Be tenured or have tenure-track appointment
  - e. Have demonstrated ability in directing others in research activities (e.g., master's theses)

The above is not intended to preclude the department establishing additional criteria.

2. In many fields, doctoral programs have been regarded as needing a nucleus of full-time, funded students in order to be viable. But this has not always been the case. The proposal will describe and justify the student profile it anticipates.
3. It will be incumbent upon a proposal to identify existing research library standards for its specific subject collections. Attention in shaping the budget request will need to be given to the availability of core journals, access tools, research publications, collection development costs, cataloging support.

*Carried:* AS 88-62/Ex. RESALE OF COMPLIMENTARY EXAMINATION TEXTBOOKS,  
POLICY ON

Whereas, Books are at the heart of the life of the University, and our students develop attitudes toward books that depend strongly on the love and respect for books that they see in practice here;

- Whereas, Many of our faculty members are textbook authors, and this scholarly work is an important professional activity which should be encouraged, respected, and rewarded;
- Whereas, It is necessary for publishers to bring such books to the attention of potential users by providing complimentary examination copies, and these examination copies are beneficial in helping faculty members choose effective and up-to-date teaching material;
- Whereas, Some of those examination copies, often in spite of being embossed "not for resale," make their way into the used-book market, thus depriving both author and publisher of the rightful reward for their work, as well as undermining the publishers' ability to continue providing examination copies; and
- Whereas, Many other universities do not allow the buying and selling of complimentary copies on campus; it is therefore
- Resolved, That the Senate recommends the following policy to be followed by all members of the CSUS community:
1. It is inappropriate to sell examination copies of textbooks which have not been purchased, even if these books were not solicited.
  2. Neither the Hornet Foundation Bookstore nor representatives of outside wholesalers shall engage in direct purchase of free examination copies on this campus.
  3. The Hornet Foundation Bookstore should in addition ask for assurance from all wholesalers from whom they acquire used books, that the books supplied will not include such examination copies.

After reviewing thoroughly the attached Academic Program Review Report for the Department of Mechanical Engineering, 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 for the response in the Review Report.)

#### Commendations to the Department of Mechanical Engineering

The Department of Mechanical Engineering is commended for

- American Board for Engineering and Technology reaccreditation of both the Mechanical Engineering and the Mechanical Engineering Technology undergraduate programs,
- efforts to improve the communication skills of its students,
- initiating a program for teaching graduate courses by TV satellite in conjunction with CSU, Chico,
- maintaining successful articulation agreements with a large number of community colleges, especially for the Mechanical Engineering Technology program, which depends on community colleges to provide the first two years of instruction for the program,
- sponsoring activities such as the Heat Transfer and Fluid Mechanics Institute and the West Coast Super-mileage Competition that promote Departmental and University visibility and recognition,
- participating in various kinds of workshops or programs for students preparing for professional exams, community college instructors, and apprentice mechanics.

#### Recommendations to the Department of Mechanical Engineering

It is recommended that the Department

1. review the Program Planning Guide and Catalog for accuracy and consistency, and make the necessary changes. (p. 11)
2. establish a policy about required information that is to be included in each course syllabus to be given to students and a procedure for monitoring compliance with that policy. (p. 11)
3. consider adding a course to the Mechanical Engineering curriculum comparable to MET 101 or identify one or more courses in which communication skills are to be stressed. (p. 15)
4. consider conducting a study to determine whether and to what extent the amount of emphasis placed on communication skills in both the Mechanical Engineering program and the Mechanical Engineering Technology program is effective in changing communication skills of majors. (p. 15)

5. include in the Program Planning Guide and Catalog the number of independent study units that may be counted for the Master's degree beyond the 6 units for the thesis. (p. 16)
6. review Engr 162, Automatic Controls, to determine whether it should be retained and taught more frequently; otherwise the course should be dropped from the Catalog. (p. 16)
7. consider consolidating the graduate program so that it consists of one areas, or at the most two areas, of study rather than trying to cover all five stems, in order to concentrate its resources more effectively and provide a suitable array of courses with predictable schedules. (p. 18)
8. consider (a) the appointment or election of a graduate coordinator whose responsibilities would include further program development based on study of current and projected industry needs as well as recruitment, and (b) allow the coordinator an appropriate amount of assigned time for these activities. (p. 19)
9. examine grading practices in ME 37 and make adjustments and/or changes necessary to reduce grade inflation. (p. 20)
10. review its summer and intersession programs to determine whether these programs adequately meet students' needs. (p. 22)
11. explore possibilities for extended learning courses or programs as a means of better serving engineers employed in local industries and government agencies. (p. 23)
12. continue to actively seek and employ members of under-represented ethnic minority groups and women. (p. 25)
13. encourage all faculty, not just minority faculty, to participate in the educational equity program. (p. 29)
14. survey its undergraduate students to determine student opinions about advising for (a) the major, and (b) General Education. (p. 31)
15. the Department clearly identify its laboratory and new and replacement equipment needs that will not be met by the engineering building program, and provide estimated costs and detailed justification thereof in its next budget request, along with a long-range plan for acquisition of equipment and the remodeling program for the labs. (p. 33)
16. the Department assume some of the responsibility for developing creative and innovative ways to supplement funds available from the University budget. (p. 33)

Recommendations to the Dean of the School of Engineering and Computer Science

It is recommended that

1. the School consider giving the new Director of MEP specific responsibility for recruitment of students as well as retention of students. (p. 28)
2. the School consider assigning the responsibility for increasing faculty awareness of the program to the new Director of MEP and suggest that having faculty serve as representatives to BECS and SHECS be considered as one way to increase faculty awareness. (p. 28)
3. the Dean of the School consider the laboratory and new and replacement equipment needs of the Department that will not be met by the new engineering building program, and, with the Department's cooperation, endeavor to alleviate those needs to the extent possible. (p. 33)

Recommendations for Academic Senate Action

It is recommended that

1. the Bachelor of Science degree in Mechanical Engineering be approved for a period of five years or until the next program review.
2. the Bachelor of Science degree in Mechanical Engineering Technology be approved for a period of five years or until the next program review.
3. the Master of Science degree in Mechanical Engineering be conditionally approved until May 1, 1990, subject to a satisfactory progress report by March 1, 1989. The conditional approval is recommended in order to give the Department time to address the concerns expressed in the body of the report regarding the graduate program.

2-29-88



After reviewing thoroughly the attached Academic Program Review Report for the Department of History, 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 for the response in the Review Report.)

#### Commendations to the Department of History

The Department is commended for

- maintaining a strong commitment to scholarly activities;
- continuing to teach in less preferred areas of history or in other departments in an on-going effort to alleviate over-staffing problems;
- resisting grade inflation;
- initiating an annual survey of students' opinion about the curriculum;
- participating in an adjunct program for students in Hist 17A-B (U.S. History);
- developing a proposal for a revised option in public history at the graduate level that takes advantage of the unique opportunities afforded by the local area;
- providing active assistance in the establishment and continued development of the Sacramento History Center;
- participating in a number of community activities such as National History Day, the annual Scottish Games, coordinating and teaching workshops for local schools, and developing grant proposals for the new model curriculum standards for teaching World and U.S. history in high school; and
- preparing a thorough, comprehensive Self-study Report.

#### Recommendations to the Department of History

It is recommended that

1. the Department establish a policy about the minimum information to be included in each course syllabus and a procedure for monitoring compliance with that policy. (p. 10)
2. the Department either structure its major requirements to insure that the programs of all history majors include geographical and chronological breadth and a knowledge of time periods and civilizations other than their own as recommended by the consultant, or as an alternative, devise a series of advising tracks that would result in coherent courses of study from which students could choose or make reasoned modifications with the approval of an advisor. (p. 12)

3. the Department consider developing and requiring an introductory research methods course that would be prerequisite to the advanced courses in the History 190 seminar series. (p. 12)
4. the Department consider designating the two lower division world civilization courses as alternatives for the lower division Western civilization requirement. (p. 12)
5. the Department differentiate between Hist 4 and 5 and their upper division counterparts, Hist 104 and 105. (p. 13)
6. the Department consider condensing some of its U.S. and regional history offerings. (p. 13)
7. the Department consider adding to the Catalog descript of Hist 280 a statement to the effect that it may be repeated for credit if it is the Department's intent that it may be repeated. (p. 14)
8. the Department delete Hist 107 and 169 from the Catalog as they have not been taught for five or more semesters. (p. 15)
9. the Department consider offering infrequently taught courses, particularly the two courses about ethnic minority history (Hist 172 and 186) at least once every two years, and more frequently if feasible. (p. 15)
10. the Department review Hist 107 to determine whether it would be more appropriate in lower division if there are compelling reasons for retaining it. (p. 16)
11. the Department continue to work toward reducing the number of upper division and graduate incomplete grades. (p. 19)
12. the Department prepare a long-range plan for its program including priorities for areas to be covered, giving careful consideration to priorities recommended by the consultant. (p. 21)
13. the Department hire a mixture of recently trained and experienced faculty as opportunities to acquire new faculty arise in order to preclude wholesale retirements at some future date. (p. 21)
14. the Department maintain vitae as outlined in the guidelines for the Academic Program Review Self-study. (p. 22)
15. the Department actively seek to employ members of underrepresented ethnic minority groups and women when it has openings. (p. 23)
16. the Department consider making advisor approval of programs for majors and minors mandatory. (p. 25)

Recommendations to the Dean of the School of Arts and Sciences

It is recommended that

1. the Dean consider the serious programmatic needs of the department and determine whether it is feasible to permit hiring of new faculty in anticipation of future retirements based on a carefully developed long-range program plan. (p. 21)
2. the Dean allow the Department to hire a mixture of recently trained and experienced faculty as opportunities to acquire new faculty arise in order to preclude wholesale retirements at some future date. (p. 21)

Recommendations to the Executive Vice President

It is recommended that

1. the Executive Vice-President take action to resolve the heating and air conditioning problems in the Math/History Building and the ventilation problems in Douglass Hall. (p. 26)
2. the Executive Vice-President consider the History Department's need for adequate office space as new buildings are planned and completed. (p. 26)

Recommendations to the Academic Senate

It is recommended that

1. the Bachelor of Arts degree in History be approved for a period of five years or until the next program review providing that the Department presents a report to the Curriculum Committee and the Graduate Policies and Programs Committee by March 1, 1990, demonstrating satisfactory resolution of the problems of either the lack of structure in the major as suggested by the consultant or lack of advising tracks for the major (see Recommendation # 2).
2. the History Waiver Program for the Teaching Credential be approved for a period of five years or until the next program review.
3. the History Minor be approved for a period of five years or until the next program review.
4. the Master of Arts degree in History, Standard Program, be approved for a period of five years or until the next program review.
5. action on the Master of Arts degree in History, Public History Option, be postponed until the revised option has completed the approval process at which time it will be reviewed for recommendation.

4-11-88

After reviewing thoroughly the attached Academic Program Review Report for the Biomedical Engineering Program, 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 for the response in the Review Report.)

#### Commendations to Biomedical Engineering

Biomedical Engineering is commended for

- developing and maintaining a nationally respected program of high quality;
- recruiting and retaining an energetic faculty who are actively engaged in research, consultation, and presentations to both professional societies and community groups;
- providing effective academic advising; and
- recruiting and retaining a relatively high proportion of women students.

#### Recommendations to Biomedical Engineering

It is recommended that

1. the Program carefully consider whatever contribution its undergraduate courses make to its graduate program to determine whether available resources might be better concentrated on the graduate program. (p. 7)
2. the Program consider developing greater in-depth treatment of signal and imaging processing areas. (p. 8)
3. the Program consider encouraging students who plan on additional graduate work to take an additional math course and identify appropriate courses for advising purposes. (p. 9)
4. the Program review its procedures for directing students in the formulation of thesis topics to determine whether the procedures can be improved. (p. 9)
5. the Program review the amount of in-depth preparation in computer science students receive before they are expected to apply computer techniques to biomedical engineering problems in order to determine whether that preparation is adequate by today's standards for training. (p. 9)
6. the Program conform with University policy in the matter of assigning faculty to supervision of theses, (p. 9)
7. the Program delete BME 281, Biomaterials: Theory and Application, from the Catalog; it has not been taught during the past five semesters. (p. 10)

8. the Program review its grading practices in upper division courses for conformity with University standards. (p. 12)
9. the Program actively recruit ethnic minority and women candidates whenever opportunities to acquire new faculty arise. (p. 15)
10. the Program continue its efforts to recruit and retain women students. (p. 16)
11. the Program undertake a vigorous program of recruitment of students with ethnic minority backgrounds. (p. 16)
12. the Program consider emphasizing the areas of specialization available in the CSUS program in the Catalog, the Program Planning Guide, and other published materials used for recruitment, advising, and promotion. (p. 17)
13. the Program consider ways of soliciting student opinions about ways in which students think career advising could be changed so that it more nearly meets their expectations. (p. 18)
14. the Program consider taking advantage of the School's career advising program to acquaint engineering majors with biomedical engineering as a career option and inform them of the requirements. (p. 18)
15. the Program consider increasing its efforts to promote biomedical engineering as a career option for biological sciences majors early in their programs. (p. 18)

#### Recommendation to the Dean of the School of Engineering and Computer Science

It is recommended that the Dean consider the feasibility of providing additional support for secretarial service and the Coordinator during times when most new student admissions occur and the need for counseling is the greatest. (p. 19)

#### Recommendation for Academic Senate Action

It is recommended that the Master of Science degree in Biomedical Engineering be approved for a period of five years or until the next program review.

4-11-88



# California State University, Sacramento

6000 J STREET, SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95819-2694

## M E M O R A N D U M


California State University Sacramento  
6000 J Street  
Sacramento, California 95819

DATE: March 18, 1988

MAR 24 1988

Academic Senate Received  
413

TO: Juanita Barrena, Chair  
Academic Senate

FROM:   
William A. Dillon, Jr.  
Presiding Member  
University ARTP Committee

SUBJECT: Salary Schedule

The University ARTP Committee has discussed the problems specified in your memorandum of March 4, 1988, same subject and has asked me to reply as follows:

1. The salary inequities as between faculty hired during the last year of the old contract and the first year of the new one are indeed unfortunate. But they are not of our making, are limited to perhaps five individuals on this campus and will be ameliorated by time. Any solution imagined by this committee appears to create other problems as bad or worse than the one it would solve. In particular, this committee declines to recommend the solution offered by San Jose State because treating early promotions as regular promotions in certain cases when not authorized by regulation would simply invite dispute. Finally, the committee recognizes that these inequities have been created by a system-wide authority and operate on every campus which has hired in a way that creates them. It therefore recommends that the Chancellor and the faculty bargaining agent seek a system-wide solution during reopeners.
2. The difficulties created by hiring new faculty at a salary step which overlaps one associated with the next higher rank can be managed, the committee believes, by the Deans' approving appointments at a step in rank sufficiently low to enable faculty to create a documented claim to promotion

while receiving an annual increase in salary. In the alternative, the department chairs might counsel patience, pointing out to faculty who are not content to "sit" at an overlapping step that they are making more money than they would have if hired at a lower step initially and that the regulations require promotions of any sort to be made on a record of accomplishment at this institution. Such counseling might be offered particularly at the time of making an appointment at an overlapping step, although people eager for a job usually don't find the conditions of prospective employment irksome.

WD:j



# California State University, Sacramento

6000 J STREET, SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95819-2694

ACADEMIC SENATE



## M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: March 4, 1988

TO: William A. Dillon, Jr.  
Presiding Member  
University ARTP Committee

FROM: Juanita Barrera, Chair  
Academic Senate

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read 'Juanita Barrera', written over the printed name.

SUBJECT: Salary Schedule

This week two issues related to the new overlapping salary schedule have come to my attention. The first, from San Jose State in the form of a resolution (attached), concerns salary inequities that may be suffered by junior faculty hired recently, but before the new contract, compared to faculty hired after the new contract. The second, raised at a Council of Deans' meeting, concerns the potential negative impact of hiring new faculty at Assistant Professor steps that overlap with Associate Professor rank (i.e., 11-13). Specifically, faculty hired at these higher Assistant Professor steps may have to "sit" at the same salary level for several years or submit their names for promotion before they have had the opportunity to develop an adequate record of performance and before they would normally be considered for tenure.

I request that the University ARTP Committee address these matters. The attached memo (12/9/87 from Sheila Orman re "New Faculty Salary Schedules Effective January 1, 1988") provides additional information on the subject.

JB:j

Attachments

cc: Vice President Burger  
Dean Moulds  
Ms. Orman