

Note: there are 2 agenda in archive files. #1 (87-88ASA-05-19f) is the original agenda without the Commendation for Peter Shattuck. #2 (87-88ASA-Additional-05-19f) is only 6 pages of the agenda with the Shattuck Commendation but not page 3 which includes part of the language for AS 88-68/CC, GPPC, Ex.

SPECIAL MEETING

1987-88
ACADEMIC SENATE
California State University, Sacramento

AGENDA

Thursday, May 19 1988
2:30 p.m.
Senate Chambers, University Union

INFORMATION

1. President's Response to 1987-88 Senate Actions (Attachment A)
2. Report on CSU Academic Senate meeting, May 5-6, 1988 (Attachment H) - Senator Peter Shattuck

CONSENT CALENDAR

AS 88-65/Ex. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS

Search Committee, Director of Admissions and Records:
PETER LUND, At-large (repl. W. Muller)

*AS 88-66/Ex. ASI, CRITERIA FOR QUALIFICATIONS FOR STUDENT OFFICERS

The Academic Senate recommends revision of the 1973 CSUS policy on Minimum Criteria for Qualifications for Student Officers (Based on SA 72-97), to read as follows [see Attachment B, Dean Raske's March 11, 1988, memorandum describing the differences between the March 1973 policy and the proposed policy]:

Candidates for, and/or incumbents of, all elected and appointed offices in CSUS student government, as a condition of eligibility for such offices, must maintain reasonable progress toward an educational goal in order to meet requirements of the Board of Trustees. Progress toward an educational goal is considered to be met by the enrollment of a student in a course of study leading to a baccalaureate degree, teaching credential, or graduate degree at CSUS.

Reasonable progress is defined as follows:

- A. Candidates, incumbents and appointees to any of the above mentioned positions shall not be on academic or disciplinary probation, as defined by the current edition of the CSUS General Catalog.

- B. All candidates for elective office must have completed no fewer than fourteen (14) semester units of academic credit with a grade point average of 2.0 or higher, during the twelve (12) months immediately preceding the term in which the filing of candidacy occurs.
- C. All candidates for elective office or appointees to any ASI position must have, if any courses are taken during the twelve months preceding the election or appointment, a grade point average of 2.0 or higher, and must complete, during the semester in which the election is held or appointment is made, at least seven semester units with a grade point average of 2.0 or higher. In addition, incumbents of any ASI office must earn, during each Fall and each Spring semester of office, at least seven semester units with a grade point average of 2.0 or higher.
- D. These requirements do not preclude additional student government requirements.

AS 88-67/AP, Ex. GRADE APPEAL PROCEDURES

The Grade Appeal Procedures (AS 87-47) shall be amended and the Interim Grade Appeal Procedures (AS 87-51) superseded by the Grade Appeal Procedures amended as follows (underlining = addition; strikeover = deletion) [see Attachment C]:

AS 88-68/CC, GPPC, Ex. CENTERS AND INSTITUTES, PROCEDURES FOR REVIEW OF

The Academic Senate recommends adoption of the following review procedures:

PROCEDURES FOR THE REVIEW OF CENTERS AND INSTITUTES

As provided for in PM 87-04, Process for Establishing Research Centers and Institutes (Appendix A), each five years a review will be conducted of each center and institute. On this schedule, each center and institute shall submit a self-study and a proposal for the next five years of operation. This self-study and five-year plan is in addition to the year-end report required by PM 87-04.

For those centers and institutes that are associated with a single department, the review will be conducted by the academic program review team at the time of the departmental review.

For those centers and institutes that are not associated with a department, the Vice President for Academic Affairs will determine the schedule for review. The review ordinarily will be conducted by a team consisting of at least three

instructional faculty members appointed by the Academic Senate. Each year the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate will prepare a list of the names of members of the University community who are willing to serve on review teams. In preparing this list, the Senate will solicit nominations from the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Council of Deans. Using this list, the Academic Senate shall appoint the three faculty members to the team for teach center or institute to be reviewed. In addition, the Vice President for Academic Affairs may appoint up to two additional members for each review team from among administrators, staff, students, alumni, or community members as appropriate. The chair of the team shall be selected by and from the team.

The self-study prepared by the director of the center or institute will comprise a response to the following:

1. Describe the activities of the center or institute since the last review.
2. If the center or institute is associated with a department or departments, describe the distinction between departmental activities and budget and the center or institute activities and budget.
3. What have been the successes and failure of the center or institute in meeting the goals of the last five-year plan?
4. By what criteria should the center or institute be judged in its success over the next five years vis-a-vis the next five-year plan?

Each review shall be made in consideration of the following:

1. the self-study,
2. the last five year plan,
3. the year-end reports submitted since the last five year review,
4. the report of the last five year review, and
5. the next five year plan.

The review team shall conduct interviews with the director of the center or institute and others, as appropriate.

The result of the review will be a report. In addition to a response to the issues of the self-study, the report should address the appropriateness of the budget and its use, and the

appropriateness of the next five year plan. The report should include specific recommendations for action by appropriate campus entities, including a recommendation to the Academic Senate and the Vice President for Academic Affairs for continuation or termination of the center or institute.

The report will be presented to a joint session of the Academic Senate's Curriculum Committee and Graduate Policies and Programs Committee, to be handled in the same manner as academic program reviews.

AS 88-69/Ex. ELECTION PROCEDURES, SENATORS REPRESENTING
TEMPORARY FACULTY

At-large Senators Representing Temporary Faculty

TERMS OF OFFICE

The four at-large Senators shall serve two year terms, staggered so that two members are elected to new terms each year. At-large Senators must have at least six wtu's during the semester of their election, and must continue to have at least 3 wtu's for each semester of their term. An at-large Senator may serve at most six consecutive years. At no time may more than two at-large Senators be from the same school.

VACANCIES

If an at-large seat is vacant, the Academic Senate may appoint a replacement for the remainder of the academic year from the temporary faculty who have at least six wtu's during the semester of their appointment. If this leaves a remaining year of the term, the position shall be filled for the second year by means of the elections held during the spring semester of the first year.

PROCEDURES FOR NOMINATION AND ELECTION

All nominations and elections shall be conducted in the spring semester. Nominations and elections shall be by and from the temporary faculty who have at least six wtu's during the semester of the election. To be nominated, an eligible faculty member must submit a nomination petition signed by six members of the electing body.

In the event that the number of nominees exceeds twice the number of positions to be filled, the Election Committee may hold a primary election in order to reduce the number of candidates.

Each member of the electing body may vote for as many

candidates on the secondary ballot as there are positions to be filled. The positions shall be filled in the order of greatest number of votes received. However, no more than two at-large Senators may be from the same school. Two-year positions shall be filled before one-year positions. In the event of ties there shall be a ballot with each member of the electing body voting for one of the tied candidates.

All ballots shall be secret ballots.

CONSENT CALENDAR - INFORMATION

AS 88-70/Ex. PRESIDENT'S CITATION AWARDS

The Executive Committee, on behalf of the Senate, endorses the establishment of Presidential Citation Awards for an outstanding masters thesis or project in each of the following categories: natural science and engineering, social sciences, and humanities.

The Executive Committee, on behalf of the Senate, recommends that a review committee of no fewer than three instructional faculty be appointed by and from the Graduate Policies and Programs Committee to review nominations and select the theses/projects for the awards. If no submission meets the expected standard of scholarship, no award will be made.

REGULAR AGENDA

AS 88-64/Flr. MINUTES

Approval of Minutes of the regular meeting of April 14, 1988.

AS 88-71A/GPPC, Fisa, Ex. MASTERS DEGREE IN PUBLIC POLICY ADMINISTRATION [responds to AS 87-86]

The Academic Senate recommends approval of the Masters in Public Policy and Administration (MPPA) to replace the Masters in Public Administration (MPA). [See program summary enclosed. The complete proposal is available for review in the Senate Office, Adm. 264].

Note: The Graduate Policies and Programs Committee has made several recommendations regarding the shape of the program, the relationship of its core courses to courses offered currently in the Department of Organizational Behavior and Environment, and the schedule for offering the courses--Attachment D. The MPPA Steering Committee has indicated its willingness to undertake discussions with the

Department of OB&E and other relevant parties to determine whether two of the courses in the MPPA can be merged with similar courses in OB&E. To await the results of those discussions would delay significantly approval of the program and the undertaking of initial implementation tasks. The Senate therefore recommends approval of the proposal as drafted with the understanding that any changes will be brought before it for approval in the form of Program Change Proposals next Fall.)

AS 88-71B/GPPC, Fisa, Ex. MPPA REPORTS

The Academic Senate notes the Fiscal Affairs Committee's fiscal impact evaluation (Attachment E) and the report of the Graduate Policies and Programs Committee (Attachment D), and forwards these reports to the President as information.

AS 88-72/GPPC JOINT DOCTORAL PROGRAM--EDCAPS: REQUEST TO NEGOTIATE

*Approved
J.S.
10/15/88
10/15/88*

The Academic Senate recommends Presidential approval of the EDCAPS request to negotiate a joint doctoral program (Ed.D. in Education Administration) with University of the Pacific [see Attachment F].

[Note: The Executive Committee forwards AS 88-72 to the Senate without a recommendation.]

AS 88-73/CC, GPPC, Ex. PACIFIC ASIAN STUDIES, PROPOSED B.A. AND MINOR IN

The Academic Senate recommends approval of the proposed Bachelor of Arts and Minor in Pacific Asian Studies with the addition of Government 149A (Japan: A New Challenge) in the elective courses [see Attachment G].

AS 88-74/CC RETENTION MODEL: PROGRAM FOR EXCELLENCE IN UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION (PEUE)

The Academic Senate is supportive of the concepts and goals addressed in the PEUE proposal (Attachment I), a model for enhancing student retention, and recommends:

A. Formation of a Task Force

The Academic Senate recommends that an implementation Task Force be selected by the Academic Senate, subject to approval by the President. The charge to the Task Force would be to consider the PEUE proposal, and the issues raised by discussion of it that were held in various committees since its submission. The group would gather

information relating to the proposal that was generated on this campus, and investigate similar models, and their successes, at other universities.

Then, a proposal would be developed for implementation of a retention program at CSUS. The proposal would address as many of the concerns as possible, and would suggest specific solutions to problems related to funding, student selection, and other topics of concern to the campus community.

B. Composition of the Task Force

The Task Force would have a majority of faculty, and would include representatives from Student Affairs, a student, an Academic Dean (or designee), a member of Central Administration, and a staff representative.

C. Schedule

The Task Force will submit its proposal to the Academic Senate for consideration by the end of the Fall semester, 1988.

AS 88-75/AP, Ex. LAST WEEK OF INSTRUCTION

The Academic Senate has reconsidered its action on AS 87-44 and recommends that the policy on "Dead Week" in the CSUS University Manual be amended as follows [strikeover = deletion; underscore = addition]:

~~No midterms, quizzes, or examinations, other than those authorized on an individual basis, will be given in the period five academic days before the beginning of the University's final examination schedule. Each semester, classes will end on Friday and final examinations will begin the following Monday. (AS-68-49) That no undue demands be placed on students during the last week of classes and that tests or quizzes and other academic assignments scheduled for the last week of classes will be specified on the syllabus for the course. Final exams will not be given during the last week of classes, except where the nature of the department's academic program requires it and the syllabus so specifies. Exceptions shall require approval of the Vice President for Academic Affairs.~~

*McQuinn
the last
- in
(i.e., not
the syllabus)
course*

*unscheduled requirements
made of
prior to
final
exam
week*

In addition, the Academic Senate recommends that the statement on "Student Rights and Responsibilities" be amended as follows [strikeover = deletion; underscore = addition]:

I. Rights in the Classroom

...

- L. ~~That the students not be given tests or additional work beyond what has already been assigned during the week prior to final examinations of each semester.~~ That no undue demands be placed on student time during the last week of classes and that tests or quizzes and other academic assignments scheduled for the last week of classes will be specified on the syllabus for the course. Final exams will not be given during the last week of classes, except where the nature of the department's academic program requires it and the syllabus so specifies. Exceptions shall require approval of the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

The Academic Senate further recommends that the use of the term "dead week" no longer be used to refer to the last week of instruction; that the policy be retitled "Last Week of Instruction", and that the term be deleted from the Academic Calendar and any other documents in which it appears currently.

AS 88-76/Ex. PROPOSITION 71 (APPROPRIATIONS LIMIT ADJUSTMENT, CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT)*

- Whereas, The voters of the State of California enacted the Gann-sponsored Proposition 4 in November 1979; and
- Whereas, Proposition 4 placed a limit on how much State and local government could spend, such that spending was to be confined to the amount spent in 1978, adjusted each year for inflation and population growth; and
- Whereas, Proposition 4 mandated that the State must refund to the taxpayers any State revenues collected in excess of the amount the State could legally spend; and
- Whereas, While, by 1987 State revenues exceeded the spending limit, thus forcing a rebate of tax revenues, it was also the case that the State's needs exceeded the Proposition 4-imposed limit of legal State spending; and
- Whereas, The Proposition 4-imposed limit on State spending makes it impossible to meet pressing problems created by increased school enrollment, the growth of the State economy, the overburdening of prisons, the worsening of traffic and transportation and other unforeseen crises such as AIDS; and
- Whereas, Specifically as regards The California State University, the continued operation of the Proposition 4-imposed limit on State spending will result in reduction of the CSU's support budget, to

the serious detriment of public higher education and the mission of the CSU; and

Whereas, According to the bipartisan Commission on State Finance, unless the limit law is changed, \$23 billion of needed spending must be cut from the current level of education and other vital services over the next ten years; and

Whereas, The proposed Proposition 71 on the June 1988 ballot will amend the State Constitution to retain a limit on the growth of State spending but will alter the calculation base for determining inflation and redefine population growth, such that the limit would more accurately measure California's economic growth and the population of Californians in the public education system; and *therefore be it*

Resolved, That the Academic Senate of California State University, Sacramento, hereby endorse Proposition 71 and strongly urge faculty and staff to vote for Proposition 71 at the June 7, 1988, election.

*All facts herein contained are from the "California Journal Analysis: June 1988 Ballot Propositions," The California Journal, April 1988, p. 4, and a circular distributed by the CSUS Chapter of C.F.A.

AS 88-77/Ex. STYROFOAM IN CSUS FOOD SERVICE ESTABLISHMENTS,
ABOLISH USE OF

The Academic Senate requests that all food service establishments on campus terminate the use of styrofoam cups, plates, bowls or other such utensils at the earliest feasible date. It should be noted that it is our understanding that styrofoam products used on this campus do not involve in their production chlorofluorocarbons and that this request is based on our concern regarding the nonbiodegradable, nonrecyclable nature of the products.

AS 88-78A/Ex. ACADEMIC SCHEDULE - *Hardout*

The Academic Senate recommends continuation of the present system of publishing separate Fall and Spring schedules of classes, rather than a single schedule of classes for the entire academic year.

AS 88-78B/AP ACADEMIC YEAR SCHEDULE

The Academic Senate supports in concept the adoption by the University of an annual class schedule. The production of such

a schedule may prove to be a valuable program planning document as well as an important academic advising tool. However, since the campus appears to be divided more in opinion about the feasibility rather than the desirability of an annual schedule, the Committee recommends a trial and evaluation period precede the formal adoption of an annual schedule. This test period would allow for examining the mechanics of putting together an annual schedule, including the time and effort spent on the enterprise, as well as for comparing the number and types of changes required under an annual schedule and a semester schedule. To this end, the Committee recommends that during the 1989-90 academic year the University continue to publish class schedules each semester while the evaluation of the feasibility of the annual schedule is tested as described below.

In the Spring of 1989, all academic units will submit to Academic Affairs class schedules for both 1989-90 semesters. Units will have an opportunity to update their Spring 1990 schedules in the Fall of 1989. With the annual schedule data, as submitted in Spring 1989, Academic Services will experiment, in cooperation with the academic units, with the mechanics of preparing and producing electronically an annual schedule. Departments and Academic Services will be asked to comment upon time and effort required to produce the data for the annual schedule in comparison to a one semester schedule. Also, Academic Services will keep track of the number and types of changes required to produce an annual schedule and its supplemental update as compared to a semester schedule and its supplemental update. Based upon the information and experience gained from this test period, Academic Policies Committee will recommend to the Senate, no later than March 1, 1990, whether the publication of an annual schedule of classes shall be adopted as University policy. In any regard, academic units will continue to prepare and submit in the Spring of 1990 a complete class schedule for both semesters of the following academic year. This material then, whether published as a semester or an annual class schedule, may be used by departments and faculty as a planning guide and an advising tool.

Attachment A
Academic Senate Agenda
May 19, 1988

ACADEMIC SENATE'S ACTIONS		1987-88 PRESIDENT'S ACTIONS		
Date	Action	APPROVED	DISAPPROVED	OTHER
8/13/87	AS 87-51 GRADE APPEAL REVIEW PROCESS	8/13/87		(Approved by EC for Senate)
8/26/87	AS 87-52 UARTP POLICY AMENDMENTS	8/26/87		(Approved by EC for Senate)
9/3/87	AS 87-57 AMENDMENTS TO UARTP POLICY	8/11/87		
9/3/87	AS 87-58 AMENDMENTS TO UARTP POLICY	8/11/87		
9/3/87	AS 87-59 AMENDMENTS TO UARTP POLICY	8/11/87		
9/3/87	AS 87-60 AMENDMENTS TO UARTP POLICY	8/11/87		
9/10/87	AS 87-63 COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS	10/7/87		
9/10/87	AS 87-65 PROGRAM CHANGES	10/7/87		
9/10/87	AS 87-66 PROGRAM CHANGES - ART	10/7/87		
9/10/87	AS 87-68 M.S. IN PHYSICAL THERAPY	10/7/87		
9/10/87	AS 87-69 CURRICULUM REVIEW, DIV. OF CR. JU	10/7/87		
9/10/87	AS 87-70 CRIMINAL JUSTICE, JOINT PHD. PROG.	(see 10/8)		
9/10/87	AS 87-67 ELECTION OF TEMP. FACULTY SENATORS	10/7/87		
10/8/87	AS 87-70 CRIMINAL JUSTICE, JOINT PHD. PROGRAM	10/19/87		
10/8/87	AS 87-73 FACULTY ENDOWMENT FUND	10/19/87		
10/8/87	AS 87-72 COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS	10/19/87		
11/12/87	AS 87-78 PROGRAM CHANGES	12/10/87		
11/12/87	AS 87-74 UNIVERSITY ARTP POLICY--AMEND SECTION 5.05.B	12/10/87		
11/12/87	AS 87-82 UNIVERSITY ARTP POLICY INTERPRETATION--5.05.5 (Relative values)	12/10/87		
11/12/87	AS 87-83 UNIVERSITY ARTP POLICY INTERPRETATION--5.05.B (Primary)	12/10/87		
11/12/87	AS 87-84 GENERAL EDUCATION (QUANTITATIVE REASONING) GRADES	12/10/87		
11/12/87	AS 87-76 COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS	12/10/87		
11/17/87	AS 87-87 1988-89 and 1989-90 ACADEMIC CALENDARS	12/1/87		Executive Committee action on part of Senate
11/19/87	AS 87-88 LOTTERY FUNDS (DISCRETIONARY) FOR CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT	11/20/87		
11/19/87	AS 87-89 LOTTERY FUNDS FOR INSTRUCTIONAL ENHANCEMENT	11/20/87		
12/10/87	AS 87-96 PROGRAM CHANGES	2/8/88		
12/10/87	AS 87-97 PROGRAM CHANGES	2/8/88		
12/10/87	AS 87-85 PROGRAM CHANGE	2/8/88		
12/10/87	AS 87-86 CURRICULUM REVIEW, SCHOOL OF BUSINESS AND PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION	2/8/88		
12/10/87	AS 87-91 GENERAL EDUCATION PROGRAM, RESOLUTION ON	2/8/88		
12/10/87	AS 87-98 PROGRAM CHANGE--COMPUTER SCIENCE	2/8/88		
12/10/87	AS 87-99 PROGRAM CHANGE--INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS CONCENTRATION	2/8/88		
12/10/87	AS 87-100 WAIVER PROGRAM--PHYSICAL SCIENCE EARTH SCIENCE EMPHASIS	2/8/88		
12/10/87	AS 87-101 CERTIFICATE PROGRAM--INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP	2/8/88		
12/10/87	AS 102A-D PROGRAM CHANGES	2/8/88		
12/10/87	AS 87-103 PROGRAM CHANGES	2/8/88		



California State University, Sacramento

6000 J STREET, SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95819-2694

DEAN OF STUDENT AFFAIRS:

M E M O R A N D U M

March 11, 1988

TO: Dr. Donald Gerth
President

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "David Raske".

FROM: David Raske, Dean
Student Affairs

RE: Minimum Criteria for Qualifications for Student Officers

Listed below are the differences in the CSUS policy implemented in March of 1973 and that proposed in March 1988.

- The 1973 policy applied to only the President, Vice President, and Senate Chair. The 1988 policy addresses all elected officers and appointees of ASI.
- The 1988 policy allows for freshmen to participate in student government but only as appointees since elected officers must have completed no fewer than 14 semester units during the twelve months immediately preceding the term in which the filing of candidacy occurs. (The present ASI Constitution does not require candidates for the undeclared Senate seat to have completed any units.)
- The 1988 policy precludes students on academic or disciplinary probation from participating in either appointed or elected officers. Again, the 1973 policy addressed only the President, Vice President and Senate Chair. (The ASI Constitution does not limit participation based on academic or disciplinary probation.)
- The present ASI Constitution requires a grade point average of 2.5 for the President and the Vice President, whereas the 1973 and the 1988 policy requires 2.0.

The Senate has not yet discussed the section on requirements in the new By-laws.

I hope this answers your questions.

rlp

cc: S. Uplinger

IV. GRADE APPEAL PROCEDURES: DETAILED STEP GUIDELINES

A. INFORMAL PROCEDURES

1. Student-Instructor Meeting

Students who believe that they have not received an appropriate grade must seek to resolve, in good faith, the matter informally with the instructor who assigned the grade. This should be done as soon as possible, but no later than the end of the fourth week of classes of the semester following the semester in which the grade was earned.

2. Student-Department Chair Meeting

If the informal student-instructor meeting does not result in a solution satisfactory to the student, the student must present his/her appeal to the chair (program coordinator or director) of the academic unit (division, department or program) in which the course was listed. This should be done as soon as possible, but no later than the end of the sixth week following the semester in which the grade was received.

The chair will attempt to seek a solution. Within ten (10) working days after meeting with the student, the chair will notify the student of the result of the chair's effort to resolve the matter. If unsatisfied, the student may then continue with the informal procedure or initiate a formal grade appeal.

3. Student-Department Chair-Instructor Meeting

If the informal student-department chair meeting does not result in a solution satisfactory to the student, it is recommended--but not required--that the student, chair and instructor have a joint meeting to attempt a resolution of the appeal. The student and/or chair may propose such a meeting within five (5) working days of the receipt by the student of the chair's report of his/her effort to resolve the matter. If the student, chair, and instructor agree to the meeting, it will be convened by the chair within ten (10) working days after being proposed. If still unsatisfied, the student may initiate a formal appeal. This appeal must be initiated

[Underlining = addition; strikeover = addition]

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO

STUDENT GRADE APPEAL PROCEDURES

I. WHAT GRADES MAY BE APPEALED?

Letter grades or Credit/No Credit grades may be appealed.

II. GROUNDS FOR APPEAL: A GENERAL STATEMENT OF POLICY

- A. Faculty have the right and responsibility to provide careful evaluation and timely assignment of appropriate grades.
- B. There is a presumption that grades assigned are correct. It is the responsibility of anyone appealing an assigned grade to demonstrate otherwise.
- C. In the absence of compelling reasons, such as instructor or clerical error, prejudice or capriciousness, the grade assigned by the instructor of record is to be considered final.

III. GRADE APPEAL PROCEDURES: SUMMARY OF BASIC STEPS

A. INFORMAL PROCEDURES

1. Student-Instructor Meeting
2. Student-Department Chair Meeting
3. Student-Department Chair-Instructor Meeting

B. FORMAL PROCEDURES

1. Student Grade Appeal Form
2. Grade Appeal Review Panel

Drawn from "Assignment of Grades and Grade Appeals," Executive Order 120, Office of the Chancellor, The California State University and Colleges, January 18, 1980.

Adopted 2/9/83 (AS 83-06); revised 5/6/87 (AS 87-47); amendments proposed 5/19/88

within ten (10) working days following the failure of the informal procedures.

B. FORMAL PROCEDURES

1. Student Grade Appeal Form

Students wishing to initiate a formal grade appeal must fill out the Student Grade Appeal Form (see attached) and submit it in triplicate to the chair (program coordinator or director) of the academic unit in which the course was listed within ten (10) working days as specified in IV. A.3. One copy will be retained by the student, one forwarded to the instructor and one held for the Grade Appeal Review Panel. Upon receipt of the appeal form, the chair will establish a Grade Appeal Review Panel as outlined below.

An initial meeting of the panel will be held within fifteen (15) working days after the selection of the panel. The chair will designate a faculty member of the panel as convener for the initial meeting.

2. Grade Appeal Review Panel

The Grade Appeal Review Panel will consist of two tenured or tenure-track faculty from the academic unit in which the course was listed, and one student who is a major in that same academic unit (or, if there are no majors, a student who has taken courses in the academic unit in question and maintains an on-going involvement in it). One faculty member will serve as chair.

- a. The department chair will randomly select six prospective panel members (who will be numbered in order of selection) from the list of full-time faculty members within the department (excluding those on leave and those involved in the appeal) or related disciplines in those cases where there is an insufficient number of eligible faculty members. The first two selected will be designated as panel members and the third through sixth will be alternates. If any faculty member selected is unable to serve, random selection will continue until the names of six consenting faculty members have been drawn.

The department chair will inform the student and the faculty member of the six names that have been drawn. Each of the principals will then have 48 hours to challenge up to two names from the panel (for whatever reason) who will then be replaced by the alternates following the order in which these alternates were drawn. If the two principals do elect to challenge panel members, they will do so in alternate order beginning with the student.

- b. The Student Senate Chair will randomly select five prospective panel members (who will be numbered in order of selection) from among the majors in the academic unit who are willing to serve (or, if there are no majors, from among all of those who have taken courses in the academic unit and maintain an on-going involvement in it). The first one will be designated as the panel member and the second through fifth will be alternates. If any student member selected is unable to serve, random selection will continue until five consenting members have been drawn.

The Student Senate Chair will inform the student and the faculty member of the five names that have been drawn. Each of the principals will then have 48 hours to challenge up to two names from the panel (for whatever reason) who will then be replaced by the alternates following the order in which these alternates were drawn. If the two principals do elect to challenge the student panel member, they will do so in alternate order beginning with the student.

- c. The panel will select its own chair from among between the two faculty members at the initial meeting of the panel. The chair will be responsible for seeing to it that the appeal review is carried out in an orderly fashion and a decision arrived at as promptly as possible.
- d. The decision must be rendered within fifteen (15) working days of the initial meeting of the panel, and such judgment must be conveyed in writing to the student, instructor, and unit chair (program coordinator or director), and Dean of Students within the same time limit.

3. Guidelines for Panel Hearings

- da. Insofar as possible, panel hearings shall be conducted at times and places of mutual convenience to all participants. The panel hearing will be open unless either party requests that it be closed. The grade appeal hearing CANNOT be taped or video recorded, without the consent of both parties.
- eb. The panel hearing shall not be conducted according to technical rules of evidence and examining witnesses. The chair shall admit the sort of evidence on which responsible persons are accustomed to rely in the conduct of serious affairs, but shall exclude evidence that is irrelevant or unduly repetitious. Rulings of the chair may be overruled by a majority of voting members of the panel.
- ec. Both the student and the faculty member shall have the right to present whatever relevant evidence they want that supports their positions--including but not limited to written statements, other documents and witnesses.
- ed. Both the student and the faculty member have the right to be present during the examination by the panel of all documents and witnesses, to offer whatever clarifications they may choose, and to ask questions of witnesses.
- ee. Both the student and the faculty member have the right to have an advocate of their own choosing present at all panel hearings. The advocate is not to be an attorney. Within reasonable limits imposed by the chair (and subject to appeal by the whole panel), advocates have the same rights to offer clarifications and question witnesses as the student and the faculty member.
- ef. If neither the faculty nor the student can attend, an advocate shall be present in her/his place. This advocate shall have all the privileges and rights of the person being represented. The advocate is not to be an attorney.
- eg. If, for compelling reasons, the student or the faculty member or both are unavailable to

participate in the proceedings, each may designate a representative to participate on his or her behalf, and the proceedings shall go forward. If no representative is designated, the proceedings must await the availability of the student or the faculty member or both. The representative shall have all the rights and privileges of the person being represented. He/she shall not be an attorney.

j. ~~Generally, the hearing should follow the basic format outlined below:~~

4. The Hearing Process

- a. Before proceeding with a hearing, the panel shall be attentive to the question of whether the student has alleged proper grounds, as defined in Section II, for the grade appeal. If a determination is made at this point that the complaint is insufficient, the panel may terminate the process and the initially assigned grade shall stand.
- b. Presentation by the student of his/her appeal, followed by questions from the panel and any clarification by the student's advocate (if one is present and wishes to be heard at this time);
- c. Response by the faculty member, followed by questions from the panel and any clarification by the faculty member's advocate (if one is present and wishes to be heard at this time);
- d. After both parties have made their initial presentations, questions may be raised by the panel, either party or the advocates (if present);
- e. If requested by either party, witnesses will be heard by the panel. After making whatever statements they care to make, witnesses will be questioned by the panel, either party or their advocates (if present);
- f. When all witnesses have been heard and any additional documents, statements, or other relevant materials reviewed by the panel, the chair will call for a summation by both parties;

9c. After the summation, the panel will retire in closed session (neither the parties nor the advocates will be present) to discuss the appeal and render a decision. The written decision, together with the panel's reasons for the decision, shall be sent to the faculty member, the student, the department chair, and the Dean of Students.

5. The Recommendation of the Panel

a. The panel may find either that the grade be allowed to stand or that it be changed. If a change is recommended, the faculty members of the panel, in accordance with Executive Order 320, shall determine the new grade.

b. The written decision, together with the panel's reasons for the decision, shall be sent to the faculty member, the student, the department chair, and the Dean of Students.

9d. If the recommendation of the panel is not accepted by the faculty member, then it is the responsibility of the department chair (program coordinator or director) to change the grade.

9e. A record of the judgments arrived at by each grade appeals panel and a copy of the Student Grade Appeal Form shall be maintained by forwarded to the Office of the Dean of Students. A summary report of such judgments shall be prepared by the Dean of Students on an annual basis, and copies forwarded to the Academic Senate and the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

6. Appeal of Procedural Violations

a. If either party believes that procedural violations have occurred during the grade appeal process, and that these procedural violations prejudiced the panel's decision against the party's interest, an appeal of the panel's decision may be made. Written notification of intent to appeal must be filed with the Vice President for Academic Affairs, with a copy to the program unit involved in the grievance, within one week of the panel's decision.

b. Within one week of the filing of intent to appeal, the Vice President for Academic Affairs shall convene a procedural appeal board consisting of three full-time instructional faculty members appointed by the Academic Senate for the current academic year. If a member of the procedural appeals board declines to serve because of a conflict of interest in the grade appeal being dealt with, the Academic Senate shall appoint an alternate.

c. A letter of appeal shall be prepared by the appellant and submitted to the procedural appeals board within one week of the filing of intent to appeal. Such letter shall state clearly the procedural violation believed to have been committed and shall explain the appellant's belief that such violation prejudiced the panel's decision against his/her interests. The other party and the grade appeal panel shall have comparable rights of reply.

d. The procedural appeals board may hold an oral hearing, if in its judgment the briefs are insufficient to determine the matter.

e. A decision on the appeal shall be rendered by the procedural appeals board in a prompt and expeditious manner. Such decision shall either: (1) reject the appeal on grounds either that a procedural violation did not occur or that if such a violation did occur, it did not prejudice the Panel's decision, or (2) confirm that a procedural violation did occur and did prejudice the panel's decision.

f. In the case of a decision in favor of the appellant, a new panel shall be formed and the grade appeal process shall be repeated.

[The "Student Grade Appeal Form," is unchanged and not shown here to save a tree.]



California State University, Sacramento

6000 J STREET, SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95819-2694

April 11, 1988

MEMORANDUM

TO: Juanita C. Barrera
Chair, Academic Senate

FROM: Mina B. Robbins
Chair, Graduate Policies and Programs Committee

RE: Masters Degree in Public Policy Administration
Recommendations of the Graduate Program and Policies Committee to the Academic Senate Executive Committee

The Graduate Program and Policies Committee has had extensive discussions and deliberation on the request of the School of Arts and Sciences for the proposed new M.A. degree in Public Policy and Administration (MPPA).

The Committee has read the report from the Fiscal Affairs Committee, reviewed the letter of 1/15/88 from Dean William J. Sullivan, Jr., and held a discussion with the Steering Committee of the MPPA (Jean Torcum, Lou Cohan and Rich Krolak).

The Committee commends Professor Torcum and her colleagues for the dedication and innovation they have exhibited in pursuing this proposal, and finds the MPPA to be an academically sound program, and that the CSUS campus as well as the graduate students would benefit from such a program.

The GPPC recommends approval of the MPPA.

A number of issues and questions arose during the course of the Committee's review, and the Committee consequently makes the following recommendations:

1. The GPPC recommends that the faculty position designated for conversion to graduate assistantships not be allocated, but rather that outside funding be sought to support graduate assistants. The usual method of conversion is to allocate faculty positions leaving the issue of conversion to graduate assistantships up to the department at a later time. The GPPC recommends the MPPA program follow this presently used model.

Memo to Juanita C. Barrera
Re MPPA Degree
page 2

2. The GPPC recommends a cooperative effort be taken between the Dean of Arts and Sciences and the Dean of the Business School to integrate OBE 270, 271, 272, and MPPA 200, 205, 230, and 240, since it appears that these courses duplicate curricula.

3. The GPPC recommends that the MPPA research courses be open to graduate students who have met the prerequisite from other disciplines.

4. The GPPC recommends that the MPPA research course (PPA 205) be offered in one section only, as a C-5, designed to accommodate all MPPA students until it becomes fully enrolled. At that time the Committee suggests that the MPPA program request to offer it twice per academic year.

5. The GPPC believes that to "require" all students to take a full-time summer internship for which they must pay Extended Learning fees is imposing an undue hardship. If, through a needs survey, it is found that most students would benefit from such an experience, the GPPC recommends exploration of two modes of internships. One for part-time students who are employed full-time; another for full-time students. Enrollment should be offered via some method during the regular academic year, and accommodations made for part-time students. Reimbursement for faculty time engaged in supervision of interns should follow the University policy for such activities.

6. It is recommended that the MPPA Steering Committee conduct a needs survey to determine the areas from which they will draw their students. The program coordinator, not the Dean of Graduate Studies, should assume the responsibility for coordinating and implementing this survey as well as preparing a report on the findings. This person should also be responsible for recruitment, potential and new students, advising and advertising of the program.

7. The GPPC recommends the MPPA offer its classes once every two years on the same scheduling as present graduate programs enrolling primarily part-time students. While full-time graduate students are an asset to the graduate programs at CSUS, the reality is that most graduate students on our campus are part-time. When outside funding is found to support graduate students in assistantships in numbers which would make the accelerated offering of classes economically sound, the MPPA program can request more frequent class offerings.

Memo to Juanita C. Barrena
Re MPPA Degree
Page 3

8. The GPC discussed the coordinator position and recommends this be funded at .4 position level.

9. The GPC recommends that on page 19, appended under Degree Requirements, the MPPA Committee indicate whether at least a C must be earned in each (or all) courses or that the GPA must be 3.0. Is this requirement true of all courses or only those required, but not electives?

10. The catalogue copy (page 17, last paragraph) will need to be changed to reflect recommended changes in course offering.

Fiscal Impact Analysis 2 March 1, 1988
M.A. Degree in Public Policy
and Administration (MPPA)

The student/faculty ratio (SFR) averages 11.1 for 1991-1992; this figure does not reflect availability of graduate assistants or a Chair.

Having reviewed the MPPA program initiation proposal, FAC believes that the budget analysis (attached) accurately reflects the costs generated by the program plan. FAC is not in a position to judge the necessity of any cost arising from the plan. In the review process, several concerns surfaced regarding the proposal. Each concern is addressed below.

Impact of MPPA Courses on Existing Courses

All seven of the core courses would be new courses designed for MPPA students. There are, however, four courses in Organizational Behavior and Environment (OBE) that appear to be similar to the proposed core courses. Those courses, and recent enrollments, are shown below. It appears as though each course is offered every other year, on the average, at a cost of about 6 WTUs per year.

	F84	S85	F85	S86	F86	S87	F87	S88
OBE 270 Survey of Public Management	6	7	4					12
OBE 271 Public Policy Analysis	20	7	9					13
OBE 272 Seminar in Public Finance and Budgeting		9	5					10
OBE 273 Public Sector Management			6					12

Whether or not these courses would be affected by the implementation of the MPPA program depends in part on a decision as to whether non-MPPA students will be admitted into PPA core courses. According to the MPPA Steering Committee, this issue has not been resolved, although the intent of the Steering Committee was that enrollment in core courses would be limited to MPPA students. The existence of a cohort of students, moving together through a core program, was seen as an important feature of the program.

If MPPA courses are closed to other majors, then the impact on the OBE courses depends on how many of the students who choose the OBE courses in the absence of an MPPA program would instead enroll in the MPPA program. Since a portion of the above

Fiscal Affairs Committee
Fiscal Impact Analysis
M.A. Degree in Public Policy and Administration (MPPA)

March 1, 1988

The School of Arts and Sciences proposes a new M.A. degree in Public Policy and Administration (MPPA). The School indicates that it does not have the budget to support the new program (see memo from Dean Sullivan, 1/15/88); presumably new resources must be located before the program can be inaugurated.

In reviewing the MPPA proposal, FAC discovered a number of discrepancies in calculating needs for faculty. FAC has recalculated these figures and adjusted the corresponding items in the MPPA budget; amended summary figures for the budget and supporting data are attached to this report. These figures are based on the following assumptions:

20 students, 5 full-time and 15 part-time, will be accepted each fall.

Courses will be offered on a structured basis with no variations, i.e., Introduction to Public Policy Analysis and Administration, Research in Public Policy and Administration, Applied Economic Analysis I, and Public Management and Administration each fall; Political Environment, Public Budgeting, Applied Economic Analysis II, and Master's Project each spring.

All Master's projects will be given in the spring.

The research course, requiring heavy directed work is classified C-5 and two sections will be required every fall after the first year.

All internships will be taken in summer session, to allow interns more time and flexibility in completing their work experience (i.e., either three or six hours credit may be granted, depending on the hours worked).

All part-time students will require six semesters to complete their work, while full-time students can complete all but the project in three semesters, leaving time to complete the project or to complete elective requirements.

The data show that by 1991-1992, MPPA enrollment becomes stable at approximately 16 full-time equivalent students (FTES) each semester. The need for full-time equivalent faculty (FTEF) excluding graduate assistants, is 1.3 in fall 1991 and 1.6 in spring 1992; the spring total increases because of staffing for projects (at .48 WTUs, 20 projects each spring require .8 FTEF).

enrollment is probably from the special masters (which will be discontinued) the demand for these courses is likely to diminish somewhat with the implementation of the MPPA. While there may continue to be some business students who have an interest in public sector course work, the number may be too low to justify offering all four of these courses. Consequently, it is reasonable to estimate a savings of 3 WTUs per year by consolidation and/or decreasing the frequency of offerings.

If MPPA courses are open to other majors, then it is possible that all of the demand for these courses could be accommodated in the proposed core PPA courses. This would definitely be the case in the first year, 1989/90, when enrollment in the two related core courses (PPA 230 and PPA 240) would be only 5. In later years, when the enrollment is projected at 20, the additional students could be accommodated if class size were permitted to be increased to 25 or 30.

In summary, the impact of the MPPA on existing OBE courses is estimated to be a savings of 3-6 WTUs.

Summer Internships

PPA 295 (Internship, 3 or 6 units) is a core requirement. Staffing for this course is not included in this budget analysis since the MPPA proposal indicates that the internships would be offered only during summer sessions. FAC questions whether a program may offer a required course in summer session only. MPPA Steering Committee members indicate that some opportunity to pursue the internship during the academic year may need to be provided--although the number of such opportunities would be limited. Should internships be offered during the academic year, the need for program faculty would increase by .48 WTUs per intern. The program proposal does not include a detailed description of the internship. Subsequent committees may need more information regarding PPA 295.

Graduate Assistants

The proposal calls for 1.0 FTEF to be used for graduate assistants. Little explanation was given as to how these students would be used in the program. Upon further discussion, members of the Steering Committee indicated that in addition to the typical uses of graduate assistants (assisting faculty with grading and research), these students would be involved in an array of research activities in the governmental "laboratory." The Steering Committee was asked to provide additional written documentation to justify the request for graduate assistants.

Cost to Program of Full-Time Schedule

The proposal includes a class schedule that accommodates 15 part-time and 5 full-time students admitted each fall. To meet the needs of the 5 full-time students, frequency of class offerings is accelerated in the schedule, at a cost to the program center. Resources could be saved by falling back to the schedule of classes recommended for part-time students.

Support Staff

The MPPA Steering Committee and the School of Arts and Sciences disagree over appropriate staff support for the program. The School requests a half-time clerical assistant, plus office set-up for this new position. The Steering Committee suggests upgrading the support position in the Government Department (Administrative Secretary to AOA I) and assigning program support to this upgraded position. Office set-up for the upgraded position would be substantially less than for the new position; there are savings in salary as well (detailed in letter from J. Torcom, dated 1/21/88). FAC is not in a position to judge which proposal is the more cost effective in appropriately staffing the program. Furthermore, FAC has no role in classifying staff positions; the School might address any concerns regarding the classification of the support position in government to Faculty and Staff Affairs.

Governance

The MPPA program would have a status similar to the International Affairs program. It would be a separate program, not administratively part of an existing department, with its own director. The Director would not be a faculty member of a department and would have no retreat rights to a department unless the person selected as Director is currently on the CSUS faculty, in which case he or she would have retreat rights to the current department. If an "outsider" is selected as Director, his or her continued employment at CSUS would be contingent upon the continued implementation of the MPPA program. The Governance Committee, consisting of faculty from departments whose faculty teach core courses (Economics, Government, and OBE) will perform the same kinds of functions as are performed by the faculty in a typical department.

There is no direct or administrative relationship between the proposed MPPA program and the Center for California Studies. The latter is not a curricular program, but rather sponsors symposia and engages in other research-type activities. There would, however, undoubtedly be an informal relationship between the two

State of California

Memorandum

California State University, Sacramento
600 J Street
Sacramento, California 95819

To : Juanita Barrera, Chair
Academic Senate

APR 21 1985

Date : April 21, 1988

Academa Shaha Barchui
413

Subject: Revised EDCAPS Dept.
Interest in Joint
Doctorate

D R A F T

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO

School of Education

Department of Counseling, Administration and Policy Studies

EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION PROGRAM

Expression of Interest and Rationale
Joint Doctoral Degree Program (Ed.D.-Educational Administration)
CSU,S-University of the Pacific, Stockton
(Revised 4/20/88)

From : Thomas P. Cottingham, Chair
Department of Counseling,
Administration & Policy Studies

Attached is a revised Expression of Interest and Rationale for a Joint Doctoral Program between the Department of Counseling, Administration and Policy Studies, School of Education, California State University, Sacramento and the Department of Educational Administration, School of Education, University of Pacific, Stockton. The additional information requested by the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate has been included as follows:

Expanded Rationale - Last two paragraphs, page 2

Statement of Need - Page 3

Faculty Experience on Dissertation Committees - Page 4, first paragraph, third sentence

Background on University of Pacific Faculty - Pages 6 and 7

In addition, attachments 1 - 4 have been included as illustrations of strong interest by California educational leaders, both local and statewide.

The Department hereby requests approval of this Expression of Interest and Rationale for a Joint Doctoral Program by the Executive Committee and the full Senate.

TFC:mjb

Attachments

cc: Mary Burger, Vice President, Academic Affairs
Arthur Williamson, Dean, Graduate Studies
Steve Gregorich, Dean, School of Education

California State University 4
600 J Street
Sacramento, California 95819
APR 21 1988
Sent Received

Attachment I
Academic Senate Agenda
May 19, 1988

Introduction

The faculty of the Educational Administration program at CSU, Sacramento have long been concerned about the dearth of educational opportunities for M.A. degree graduates. Periodically, over the past ten years, informal discussions have been conducted with several higher education institutions about possible joint doctoral degree ventures but to no avail. Recently, however, upon the initiative of the faculty in the Educational Administration program at the University of the Pacific, preliminary informal talks have been held to ascertain common interests between the faculty in educational administration at CSU,S and the UOP faculty. These discussions have proved to be most fruitful in identifying common purposes and concerns in graduate education for school administrators. The faculties have found that they share a great many points of view regarding quality issues, current trends in education reform, research focus in doctoral degree programs and the desired outcomes for graduates of such programs.

As a result of these informal efforts, the respective School of Education deans at the two institutions met with the chairpersons of the two departments involved to examine the potential for launching formal negotiations between the two institutions. Various key issues were identified and potential common purposes were explored. It became apparent that indeed there was a great opportunity in pursuing formal negotiations between the two universities, both for the field of school administration in the greater Sacramento-Stockton region and for the growth and development of the respective Schools of Education involved.

Rationale

Several phenomena have occurred during this decade of the 80's that have significant impact upon the preparation and continuing education of school leaders in California. These factors have to do with the certification of school administrators, school reform issues and the changing demographics of California.

With the passage of AB 777 (Greene) in 1981, the State of California modified its requirements for the Administrative Services Credential, effective July 1, 1984. The former requirements for a clear credential were a one stage process normally culminating in a Master's degree. The new law essentially required a second stage, professional development process of 24 semester units beyond the former preparation program. AS it now stands in the

Educational Administration program at CSU, S. students complete the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential program (usually with an MA degree) and then must complete an additional 24 unit advanced program for the Professional Administrative Services Credential. This advanced curriculum is nearly parallel with the level and quality of work normally completed for the educational administration major in the doctoral degree programs. At the present time, there is no public higher education institution in the central California region which serves this need or is interested in serving this need, except the interest herein presented by the CSU, S program.

Of utmost importance at this time is the changing nature of educational leadership in California schools. The demands placed upon school administrators require highly developed personnel who have not only sound basic preparation but who have the commitment and opportunity to continue their education as education policy issues are examined by the public and the political forces of the state. The complexity of these demands and issues are not fixed but dynamic; as leaders move from site level roles to broader district level positions of influence, the breadth and depth of their functions require the kind of reflective study that the Professional Credential was designed to provide. However, many of the graduates of the CSU, S credential program, like their counterparts around the state, seek to couple this study with the kind of further research and writing that only a doctoral level program can provide.

Accompanying these two factors is the changing face of the 21st century Californian. The multicultural dimension of school leadership environments are requiring a different breed of leader; competence not only in the discipline of leadership and management but a "mindscape" that looks at the role and function of administration as multi-dimensional, complex and ever-changing. Ambiguity has become a way of life. It is the vision of the faculty involved in this proposal that the program developed will not be simply a mirror of other programs in this state or around the nation; rather, an attempt will be made to focus on the kind of outcomes in graduates that will reflect this new mindscape. Once these outcomes are identified and agreed upon, a program will be developed geared to providing outstanding practitioners who can effectively help lead the schools of California into the changing era of the next century.

It is the intent and desire of the Department of Counseling, Administration and Policy Studies and the School of Education faculty that this process have widespread involvement in both the planning and implementation process from departments and programs throughout the University. The importance of this cannot be overemphasized. Programatically, a major goal of this Ed.D. concept is to provide candidates the opportunity to gain both breadth and depth in the development of educational policy and the discussion and exploration of the complex issues involved in policy development. Government leaders, legislators and other elected officials as well as representatives of the body politic are central to this matter now in California.

Hence, it seems appropriate that such departments as government, anthropology, (ethnology) communication studies and organizational behavior and environment might be willing to work with the CAPS Faculty and other School of Education representatives on this project as a joint endeavor (the above listing is not meant to be all inclusive but rather examples). Certainly the Center for California Studies, the Center for the Reasoning Arts, the Cross-Cultural Resource Center and other special programs have important roles to play if this proposed program is to be truly a University wide effort.

Statement of Need

Statewide. Because of the changing nature of the leadership/management function, school district boards of education increasingly are searching for candidates for district leadership roles who have a high degree of preparation in both school administration and in the development of educational policy. Associated with this need, there is a demand for candidates to have both depth and background in research regarding effective school practices, the changing demographics of California and other socio-economic changes. In short, they are looking for candidates who have completed doctoral studies.

At the present time, few opportunities are available at public California universities. Statewide, the University of California will admit for 1988-89 fewer than 30 candidates in all Educational Administration doctoral programs in the system and only about half of these candidates will be in the practitioner-~~practitioner~~ emphasis of the Ed.D.

Coupled with this situation is the number of retirements in the ranks of school administrators. The Association of California School Administrators found in a statewide survey in 1984 that of 5,000 respondents (50% return) 26.3% plan to retire by 1989 and another 26.9% plan to retire by 1994. This retirement rate indicates the need for a pool of well trained professionals to assume district leadership roles.

Currently the advanced training, doctorate-granting universities are located almost exclusively in the metropolitan areas of the state. Further, no tax supported university offers a job-oriented applied doctorate, creating a state-wide vacuum often filled only by high-cost, out-of-state institutions of unknown quality. As the racial makeup of our state and the role of women in education changes, there is an increasing demand for these two groups to enter school administration; and yet, these are the two groups most unable to leave family obligations or marshal the resources for the two to five-year sojourn to the metropolitan location of the doctorate-granting universities.

Sacramento Region Need. The Educational Administration program at CSU, S serves a region from Oroville/Chico in the North to Lake Tahoe to the East, Merced to the South and Vallejo/Napa/Sonoma to the West. Since 1980, approximately 500 candidates have completed school administrative preparation and/or Master's degrees in Educational Administration at CSU, S.

During the discussions in 1985/87 on the proposal for an independent doctorate in educational administration for the CSU, S system, the Department of CAPS was deluged with inquiries regarding an Ed.D. program in educational administration. Approximately 50 students in the current program expressed strong interest and approximately 100 telephone inquiries were processed by the Department office. Moreover, the department received copies of many letters of interest expressed by school leaders in Sacramento County alone (copies attached).

Finally, the Community Advisory Committee to the Educational Administration program consistently inquires about the possibility of an Ed.D. program at CSU, S. This 20 member group meets semi-annually and is composed of school administrators and lay persons from the 13 county region surrounding Sacramento.

James Livingston - Ed.D., University of California, Berkeley. Dr. Livingston has broad expertise in the financing of education and has published widely in this field. He has developed strong relationships with state agencies and school districts in the school business area and has been instrumental in the development of a special focus MA in Educational Administration preparing school business officers. He is active in several professional associations including the California Association of Professors of Educational Administration and the National Association of Professors of Educational Administration.

Leo Maestas - Ph.D., University of New Mexico. Dr. Maestas has developed an outstanding reputation in the field of multicultural education and the preparation of school administrators for schools with large multicultural populations. He has conducted extensive research in this area and has been active in curriculum revision for programs in educational administration in this regard. By virtue of his background and training, he also has a strong interest in the preparation of school counselors and has been a significant contributor to this field. He has broad experience in the public schools in both school administration (principal to superintendent) and in student personnel services.

Cirenio Rodriguez - Ph.D., University of California, Santa Barbara. Dr. Rodriguez has significant background with multicultural populations and has conducted extensive research in this area. More recently, he has become heavily involved in effective schools research especially as it pertains to dilemmas facing at-risk students. He has received several university research grants and has published widely in this field. He has extensive experience in working with prospective administrators with strong bilingual and multicultural backgrounds in schools and school districts with such populations. He has significant administrative experience in community based educational organizations.

Marilyn Winters - Ph.D., Claremont Graduate School. Dr. Winters has a statewide reputation in the area of curriculum development. She has served as consultant and advisor to many state agencies and school districts in this field and has published several articles and monographs. Active with the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, both statewide and nationally, she has developed significant expertise in trends and developments in curriculum over various periods of school reform. Dr. Winters has had significant experience as a school administrator, especially in the area of instructional leadership.

Academic Unit's Experience with Graduate Study

Since the Educational Administration program is totally at the graduate level, all faculty have had extensive experience with graduate education during their careers at CSU/S. Moreover, three professors, Dr. Carter, Dr. Gezi, and Dr. Winters, also teach graduate core classes required for all Master's degree candidates in the School of Education. Although each faculty member advises and sponsors candidates for the Master of Arts in Education (Educational Administration), because of the workload of candidates (42 for Spring 1988) Dr. Carter, Dr. Costa, Dr. Gezi, and Dr. Livingston by choice

Department Ability to Offer Doctoral Instruction

As noted above, the Educational Administration program faculty are already involved in developing, teaching and assessing the quality of advanced courses which parallel doctoral degree courses (as judged by colleagues at institutions which grant doctoral degrees). Moreover, the size and quality of the faculty appear to be one of the most singular in the CSU system. In terms of experience serving on doctoral dissertation committees, Dr. Carter served on committees at the University of Texas and the University of California Riverside; both Dr. Rodriguez and Dr. Winters have or are serving as outside members on committees at Claremont Graduate School and University of the Pacific respectively; and Dr. Gezi has served on dissertation committees for Michigan State University. A brief review of the nine faculty and their background follows:

Thomas Carter - Ph.D., University of Texas. Dr. Carter has extensive background in civil rights work nationwide and has done extensive research and consulting in effective schools practice, especially as it pertains to the at-risk student. He also has extensive experience as a university administrator and has many publications to his credit.

Arthur Costa - Ed.D., University of California, Berkeley. Dr. Costa is internationally renowned in the field of instructional supervision, cognitive coaching and the development of thinking skills in students. He has been a national and state leader in this field with extensive publications. He has recently been elected as president of the prestigious Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development and he has extensive experience as a school administrator.

Thomas Cottigim - Ph.D., University of California Berkeley. Dr. Cottigim has been active in the field of organizational development and leadership theory. As a functioning higher education administrator for some ten years, he has worked actively with school leaders and state agency leaders in the development of effective preparation programs for school administrators. He has served as consultant and leader in numerous leadership institutes throughout the state, and he has wide experience as a school administrator.

Robert Garmston - Ed.D., University of Southern California. Dr. Garmston has significant background and research in the area of staff development, curriculum, supervision and the management of interpersonal and organizational changes. A contributor to several major journals, he has also published widely and is active nationwide in schools and school districts in supervision and cognitive coaching processes. He provides leadership statewide and nationally with the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. He has extensive experience at all levels of school administration from principal to superintendent.

Kal Gezi - Ph.D., Stanford University. Dr. Gezi has extensive background in educational research and has been very active with American Educational Research Association. In addition to numerous papers he has presented, he has conducted significant research in the school reform movement, curriculum trends, and multicultural education. He is most active as a member of several major professional boards and has wide experience as a higher education administrator.

assume primary responsibility for thesis/project advising. Normally, students register as candidates for two semesters during which time they are expected to complete the thesis/project. Some candidates, because of workload or other problems must register for an additional semester. Over the last 10 year period an average of 30 candidates complete the Master's degree annually (Fall, Spring or Summer). The Master's degree option in Educational Administration was approved in 1955.

Instructional and Research Facilities

- The instructional facilities for this program would consist of:
 - Excellent seminar and classrooms in the School of Education building at CSU,S
 - Excellent seminar and classrooms at McGeorge School of Law, University of Pacific (located in Sacramento)
 - Excellent seminar and classrooms in the School of Education building at the main University of Pacific campus in Stockton, California

Research facilities for this program would be as follows:

- Main library, CSU,S. The educational administration and education policy studies collection is one of the finest in the State. In fact, doctoral candidates from other institutions of higher education often travel to Sacramento to utilize this collection. A complete ERIC system is in place and faculty will be able to call for searches from their own offices by Fall 1988.
- Library specializing in law and law related issues, McGeorge School of Law. This facility is widely regarded as one of the finest in northern California.
- Main Library, University of Pacific, main campus. A very sound and thorough collection in education and educational administration.
- State of California Library and State Archives. Access to this important collection will be available through library loan agreements. Doctoral candidates in this program will have a quickly accessible resource that few other institutions of higher education can have.

Background on Current UOP Ed.D. Program and Faculty

The UOP Ed.D. program in educational administration has been in existence for some time. It is accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges, the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education and the California Commission on Teacher Education. Over the last decade, the University has granted 3-6 Ed.D. degrees annually in educational administration and 10-15 Ed.D. degrees annually in other programs in the School of Education.

The educational administration faculty have broad backgrounds in organizational behavior, leadership theory, school finance and the economics of education, curriculum and instruction, multicultural education and personnel practices. All of these faculty serve on dissertation committees

and teach research courses also. The faculty have also served on doctoral dissertation committees at other higher education institutions such as the University of Iowa, University of Pittsburgh and Washington State University. Several of the faculty are active in the American Educational Research Association and all have published research.

TFC:mjb
4/20/88

Attachments

APPENDIX D

General Procedures for Developing Joint Doctoral Programs

The following procedures are based on the documents developed by the Joint Graduate Board and the California Postsecondary Education Commission Joint Graduate Board, shown in Appendices E and F. They were originally issued in September 1969 under Code Memo AP 69-68. They have been updated to reflect changes in system terminologies and the addition of accredited independent institutions to the joint doctoral authorization language.

1. An expression of interest in and the rationale for a joint doctoral program is submitted by the respective California State University campus to the Office of the Chancellor, Division of Educational Programs and Resources. This initial expression of interest contains an indication of program need and supporting evidence as to the requesting department's ability to offer doctoral instruction. Specific information includes:
 - a. Faculty: degrees, honors, grants, professional and other relevant experience, publications and other matters pertinent to judging qualifications to guide advanced graduate work.
 - b. Academic unit: experience with graduate study, degrees offered, number of degrees awarded, year in which each graduate degree program was authorized.
 - c. Instructional and research facilities: description of facilities available to accommodate joint doctoral candidates.
2. Receipt of the preliminary proposal is acknowledged.
3. Comments on the desirability and appropriateness of the proposal, and on evidence of need and feasibility, are sent to the State University campus by the Division of Educational Programs and Resources.
4. After initial questions have been answered, the State University campus requests permission to negotiate.
5. Formal permission to negotiate is granted by the Chancellor, with appropriate notification to both the CSU campus and the University of California or accredited independent institution involved.
6. The proposal is added to the campus' Academic Plan.
7. The Chancellor will notify the CSU campus when the President of the University of California or the President of the accredited independent institution has granted permission to negotiate.
8. An ad hoc joint committee of the cooperating units prepares a formal draft proposal. This proposal is submitted through local University/College administrative channels to the President of the University of California or accredited independent institution and to the Chancellor of The California State University.
9. For the submission to the California State University Chancellor, five copies of the proposal are submitted to the Division of Educational Programs and Resources. In addition to the information outlined in #1 above, the draft proposal is to include a statement of budgetary support and budgetary requirements.
10. The proposal is reviewed by the Division of Educational Programs and Resources. Comments are forwarded to the participating campus.

11. The final proposal is submitted by the Division of Educational Programs and Resources to the Joint Graduate Board for action.
12. Notification is received from the Joint Graduate Board regarding such action.
13. The Chancellor notifies the CSU campus of the action taken by the Joint Graduate Board.
14. The proposal is submitted to the Trustees' Committee on Educational Policy.
15. The funding request is prepared for the joint doctoral degree and submitted with the budget for approval by the Trustees' Committee on Finance for eventual inclusion in the State Budget.
16. Following inclusion in the final budget, the CSU campus is notified by the Division of Educational Programs and Resources of the full approval of the joint doctoral degree; a reminder of the progress report due in one year after implementation is included.
17. A request for a progress report is sent to the CSU campus.
18. A progress report is submitted to the Board of Trustees.

November, 1986

W. Ann Reynolds, Chancellor
 California State University System
 400 Golden Shore
 P.O. Box 1590
 Long Beach, CA 90801

Dear Chancellor Reynolds:

It is my understanding that the Trustees of the California State University system, upon your recommendation, have adopted policy that would allow the universities in the system to offer Ed.D. doctoral programs, especially in the field of educational administration. Recognizing that the California Master Plan for Higher Education will be reviewed in the next session of the Legislature, I would like to offer my strong support for a change in the statutes so that this policy can be implemented.

As a practicing school administrator, there are several reasons why I support such a change:

- The continuing professional development of school administrators, especially at the school district leadership level, has been severely constrained in Central California by the absence of public higher education doctoral programs oriented to the needs of the practicing school administrator and the unique characteristics of the region.
- Currently Schools of Education in the UC system supposedly place equal emphasis on the research degree (Ph.D.) and the practitioner degree (Ed.D.). However, limited faculty resources and interest by the UC Schools in the Ed.D. degree, in reality, effectively curtail opportunities for school district leaders to actively participate in these programs. Programs are geared to the full time student, are campus centered rather than region centered and enrollment is limited to a small number of new students each year in the Ed.D. emphasis.
- California school systems are facing increased enrollment of a diverse demographic nature and at the same time a large number of administrative retirements. It is most important, especially at the district leadership level, that administrative candidates be available to fill these positions who have significant educational development, both in intensity and breadth. In addition, school districts are anxious to have access to a broadly based applicant pool with solid affirmative action representation. Currently, California ranks far below comparable states such as New York, Illinois, Michigan and Texas in the number of Ed.D. programs, and hence the number of graduates available who have had both significant administrative experience and intensive educational development. It is imperative that this situation be remedied as soon as possible.

- Since over 75% of current public school teachers, counselors and administrators are graduates of the CSU system, and since the CSU systems has an enviable record in the quality of its graduate programs leading to Master's degrees, it seems most appropriate that the CSU system be authorized to develop professionally oriented, quality doctoral programs in education, especially at this time in the field of educational administration.

Your interest in the preparation and development of effective school administrators is timely and most appreciated. Your support for broader and more complete opportunity for professional school administrators to continue their education at the doctoral level will be a most important factor in how this situation is resolved.

Sincerely,

This is a copy of a letter sent by the following school superintendents in November, 1986 regarding a CSU, S Ed.D.

Nick Floratos, Superintendent, Sacramento County
 James Loughridge, Superintendent, Folsom-Cordova
 Tom Gluni, Superintendent, Sacramento City
 Fred Stewart, Superintendent, San Juan
 Dale Faust, Superintendent, Rio Linda
 Robert Trigg, Superintendent, Elk Grove
 Jim Meshwect, Superintendent, Pleasant Ridge

cc: William Pickens
 Executive Director
 California Post Secondary
 Education Committee
 1020 12th Street
 Sacramento, CA 95814

Lee Kirschner
 Executive Director
 California Master Plan for Higher
 Education Review Commission
 1215 15th Street
 Sacramento, CA 95814

ATTACHMENT 2



JOINT UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT

148 NORTH LINCOLN WAY GALT, CALIFORNIA 95632

JAMES A. ARWOOD
DISTRICT SUPERINTENDENT
(209) 746-5061

November 4, 1986

DEC 12 1986

W. Ann Reynolds, Chancellor
California State University System
400 Golden Shore
P O Box 1590
Long Beach California 90801

Dear Chancellor Reynolds:

I understand that the trustees of the California State University System are considering a recommendation of an adoption that would allow you as his assistant to offer educational doctorate programs in the field of educational administration. As a superintendent in a small district outside of Sacramento, I would like to offer my strong support for the proposed program. It is imperative in our present educational and social climate that administrators in smaller districts, such as my own, have the opportunity to continue to grow educationally and expand their skills.

My understanding is that the proposed program is for a higher education doctoral program oriented to the needs of the practicing school administrator and the unique characteristics of the region. I strongly urge that the proposed program be implemented at the earliest possible date to provide those opportunities.

James A. Arwood
James A. Arwood
District Superintendent

cc: William Pickens
Executive Director
California Post Secondary
Education Committee

Lee Kirschner
Executive Director
California Master Plan for Higher
Education Review Commission

HEAL CODE BOARD OF TRUSTEES
NEAL CODE LINDA GURN DON MOTTOLI
BOB WEBB CEUCE CANNON

ATTACHMENT 1 BLACK EDUCATORS FOR ACTION

BEFA
SACRAMENTO CALIFORNIA

March 13, 1987

W. Ann Reynolds, Chancellor
California State University System
400 Golden Shore
P.O. Box 1590
Long Beach, Calif. 90801

Dear Chancellor Reynolds:

For many years Sacramento students have had great difficulty securing doctoral degrees without undue transportation hardships. Currently, the closest school offering a terminal degree is located in Stockton, 35 miles away. For that reason current plans to offer a doctorate program at California State University Sacramento in educational administration are greeted with welcomed arms by Black Educators for Action (BEFA).

We are sure that you are aware of the fact that the number of Black teachers and administrators in Sacramento school districts do not equal the number of Black students presently enrolled. This organization feels that sufficient numbers of Black role models at every echelon are vital not only to Black students, but to White students and the large number of increasingly enrolled students of a diverse demographic nature. As older teachers and administrators retire there is a growing need to replace them with people who represent all of Sacramento's diverse population. Consequently, this brings about a requirement for a greater applicant pool from which districts and educational agencies may be able to select Black leaders. The placement of a doctoral program at CSUS will greatly facilitate this need and provide a corresponding service to all of Sacramento.

For reasons stated above the Black Educators for Action (BEFA) strongly supports the proposed plan to bring a doctoral program to the California State University Sacramento Campus.

Sincerely,

Sam Pannell
Sam Pannell
President

cc: William Pickens
Executive Director
California Post Secondary
Education Committee
1020-12th Street
Sacramento, Calif. 95814

Lee Kirschner
Executive Director
California Master Plan for Higher
Education Review Commission
1215 - 15th Street
Sacramento, Calif. 95814



BEFA

SACRAMENTO CALIFORNIA

HELPING TO PROVIDE QUALITY EDUCATION IS OUR GOAL. WHILE SERVING THE NEEDS OF THE COMMUNITY.



Chancellor W. Ann Reynolds
Page 2

October 27, 1986

Chancellor W. Ann Reynolds
California State University Headquarters
400 Golden Shore
Long Beach, CA 90802-4275

Dear Chancellor Reynolds,

Please be advised that the Association of California School Administrators is in support of the California State University System's mission statement allowing for authorization to grant an applied doctoral degree in school administration.

The following factors create an increased need for this program.

1. Increased State Administrator Professional Education Requirements - An Inadequate State Delivery System. All research indicates that the single most important factor in creating an effective school is quality leadership. In 1981 the California Legislature responded to this identified need for quality leadership by passing AB 777 which added a second-tier administrative credential beyond the traditional one-tier and M.A. programs. The additional 24 semester hours of required coursework mirror the skills and knowledge found in applied doctoral programs. However, since the smaller private colleges and the CSU campuses do not offer doctoral programs there appears to be an inequity in equal access in all areas of the state. ACSA supports the state's requirements for increased education for administrators, but believes also that the state has an obligation to provide a delivery system which will allow administrators throughout the state the opportunity to meet the increased requirements.

2. Administrator Retirement Rate Increasing - A Shortage of Quality Trained Administrators. During the 83-84 school year, ACSA surveyed California's practicing administrators regarding their retirement plans. Based on an approximate 50% return (4,896 respondents) this study indicated that 26.3% plan to retire by 1989 and another 26.0% plan to retire by 1994. Although there is a pool of one-tier credential holders, many of whom will also be interested in further study, the passage of the two-tier program indicates a professional consensus for the need to increase the quality of administrator education; and the retirement rate indicates that we also need to increase the quantity of well-trained administrators in the state.

Association of California School Administrators, 1517 L Street, Sacramento, CA 95814 (916) 444-3216

15175 Old Bayshore Hwy, Burlingame, CA 94010
(415) 692-4200

4655 Lamson Ave, Los Alamitos, CA 90720
(714) 493-4431

Officers
James R. Fallbrant
President
Jack W. Dethman
President Elect

Pres. Elector
Vice President
John W. Dethman
President Elect

Board of Directors
David L. Brown
Gerrit Brown
James Christ
Jack M. Hill

Executive Director
Emergent Director
Wesley L. Asher

3. Changes in Statewide Demographics and Role of Women and Minorities in School Administration. Currently the advanced training, doctorate-granting universities are located almost exclusively in the metropolitan areas of the state. Further, no tax supported university offers a job-oriented applied doctorate, creating a statewide vacuum filled only by high-cost, out-of-state institutions of unknown quality. As the racial makeup of our state and the role of women in education changes, there is an increasing demand for these two groups to enter school administration; and yet, these are the resources for the two to five-year sojourn to the metropolitan location of the doctorate-granting universities.

4. Shortage of Doctorates Granted From Public Universities in California. Higher education statistics indicate that there are fewer doctoral degrees in school administration granted from tax supported California universities per unit of population than in other leading states. California administrators are faced with fragmented applied training offerings from several uncoordinated sources including Teacher Education Centers, the new Administrator Training Centers, and Staff Development Grants, all financed with tax funds through the State Department of Education, county offices district programs, private universities, and professional associations. A CSU applied doctorate developed collaboratively with the above training sources could assure that each administrator would be motivated to secure a well-rounded, coherent training program.

In conclusion, ACSA believes that the California State University System, with its statewide network of campuses and historical purpose of training teachers and administrators is a most efficient and economical delivery system for meeting the above-described need for advanced and applied administrator training culminating in a doctorate degree. With your leadership, ACSA will support this program before the Legislature.

Very truly yours,

James R. Fallbrant
James R. Fallbrant, President
Association of California School Administrators

JRF/mwd
07000B

Excerpted from "Program Change Proposal: Request for Implementation of Proposed Bachelor of Arts and Minor in Pacific Asian Studies." (The complete PCP is available for review in the Academic Senate Office, Adm. 264.)

1. Definition of Proposed Degree Major/Minor Program in Pacific Asian Studies:

- a. California State University Sacramento requests approval to offer a Bachelor of Arts and Minor in Pacific Asian Studies to be implemented with the 1988-89 academic year.
- b. The proposed program will be administered by Pacific Asian Studies Program Committee of the Center for Pacific Asian Studies, School of Arts and Sciences. (See Appendix A)

c. Individuals primarily responsible for drafting the Pacific Asian Studies Program:

- Jay B. Crain, Ph.D., Professor of Anthropology
Tom Swift, Ph.D., Professor of History
Richard Shek, Ph.D., Associate Professor of Humanities
Shotaro Hayashigatani, M.A., Professor of Foreign Languages
Kazuo Ninomiya, Ph.D., Professor of Geography

d. Objectives of the proposed Pacific Asian Studies Major program are to:

- 1) provide students with a coherent introduction to the language, history and culture of Asian societies on the western rim of the Pacific Basin.
- 2) Each of the three proposed concentrations provides a focused interdisciplinary background toward understanding the major social and historical forces at work in the Pacific Asian region. Each concentration is supported by appropriate language training.
- 3) Graduates of the program would either continue their studies at graduate institutions or utilize their knowledge and training through employment in government, business or education relating to this increasingly important region of the world.

- e. The proposed major consists of 45 units, 24 of which must be in upper-division. Students must also demonstrate language proficiency in a Pacific Asian Language relevant to their concentration.

A. CORE REQUIREMENTS

- | | |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| (3) History 6 | Asian Civilizations |
| (3) Sociology 160 | Asian Societies |
| (3) Humanities 70 | Introduction to Asian Humanities |
| (3) Geography 125 | Geography of East Asia |
| (3) Pacific-Asian Studies 100 | Topics in Pacific Asian Studies |

B. CONCENTRATION REQUIREMENTS

1. Japanese Studies (30 units)

- | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------------------|
| (3) Anthropology 134 | Japanese Culture and Society |
| (3) History 146a | Cultural History of Japan |
| (3) History 146b | Modern Japan |
| (6) Japanese 116a, 116b | Language and Culture of Japan |
| (3) Japanese 120 | Japanese Civilization |
| (12) Electives | See below, C. |

2. Chinese Studies (30 units)

- | | |
|-------------------------|--|
| (3) Chinese 150 | Survey of Chinese Literature |
| (3) History 148a | Traditional China |
| (3) History 148b | Modern China |
| (3) Humanities 172 (or) | The Classical Culture of China |
| (3) Chinese 120 | Chinese Civilization |
| (3) Humanities 173 | Chinese Philosophy and Religion |
| (3) Government 137 (or) | China's Foreign Policy |
| (3) Government 145 | China: Politics of Continuing Revolution |
| (12) Electives | See below, C. |

3. General Pacific Asian Studies (30 units)

- | | |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| (3) Anthropology 134 | Japanese Culture and Society |
| (3) Anthropology 147 | Peoples of Southeast Asia |
| (3) Humanities 173 | Chinese Philosophy and Religion |
| (3) Philosophy 145 (or) | Far Eastern Philosophy |
| (3) Humanities 171 | Introduction to the Eastern World |
| (3) History 146a (or) | Cultural History of Japan |
| (3) History 146b | Modern Japan |
| (3) History 148a (or) | Traditional China |

- (3) History 148b Modern China
 (12) Electives See below, C.

f. ELECTIVE COURSES

These may include courses in another concentration, as well as:

- (3) Art 115 Arts of China
 (3) Art 116 Arts of Japan
 (3) Ethnic Studies 100 Asian Americans
 (3) Home Economics 124 Asian Design
 (3) Humanities 175 Zen Buddhism and Taoism
 (3) Humanities 174 Modern Japanese Literature and Society
 (8) Chinese 1a-1b* Elementary Cantonese
 (3) History 129 C Century of Chinese-Russian Relations, 1850-Present
 (3) Japanese 70 Language and Culture of Japan
 (3) Japanese 150 Advanced Japanese Grammar and Conversation.
 (1-3) Tutorial 199 Approved by Program Committee
 (1-3) Fieldwork 195 Approved by Program Committee
 (1-3) Internship 197 Approved by Program Committee

Language Proficiency: Equivalency of four semesters of language study can be met through examinations arranged with the Department of Foreign Languages or through study of courses offered at CSUS such as:

- 1b
 (8) Japanese 1a-2a* Elementary Japanese
 (8) Japanese 2a-2b* Intermediate Japanese
 (or)
 (8) Chinese 6a-6b* Elementary Mandarin
 (8) Chinese 7a-7b* Intermediate Mandarin

With the exception of Pacific-Asian Studies 100, the courses listed above are already taught (see enrollment figures in Appendix B).

Course needed to implement proposed major:

**COURSE DESCRIPTION: PACIFIC ASIAN STUDIES 100
 TOPICS IN PACIFIC ASIAN STUDIES**

This is an undergraduate proseminar that examines a variety of issues concerning the past and contemporary relationships between America and Pacific Asia. Various cultural, historical, anthropological, political and social-economic aspects of these relationships will be explored. The focus may vary with individual instructors. A required course for Pacific Asian Studies majors and minors.

MINOR REQUIREMENTS

The minor consists of 24 units, 12 of which must be in upper-division.

A. Course Requirements

- (15) The Core Course Requirements for the Major.
 (9) Three courses from the three Concentration Requirements.

B. Language Proficiency

Prior to advancement to candidacy, students must demonstrate language proficiency equivalent to two semesters of Japanese, Chinese or other relevant Pacific Asian Language.

- g. Students must choose one of three concentrations: Japanese Studies, Chinese Studies or General Pacific-Asian Studies. The three concentrations are linked through a 15-unit core. (See courses listed in e.)
- h. The major and minor have language proficiency requirements. Before advancement to candidacy, students must demonstrate proficiency equivalent to four or two semesters (respectively) of a Pacific-Asian language appropriate to their concentration.
- i. n.a.
- j. The only Los Rios campus which offers Mandarin or Japanese language is City College. Following completion of the articulation agreements with the Department Foreign Languages (pending) appropriate credits will be identified.
- k. n.a.
2. Need for the Proposed Degree Major Program.
- a. At this time only three schools in the CSU System offer majors in the area of Pacific Asian Studies (San Francisco State, California State University Long Beach, and San Diego State University) and no schools in the Sacramento area offer any such degree (including University of the Pacific and University of California at Davis).

b. San Francisco State, the only one of the three CSU schools located in Northern California, offers only language degrees (B.A. level) in Chinese and Japanese. The other degree offered that relates to Asian Studies is in Ethnic Studies with an option of specialization in Asian-American Studies but does not focus on the Pacific Rim as a region. Both California State University Long Beach and San Diego State University have comparable B.A. and M.A. programs but are in the Southern California service area, making it less accessible to interested students in our own area who may not find it possible to move.

c. Enrollment figures for courses in various departments to be included in the proposed program are listed in Appendix B. No formal minor, option or concentration is currently offered in the proposed subject area.

d. Student interest in the form of Special Majors has been about 2 per year, but the number of inquiries about such a program has about 10-15. Another justification for the proposed program is based on the recommendations and findings of national and state academic, government and business entities. Student interest in the courses which constitute the proposed program is documented in the enrollment figures shown in Appendix B. Since these courses are already sustained by adequate enrollment outside the proposed program, it is argued here that initial demand for the major/minor is not critical.

1. National Level:

i. The National Endowment for the Humanities call for national effort to strengthen foreign studies. (see Appendix C)

ii. Chinese, Japanese and most Pacific-Asian languages appear on the U.S. Department of Education list of critical languages. (see Appendix D)

iii. Pending legislation in U.S. Congress to meet deficiencies in foreign language and culture training. (see Appendix E)

iv. Increasing employment opportunities for graduates with foreign language proficiency. (see Appendix F)

2. State Level:

i. Recommendations in the Report of the CSU Commission on the Pacific Rim. (see Appendix G)

ii. Recommendations of the California Economic Development Corporation Report, California and the Pacific Rim: A Policy Agenda. (see Appendix H)

iii. Article by Tom Hayden (D-Santa Monica), Chair of the Assembly subcommittee on Higher Education. (See Appendix I)

iv. Recommendations of the report on California's economic future, Building New Foundations for a Competitive Society, Joint Committee on Science and Technology, California Legislature. (see Appendix J)

e. n.a.

f. Graduates of the program would either continue their studies at graduate institutions or utilize their knowledge and training through employment in government, business or education relating to this increasingly important region.

g. The expected number of majors in the first year of initiation is 20; three years thereafter, 60; and five years thereafter, 75.

It is expected that after the Pacific Asian major program is approved and advertised, there will be increased demand for the program (also see Appendices C-I).

3. Existing Support Resources for Pacific Asian Studies Major Program.

a. Faculty teaching courses in Pacific Asian Studies: (See Vitae in Appendix K)

b. Administrative space is available in the offices of the proposed Center for Pacific Asian Studies. Since the courses comprising the proposed program are already being taught, no additional lecture room needs are anticipated beyond that required for Pacific-Asian Studies 100.

c. Library holdings are adequate to support the proposed program (see Report in Appendix L).

d. n.a.

4. Additional Support Resources Required

- a. See Table I (see next, page 11).
- b. No additional faculty positions are needed to support the initiation of the proposed program. Six units assigned time for the Director and secretarial support are included in the prospective budget request submitted to Arts and Sciences in October 1986 (see Appendix M). If the demand for the proposed program exceeds present staffing, additional faculty time would be required. Failing this, the program would have to limit admissions.

Since the Director would serve as both the Chair of the proposed Program Committee and proposed Committee of the Pacific Asian Studies Center (see Appendix A, page 4), it is anticipated that three units of the Director's assigned time may be funded at various times with extramural grants.

In the early years of the proposed program, it would appear both feasible and practical (in the absence of extramural funding) for the Director to teach the proposed Pacific Asian Studies 100 course. This would reduce the required assigned time to three units.

- c. It not anticipated that additional lecture space will be required unless there are major shifts in enrollment patterns into the some of the G.E. courses included in the proposed program.
 - d. Routine library acquisitions to support the programs of the departments whose existing courses comprise the proposed program should be adequate. Additionally, the proposed Center for Pacific Asian Studies will seek to secure extramural funds to further enrich the library collections.
 - e. Office computer and printer (see prospective budget, Appendix N).
5. Abstract of Proposal and Proposed Catalog Description.

See Appendix N.

SCHOOL OF ARTS AND SCIENCES
BUDGET REQUEST FOR PROGRAMS AND CENTERS

PROGRAM: PACIFIC ASIAN STUDIES DATE: October 22, 1986

Category	Allocation 1986-87	Request 1987-88	Request 1988-89
Faculty Positions	2,141	4,144	4,144
Administration Positions	--	--	--
Clerical Positions	--	53	53
Student Assistants	1,000.2	1,200.	1500.
Operating Support	500.3	3,000.4	3,500.
Equipment	--	1634.2	550.4

1. Identify costs to other academic units from your proposal. These academic areas must be consulted, and they must submit a statement noting how these costs will be met.

P.a.

2. What proportion of costs each year will be recovered by use of non-school resources, such as, grants, university development funds, donations, other schools' funds. Identify these resources and provide supporting documentation where appropriate. Use another page if necessary.

It is anticipated that the program will receive some support from three sources: 1) university development funds following implementation at some level of the recommendations of the CSU Pacific Rim Commission, 2) NEH and USDE grants are available to support further development of programs of this type and we are in the process of making applications, and 3) through the Center for Pacific Asian Studies, we will solicit funds and donations from the consumer, business and Asian communities.

3. Identify the space needs, if any, which must be met before your program or center can be approved.

While we are in the proposed Center for Pacific Asian Studies, we will administer the proposed program) has been approved. The Seathe facility.

continued over

NOTES:

1. An addition; 2 assigned time is requested for the Spring 1987 semester. This is assuming that the approval process for the proposed major/minor is proceeding and will allow a Fall 1987 initiation date. In this case, all the announcements and materials for the programs must be prepared during the Spring Semester.

The program is now using a graduate student with a work study grant that will allow the current allocation to meet our needs through the end of this academic year.

2. See footnote 1. To prepare for the program initiation, announcements will have to be prepared, mailed, etc.

Breakdown of 1987-88 Operating budget:

a. Supplies and Services	-----	\$2250.00
b. Telephones	-----	\$250.00
c. Postage	-----	\$200.00
d. Travel (Asian Program chairs' meeting at Society for Asian Studies)	-----	\$300.00

\$3,000. for 15% clone, 634.00 for printer, cables.

1. SOME hard disk for student record storage and data files.

2. M-C Construction has donated a Tandy computer system which will can use until we can get equipment supported by the campus computer services. We still are seeking the use of a printer and some extra furniture, but expect these will be forthcoming from donations or university surplus.



California State University, Sacramento

6000 J STREET, SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95819-2694

M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: April 15, 1988

TO: June Stuckey
Associate Vice President for
Program Development and Evaluation

FROM: Michael Lewis, Chair *ML*
Fiscal Affairs Committee

SUBJECT: Proposed Minor and B.A. in Pacific Asian Studies

I believe the Fiscal Affairs Committee has sorted through the relevant variables affecting the cost of the Pacific Asian Studies B.A. and minor. The fiscal impact of the proposal is minor, as detailed in the Fiscal Affairs Committee's Minutes of April 5, 1988 (attached) and the supporting material from Jay Crain and Claude Duval (also attached).

Please feel free to call on me if you or Curriculum Committee members have any questions.

ML/CD
Attachments
cc: Dean Sullivan
Associate Dean Wagner
Professor Crain

FISCAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Fiscal Affairs Committee
Minutes

2

April 5, 1988

MINUTES

Tuesday, April 5, 1988

1:10 P.M. Adm. 275

Members Present: Bynum, Elmallah, Lewis (Chair), Malveaux,
Nelson, Renken, Richardson, Rios, Schulte,
Shulock

Members Absent: Scheel, Spaulding

The Minutes of March 1, 1988, were approved.

PACIFIC ASIAN STUDIES--MINOR AND B.A.

The ad hoc committee (Bynum, Rios, Richardson and Lewis) contacted Associate Dean Wagner in the School of Arts and Sciences who requested that the proposal be returned to the School of Arts and Sciences for further budget review; the proposal was returned with specific questions for the School. J. Crain, Anthropology Department, responded for the School of Arts and Sciences to the ad hoc committee's concerns. The School of Arts and Sciences will not need any additional resources in order to proceed with the program. The cost, which the School of Arts and Sciences has agreed to absorb, is one additional course once a year, which equals 3 wtu's per academic year. The operating expenditure (O.E.) cost will be \$150.00 for the academic year and Arts and Sciences has also agreed to cover this cost. No units are being requested for coordination of this program and the program can be handled within the current resources of the School.

The only apparent impact on other departments is in the Department of Foreign Languages, which, Chair Duval stated, will increase enrollment in Japanese and Chinese language courses. C. Duval's letter further states that these courses will not be negatively affected due to the Foreign Languages Department anticipation of increased enrollment due to the implementation of the new general education foreign language requirement.

The committee asked Chair Lewis to write a letter to Associate Vice President Stuckey and Dean Sullivan stating the above findings.

DISCUSSION OF THE SABBATICAL LEAVE POLICY

The committee has been asked by the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate to "develop recommendations that will enhance funding of sabbatical leaves and shorten the period between leaves." This request has been made in response to a memo from J. Moon, Chair, History Department, in which she asked the following questions:

- 1) Regarding the sabbatical list cut off at eleven years seniority--how does this lengthy period compare to sister campuses?
- 2) How do sister campuses that award sabbaticals closer to seven years manage the funding?
- 3) How are we funded for sabbaticals?
- 4) What efforts are being made to increase funding?

The current formula from the Chancellor's Office is one leave for every 12.7 eligible faculty. The formula has been increased from 12 to 12.7 as the pool of faculty who are eligible has increased. The increased pool now includes librarians, academic administrators, and full-time lecturers. Funding from the Chancellor's Office also is based on the number of faculty in the pool. Eligible faculty must have six years of academic service in the previous seven years; the M.O.U. also specifies a certain period of time before a person who has received a sabbatical is again eligible to apply. The M.O.U. also states that faculty who were hired at CSUS and given credit toward tenure for experience at another institution can count this time.

Chair Lewis received information from S. Orman, Coordinator of Faculty Personnel, that, for the past three years, the cut-off for sabbaticals has been at eleven years.

An ad hoc Committee on Sabbatical Leave Policy was formed. The members are: W. Bynum, S. Orman, R. Richardson, R. Nelson, A. Elmallah and J. Moon. They will meet on Tuesday, April 19, at 1:10 in Adm. 275. The ad hoc committee will begin to develop questions for a survey to be distributed to all CSU campuses. The committee also suggested that the survey be sent to Schools at each campus, as well as to the Faculty and Staff Affairs Offices at each campus. The survey will be sent in Fall 1988.



California State University, Sacramento

60011 STREET, SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95819-2694

DEPARTMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY

M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: March 17, 1988

TO: Michael Lewis, Chair
Fiscal Affairs Committee

THROUGH:

William Sullivan
William Sullivan, Dean
Arts and Sciences

FROM:

John Gray
John Gray, Director
Center for Pacific Asian Studies

SUBJECT: Proposed Major/Minor in Pacific Asian Studies

Thank you for your memorandum of March 8. In preparing the clarifications you requested, I met with Associate Deans Wagner and Gray and talked with Associate Dean Yamanaka, Vice President Stuckey, Geography Chair Ninomiya and Foreign Language Chair Duval. I have organized the answers to your questions in the same order in which they appear in your memorandum.

1. The proposed budget (Appendix H) does not reflect the costs of the proposed program (that budget estimate also included the Center for Pacific Asian Studies). The cost of the proposed Major/Minor will be three units per academic year to staff Pacific Asian Studies 100 and approximately \$150.00 O.E. The costs of typing course materials will be handled by the department of the instructor. At least in the beginning, this will be the Department of Anthropology. I submitted a Foreign Area Studies Training Grant application to the U. S. Department of Education in November. Should this be awarded, the costs of the initial year of the program will be funded without using university resources.

2. It is anticipated that initial demand for the proposed major/minor will be quite small. This, together with the likelihood that some of the students who enter the program are those already at CSUS and enrolled in these courses, suggests that the initial impact of the proposed program on departments offering these courses will be minimal. In the case of Foreign Languages, this is not the case. They have been making preparations for the proposed major/minor (see attached memorandum from Dr. Duval). In some cases, the proposed program should help support under-enrolled courses (such as in History and Geography). Later, should the major/minor result in enrollment shifts, the departments involved would follow normal budget augmentation procedures through the School of Arts and Sciences.

3. I consulted with Dr. Stuckey and Dr. Yamanaka concerning the appropriate listing of Pacific Asian Studies 100. They felt this would be best handled by using the CSU existing Regis code for Asian Studies.

Attachments: 1) Memorandum of March 8 from Michael Lewis.
2) Memorandum of March 15 from Claude Duval.

- cc: D. Wagner
C. Gray
T. Yamanaka
J. Stuckey
L. Heidecker
C. Duval
K. Ninomiya
T. Swift
R. Shek



California State University, Sacramento

6000 J STREET, SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95819-7694

2

Memo to J. Crain re:
Proposed B.A. and Minor,
Pacific Asian Studies

March 8, 1988

M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: March 8, 1988

TO: Jay Crain, Professor
Anthropology Department

FROM: Michael Lewis, Chair
Fiscal Affairs Committee

SUBJECT: Proposed B.A. and Minor, Pacific Asian Studies

An ad hoc committee of the Fiscal Affairs Committee has been conducting preliminary fiscal analysis of the proposed B.A. and minor. During the course of the ad hoc committee's work, several questions/concerns have arisen which need to be addressed before work can continue.

1. Does the proposed budget (Appendix M; dated October, 1986) still reflect the proposed program costs? Please show how requested faculty positions will be used each semester to staff Pacific Asian Studies 100 and to coordinate the program. If resources already existing within the Center for Pacific Asian Studies will be used to support the program, indicate the current funding source (School, grants, etc.). You may wish to work with the School of Arts and Sciences Budget Committee in re-thinking the budget for 1988 and thereafter.

2. The proposal does not evaluate the impact of increased FTES on other departments. The ad hoc committee's initial work suggests a real impact on some of the core courses and on foreign language courses as well. Since a surge in enrollment could lead to increased demand for sections in these departments, the potential impact of the proposed B.A. and minor on these departments needs to be defined. Furthermore, the proposal does not indicate those resource needs which may be met within the existing allocations to the School and those which would require an increased allocation. Again, the School's Budget Committee might help with this task.

(OVER)

3. A concern has been expressed about the percentage of the proposed Pacific Asian Studies 100. You may wish to work with the School of Arts and Sciences, Dr. Stuckey, and the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee to ensure the appropriate listing of the course under an existing academic program.

Thank you for your patience in working through these issues. If I may be of any assistance to you in clarifying FAC's concerns or in thinking through responses, please do not hesitate to call on me.

ML/CD
cc: W. Bynum
R. Richardson
S. Rios
J. Stuckey
D. Decious
D. Wagner
J. Barrera

DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES - CSUS

MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. Jay Crain
Pacific Asian Studies

DATE: March 15, 1988

FROM: Claude Duval, Chair
Foreign Languages
Claude Duval

SUBJECT: Pac Asian
Studies Major/Minor

As requested, I am providing you with the following information concerning the impact on the Foreign Language Department should a Pacific Asian Studies Major/Minor be approved.

The two foreign languages most directly affected are Japanese and Mandarin Chinese. These two languages are presently enjoying sound, growing enrollments in upper as well as lower division courses in spite of scheduling restrictions. The new BA and Minor would definitely direct more students to these languages with a slight increase in FTE:

1. Answering the obvious interest and need for more complete Asian language programs, the Department of Foreign Languages has sufficient enrollment to propose regular minors in Japanese and Chinese. The language minors will make it easier for Pacific Asian Studies students to meet part of their core requirement without creating an unmanageable impact of slight increased FTE (which had already been anticipated) by the Department of Foreign Languages.
2. The need to schedule an additional Mandarin 6A (first semester) every Fall semester would likely be projected for the Fall 1989 semester instead of the Fall 1990 semester, as planned by the Department of Foreign Languages. No additional sections of 2nd, 3rd or 4th semester course would be envisioned for the next 3 to 4 years.
3. The need to schedule an additional Japanese 1B (second semester) every Spring and a possible 3rd section of Japanese 1A (first semester) every Fall would also be projected for the 89-90 academic year or 90-91 at the latest. The demand for Beginning Japanese continues to be very strong and the Department projections to meet demands in that language would easily accommodate initial interest of new Pacific Asian Studies Majors/Minors. No additional sections of 2nd year courses would be needed at this time.

4. In conclusion, the possible increase of Pacific Asian Studies students in Chinese and Japanese beginning and intermediate courses will not create programmatic demands not already anticipated by the Department of Foreign Languages.

cc: Tohru Yamanaka
Shotaro Hayashigatani
Lewis Robinson

(OVER)

HIGHLIGHTS
ACADEMIC SENATE
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
MEETING OF MAY 5-6, 1988

By Peter Shattuck, Secretary
Academic Senate

At its May meeting, the 1987-88 Academic Senate completed its work for the year, debating and passing twenty-two resolutions, discussing three additional issues, and hearing a report on the state's fiscal situation from Chancellor W. Ann Reynolds. Culminating a year of intensive systemwide discussion, the Senate passed a resolution supporting the General Education Transfer Curriculum.

Chair Ray Geigle reported on the progress of the Joint Committee for Review of the Master Plan; the Committee's final report is not expected until the summer. He noted a number of positive actions taken by the Legislature in its review of the CSU budget, including "support for \$2.5 million of our \$7.5 million request for research." He asserted that the "tripartite process" of cooperation among the Senate, the CFA, and the CSU administration has been "useful and productive, and ought to be continued," and he noted the growth of cooperation with CSSA leaders.

The controversial issue of an intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum has been before the Senate since last fall. After a two-hour debate, the body finally passed a resolution endorsing the concept, accepting a specific proposal in which "31 units are common to all three segments of public postsecondary education and 6 units are specific to CSU", and encouraging further efforts "to achieve as much commonality as possible in a single statewide" GETC. Senators proposed two significant amendments, but the resolution finally passed as it appeared in the Agenda. In a related action, the Senate narrowly passed a set of recommended guidelines for General Education programs for students in majors with a substantial number of required prerequisite courses.

Turning its attention to issues before the Legislature, the Senate endorsed AB 3973 (Chacon) and AB 2707 (Hughes), supported the intent of AB 4130 (Hayden), AB 4071 (Vasconcellos), and ACR 126 (Campbell), and gave qualified support to SB 148 (Bergeson).

Two resolutions about library resources gained unanimous Senate support. One expressed deep concern over "the harm that inadequate library acquisition funding has done to library holdings and consequently to instruction and creative activity in the CSU." The second called attention to "the state of deterioration and obsolescence of library equipment," and labelled this an "equipment crisis."

Chancellor Reynolds gave a very preliminary report on the meaning for the CSU of the state's fiscal situation, noting that estimates of the shortfall now range from \$800 million to \$1.4 billion. The Department of Finance intends to make cuts across-the-board, rather than selectively. The Chancellor assured the Senate that the research PCP was very high on her priority list. She supported efforts to create joint doctorate programs in the field of education, and she discussed plans for a major study of library needs to be conducted next year.

Senators had the opportunity to discuss the Report of the Task Force on the Recruitment and Retention of a Quality Faculty, Legislative Draft Supplemental Language on the research PCP, and a summary of the possible results of Propositions 71 and 72.

In other action, the Senate passed resolutions:

_ Endorsing and adopting the 1987 "Statement on Professional Ethics" of the American Association of University Professors;

_ Insisting that faculty be "consulted about and involved in the creation of new academic administrative positions";

_ Supporting new requirements for teachers adding a supplementary authorization to their teaching credential;

_ Emphasizing the importance of adequate single-station office space for faculty;

_ Endorsing a developmental paper, "Campus Responsibilities in Collegial Governance";

_ Endorsing "The California State University Statement of Principles Regarding Teacher Education Legislation";

_ Endorsing a resolution of the English Council calling for the reclassification of composition courses;

_ Approving the Statement on Competencies in Mathematics Expected of Entering Freshmen; and

_ Calling attention to a variety of materials which faculty can use in assessing the subject-matter competency of prospective teachers.

On Friday, May 6, the 1988-89 Academic Senate held its organizational meeting. It returned Ray Geigle as Chair, and elected Becky Loewy as Vice-Chair, Sandy Wilcox as Secretary, and Paul Spear and Frieda Stahl as At-Large members.

PROGRAM FOR EXCELLENCE IN UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION:
A Model for Enhancing Student Retention

2

GOALS OF THE PROGRAM:

- To meet the academic needs of students adequately by focusing on the development of writing, critical thinking, communication, and math skills so that newly admitted C.S.U.S. students will succeed and eventually graduate from the University.

- To address more fully the total range of student needs particularly those in need of supportive student services and those who desire to explore career options.

- To assist faculty who desire to participate in the program by offering them opportunities to learn more about the diverse nature of today's student population and their special needs, the compatibility of their teaching styles and student learning styles, and instructional innovation.

RATIONALE:

The primary purpose of the Program for Excellence in Undergraduate Education is to enhance institutional support for students who could benefit from special advising, counseling and academic support, thereby increasing student retention.

Educational equity demands that the University more effectively address the needs of specific populations of students: i.e., underrepresented minorities, older, disabled, and transfer students. There are many reasons why students eventually do not complete their academic programs and graduate from the University. Among these reasons are alienation, lack of appropriate preparation, finances, family and personal problems, and lack of success during their transition year at the University. Research studies suggest that students who withdraw from college are less integrated into the academic environment, less involved in the campus, and benefit from less family support than do those who persist to graduation. In conclusion, students who believe that they have entered an academic community where high standards, coupled with concern for their growth as individuals throughout their career path as students, will be more likely to persist to graduation, regardless of the pulls toward outside commitments (Billson and Terry, 1987).

Of particular concern to the faculty, staff, and administration at C.S.U.S. is the providing of the best possible educational experience for entering students so that they have the best possible chance for success while they are at the

University. Special programs, such as the College Assistance Migrant Program, have proven to be successful in providing support for populations with special needs. Such programs are generally integrative in nature, addressing the total needs of the student population. Integration of academic programs and student support services is essential in accomplishing the general goal of retaining and graduating students who desire to be successful while they are at C.S.U.S.

CENTER COMPONENTS:

In general, the Program for EMVE will include the following components: (See Appendix A for chart)

1. Coordinated outreach activities
2. Personal advisement and counseling (academic, campus activities, financial aid and career development)
3. Regular monitoring of student performance (attendance and academic achievement, etc.) via computer technology
4. Faculty development and mentoring program (emphasizing faculty time with students outside of the instructional setting)
5. A required one or two semester student development course (knowledge of university, study skills, campus activities, goal setting, career choices, community service internship, etc.)
6. Peer counseling and support group system
7. Diagnostic and placement testing for writing, reading, and math
8. Offering of several modules which would include general education courses (English, math, science, etc.) and introductory level major courses. Study groups and tutors are made available
9. Research and evaluation unit. The primary purpose of this component will be to study teaching effectiveness and retention strategies

TARGET POPULATION:

The Center's primary interest is offering a structured, supportive environment for students who wish to participate. Since the retention of all qualified students is the university's

goal, all newly admitted freshmen and transfer students will be invited to participate their first semester on campus. The population demographics of the Sacramento service area will be used to select participants from the applicant pool. Students who are underrepresented minorities, first generation, conditionally admitted, and undeclared majors will be encouraged to apply and will be given priority based on a needs assessment by the students themselves and appropriate professional staff.

PROGRAM PLAN:

Initially, students will be invited to participate in a structured program designed to incorporate the various program components and to meet academic and personal needs for support services. Existing academic and student service resources will be coordinated and organized into an intra-structure to provide for individualized advising, guidance, and academic and social support. All departments will be invited to submit a 9-12 unit course module which departments have determined to be appropriate for a newly admitted student interested in a discipline or a combination of related disciplines. School curriculum committees will assist with this process and will work with an advisory committee appropriate in designing the modules. Each module should include at least two courses addressing basic skills and quantitative reasoning and a basic course introducing the student to the discipline(s). For example, the Psychology Department might develop a module for potential majors which would include Psychology 1A, English 1A, Biological Science 10, and an elective. A module for undeclared majors would include English 1A, Computer Science 5, Math 1, and I.D. 96A - Introduction To The Sciences and Careers. Additional modules would also be developed to address the needs of the students who are conditionally admitted, E.S.T., transfers, and the undeclared.

Newly admitted S.S.U.S. students from the identified student populations noted above will contract to participate in the program for one semester. Each student will select one of the course modules. Specific sections of the courses in the modules will be identified based on faculty willingness to participate in the program. Approximately 12 students will be admitted into each course module, and spaces will be reserved for them in specific sections. Each of the 12 students will be assigned a faculty mentor, a peer mentor, and a professional staff person from Student Affairs who will work together as a team to monitor the student's progress in the courses, provide opportunities for instructor-student interaction, organize study groups, and expose the student to social, educational, and cultural experiences on the campus and in the community.

ROLES OF TEAM MEMBERS:

Faculty mentors with three units of assigned time will be responsible primarily for monitoring the student's academic progress, providing opportunities for interacting with the 12 students in the module on matters of concern to the students, and working with the Student Affairs professional in order to link students with appropriate campus and community resources as needed.

Student Affairs professionals, with the faculty mentor, will be responsible for assessing the student's academic needs, advising and counseling the student in non-academic areas, consulting with the faculty mentor on the academic progress of the student, and linking the student with appropriate resources if needed.

Peer mentors will be responsible primarily for conducting study sessions for students, planning social, educational and cultural experiences on campus and in the community with students, and generally being a peer advocate for the 12 students.

All team members will be provided with training sessions appropriate to their individual roles as team members to facilitate their involvement with students in the program. Faculty teaching the courses in the modules will also be invited to some training sessions on student learning styles. Training should be conducted before classes begin in the fall.

ROLE OF STUDENTS:

Students who decide to participate in the program will attend an advising session, select an appropriate module of courses, and participate in study sessions and planned social and cultural experiences. They must meet regularly with team members and participate in individual conferences.

ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE:

The program will be administered by the Vice-President for Academic Affairs. A program coordinator will be selected who will be responsible for coordinating the PERVE Program for Excellence. This position would include responsibility for supervising the faculty, staff and student participants developing the training sessions, preparing the publicity for the program, administering the budget, and executing the program details.

An Advisory Committee composed of 7 instructional faculty (3 from Arts & Sciences and one from each professional school), and 4 student affairs professionals, appointed by each unit's faculty governance structure. The Advisory Committee shall be responsible for selecting the program coordinator and advising the director on all aspects of the program including the development of course modules, selecting and training of the student affairs professionals, faculty and peer mentors, and determining the criteria for accepting students, and selecting the students from the applicant pool.

RESOURCE NEEDS:

Three hundred newly admitted students will be accepted into the program the first year with 25 faculty mentors, 25 student affairs professionals, and 25 peer mentors. The program coordinator should receive 6-9 units released time for coordinating the program. Secretarial assistance and an operating budget would be needed as well as an office with phone.

Estimated resource needs:

25 faculty with 3 units assigned time	5 faculty positions
25 student affairs professionals w/.2 time	5 student affairs positions
25 peer mentors paid as student assistants (10 hours per week at \$4 per hour)	\$30,000 for one year

EVALUATION:

In order to evaluate the effectiveness of this program, a research model would need to be designed which would take into account all components of the program. The effectiveness can be evaluated in a way by comparing the retention and eventual graduation rates of students who participate with those who do not.

C. Gray, Associate Dean, School of Arts and Sciences
D. Raske, Dean, Student Affairs
2/88

Refer to May 19, 1988, Academic Senate Agenda, page 7:

AS 88-74/CC, Ex. RETENTION MODEL: PROGRAM FOR EXCELLENCE IN
UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION (PEUE)

At its meeting of May 17, 1988, the Executive Committee recommended adoption of AS 88-74 with the following amendment (underline = addition, strikeover = deletion):

B. Composition of the Task Force

~~The Task Force would have a majority of faculty, and would include five faculty members, selected at-large, appointed by the Senate; two representatives from Student Affairs; a ^{W/O} student; and an academic dean (ex-designee), or associate dean designated by the Academic Vice President. a member of Central Administration; and a staff representative.~~

MPPA PROGRAM CHANGE PROPOSAL

PROGRAM RATIONALE

Policy studies developed as a separate academic field in the 1970s in response to the intense national focus on the public policy problems of the 1960s, the emergence of new analytical tools and interdisciplinary approaches for evaluating policies, and the growing attractiveness of government as an employer and research sponsor. The field links the concerns of public administration with the discipline of political science while incorporating the tools of quantitative and economic analysis. It is clearly an interdisciplinary field and, in addition to public administration, government, and economics, draws on psychology, sociology, anthropology, geography, history, criminal justice, social work, and other disciplines in its pursuits.

The growth and acceptance of the field is reflected in the number of new graduate programs that have been established at well-known universities (including Harvard, Stanford, Duke, Carnegie-Mellon, Johns Hopkins, Princeton, Texas, Michigan, Minnesota, and U. C. Berkeley); new policy journals (including the Journal of Policy Analysis and Management, Policy Studies Journal, Policy Studies Review, Policy Sciences, Public Choice, Evaluation Quarterly, and Policy and Politics); and new professional policy study organizations (including the Policy Studies Organization, the Association for Policy Sciences and Management, and the Public Choice Society).

It is clear that the policy studies field is growing and here to stay. However, just as the field is becoming established, CSUS has discontinued its Master's Program in Public Administration. This means that the only public university in California's capital will not have a graduate program dealing with public policy and administration. This situation seems inappropriate and has attracted the attention of public sector participants as well as observers within the CSU System. (See Appendix D for a brief history of CSUS developments.)

CATALOG COPY FOR THE M.A. PROGRAM IN PUBLIC POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The M.A. in Public Policy and Administration is an interdisciplinary program designed to equip its graduates with conceptual, analytic, and problem-solving skills and experiences enabling them to deal with public sector policy and administrative issues, problems, and opportunities. It is an expanding field of study in the United States that has resulted in the establishment of policy and administration academic programs at many well-known universities in the country.

The CSUS program differs from other similar programs in that its focus is on California state and local levels of government. This attractive feature is facilitated by the proximity of the CSUS campus to the main operations of the California state government. That proximity offers significant advantages to students in the program, providing them with a ready "laboratory" for observing the policy and administrative issues they will confront professionally and for gaining experience alongside existing practitioners in public policy and administration. In particular, the program's internship feature is greatly strengthened by the placements available in California state government, local government, and related organizations.

The core of the program consists of a set of seven courses from the disciplines of economics, government, and public administration. Following completion of the seven core courses, students choose a set of elective courses from a variety of academic departments in the University and undertake an internship.* The elective courses and the internship allow students to develop expertise in particular policy areas. Culmination of the program occurs with the completion of the Master's Project. Under the supervision of program core faculty members, students undertake projects involving the analysis of policy or administrative issues and prepare a significant written work.

Because the emphasis of the program is on broadly applicable conceptual, analytic, and problem-solving skills, supplemented by an emphasis on written and spoken communication skills, graduates will be well-qualified to pursue employment opportunities in a variety of public (and private) organizations. Students can specialize in particular policy areas through their choices of elective courses, internships, and policy analysis topics. This allows them to prepare for careers in specific areas or units of government.

The program's curricular design and scheduling of courses allow students to complete the program in four semesters if enrolled full-time. In addition, part-time students may complete the program under a five- or a six-semester

*Internships normally will be taken in summer session to allow interns more time and flexibility in completing their work experience.

schedule. Classes are scheduled in the late afternoon and evening hours to accommodate the scheduling interests of students who are employed in the daytime or who have other obligations that require evening schedules. Given the sequential structure of course work, students are admitted for the Fall Semester only.

For further information or to make an appointment for an interview with the Program Director, contact:

Director
M.A. Program in Public Policy and Administration
California State University
Sacramento, CA 95819

ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS

Admission to classified standing in the program requires:

- The baccalaureate degree.
- A GPA of 3.0 for all undergraduate coursework and in the last 60 units.
- Results of the Graduate Record Examination General Test.
- Completion of the following courses: Introduction to Statistics, Macro- and Microeconomic Principles, and Essentials of Government.
- A written statement of purpose. This statement shall be from one to two pages in length (typewritten) and shall address the applicant's purpose in pursuing the M.A. in Public Policy and Administration.
- A minimum score of 560 on the TOEFL. (This requirement applies only to students earning degrees abroad whose primary language is not English.)

A student with deficiencies in the above requirements may be admitted to the program on a conditionally classified status. Admission conditions will be determined on an individual basis.

ADMISSION PROCEDURES

Applications are accepted as long as there are places in the program. However, students are strongly urged to apply by April 1 for Fall admission in order to allow admission before the Computer-Assisted Registration deadline. All prospective students must file the following with the CSUS Admissions Office:

- An application for admission and a supplemental application for graduate admission (Forms A and B in the CSUS application booklet).
- Two sets of official transcripts from all colleges and universities attended, other than CSUS.
- Graduate Record Examinations General Test scores.
- The written statement of purpose.
- TOEFL score, if applicable.

ADVANCEMENT TO CANDIDACY

Each student must file an application for Advancement to Candidacy listing the student's program of graduate study. The filing procedure should begin as soon as the student has:

- Removed any deficiencies in admission requirements.
- Completed the following core courses in the program with a minimum grade of "B" in each: PPA 200, 205, 210, 220A, 220B, 230, and 240.
- Received approval from the Program Governance Committee of a written proposal for the student's PPA 502 project.

Advancement to Candidacy forms are available in the Graduate Studies Processing Center.

DEGREE REQUIREMENTS

The M.A. in Public Policy and Administration requires completion of a minimum of 39 units of coursework with a minimum 3.0 GPA.

Required Courses (24 - 27 Units)

- PPA 200 - Introduction to Public Policy and Administration (3 units)
- PPA 205 - Research in Public Policy and Administration (3 units)
- PPA 210 - Political Environment of Policy Making (3 units)
- PPA 220A - Applied Economic Analysis I (3 units)
- PPA 220B - Applied Economic Analysis II (3 units)
- PPA 230 - Public Budgeting and Finance (3 units)
- PPA 240 - Public Management and Administration (3 units)
- PPA 295 - Internship in Public Policy and Administration (3 or 6 units)

Electives (9-12 Units)

Students are expected to take elective coursework in an area of concentration. The areas of concentration available in the program are:

Health and Human Services	Criminal Justice Policy
Government Finance	Urban Policy
Intergovernmental Relations	Educational Policy
Organizational Theory and Behavior	Environmental Policy
Management Science	Advanced Economic Analysis

Coursework in each area of concentration shall be selected in consultation with, and with the approval of, a program advisor. In unusual circumstances, a student may receive approval for an area of concentration other than those listed above. Such approvals must be agreed upon by the Program Governance Committee. Lists of courses appropriate for the preceding areas of concentration may be obtained from a program advisor.

Culminating Requirement (3 Units)

Enrollment in PPA 502, Master's Project, is required of all students in their last semester of enrollment in the program. Each student will undertake a project dealing with a policy or administrative issue and complete a significant written work detailing the problem or issue examined, sources of information used in analyzing the issue, and project findings and conclusions.

COMPARATIVE DISPLAY OF DEGREE REQUIREMENTS
FOR PREVIOUS MPA PROGRAM AND PROPOSED MPPA PROGRAM

Public Administration

Core Requirements (15 units)

- MIS 206 - Managerial Statistical Analysis
- OBE 116 - Administrative Law
- OBE 193 - Intergovernmental Administration
- ACCY 201- Accounting
- MIS 205 - Introduction to Computer-Based Information Systems

Program Requirements (30 units)

Specific Courses:

- PA 209 - Survey of Public Administration
- PA 204 - Management and Organization Concepts
- PA 210 - Method and Research in Public Administration
- PA 211 - Public Policy Analysis
- PA 212 - Seminar in Public Finance and Budgeting
- PA 253 - Personnel Management
- PA 284 - Issues in Public Administration

Supervised Work Experience

- PA 295 - Public Administration Internship (3-6 units)

Electives (0-9 units)

Culminating Requirement (one of the following)

- PA 500 - Master's Thesis (3-4 units)
- PA 502 - Master's Project (2-3 units)
- Written Examination

TOTAL UNITS: 30-48

Public Policy and Administration

Core Course Requirements (24-27 units)

- PPA 200 - Introduction to Public Policy and Administration
- PPA 205 - Research in Public Policy and Administration
- PPA 210 - Political Environment of Policy Making

- PPA 220A - Applied Economic Analysis I

- PPA 220B - Applied Economic Analysis II

- PPA 230 - Public Budgeting

- PPA 240 - Public Management and Administration

- PPA 295 - Internship (3 or 6 units)

Elective Courses (9-12 units)

Culminating Requirement (3 units)

- PPA 500 - Master's Project

TOTAL UNITS: 39

BUDGET ANALYSIS: MPPA

1988-89

Faculty Coordinator .2

Clerical - 0.5 CA II

O.E. Support

S&S	4,800	-	4,000 brochures; design and print
	400	-	Misc. S&S
Travel	1,800	-	Student recruiting
Postage	700		
Phone	180		
Student Asst.	<u>800</u>		
Total Support	\$8,680		

	<u>1989-90</u>	<u>1990-91</u>	<u>1991-92</u>	<u>1992-93</u>
<u>Faculty</u>				
Teaching Positions	.9	1.0	1.0	1.2
Director (12 month)	.6	.4	.4	.4
Graduate Assistant	.5	.5	.5	.5
	<u>2.0</u>	<u>1.9</u>	<u>1.9</u>	<u>2.1</u>

Clerical - 0.5 CA II

Support Budget

Supplies - Brochure	4,500	3,500	3,500	3,500
Misc. S&S	1,000	1,000	1,100	1,100
Travel	2,500	2,000	2,000	2,000
Postage	850	850	850	850
Phone	500	500	500	500
Equipment	5,000	-0-	-0-	-0-
Student Assistant	<u>1,500</u>	<u>1,500</u>	<u>1,500</u>	<u>1,500</u>
Total Support Budget	15,850	9,350	9,450	9,450

PROPOSED AMENDMENT
EDCAPS PROPOSAL - JOINT DOCTORAL DEGREE NEGOTIATION
(P. 6 Research Facilities for Program)

attach F
pg. 6
Carriese.

Research facilities for this program would be as follows:

- The Library, CSU,S. The educational administration and education policy studies collections are viewed by the faculty as one of the finest in the state. Often doctoral candidates from other institutions of higher learning travel to Sacramento to utilize this excellent collection. Access to journal literature is achieved through subscriptions to the appropriate indexing and abstracting services including Educational Information Resources Center (ERIC) on laser disk. Online searching of ERIC is available upon request. Because of its organization, based on instructional program areas, the Library is uniquely prepared in its staffing to meet the needs of both students and faculty at the doctoral level. Librarians in the Education and Psychology Department are ready to provide expertise and assistance to assure that the Library will be in a good position to provide effective support for the research component of this proposed degree program. This would include a review of current and projected Library funding.
- William Knox Holt Library, University of the Pacific, Main campus. The collection for education and education administration is substantial and library services required to support graduate work in education are already in place.
- Other Research Centers. Doctoral candidates would have access to the significant collection of series, monographs and journal titles housed at the McGeorge School of Law Library, widely considered to be outstanding for northern California. Also available in the region is the State of California Library and State Archives, with its important collections of federal and state documents. Materials at libraries throughout the world can of course be obtained through the interlibrary loan process.