

**YOU'LL NEED YOUR APRIL 27 AGENDA WITH ATTACHMENTS!**

1988-89  
ACADEMIC SENATE  
California State University, Sacramento

**AGENDA**

Thursday, May 11, 1989  
2:30 p.m.  
Student Senate Chambers, University Union

**INFORMATION**

1. Moment of Silence:

JOHN D. MIZELLE  
Professor Emeritus, Biological Sciences  
1959-1973, CSUS

2. Status of administrative searches.

**CONSENT CALENDAR**

AS 89-51/Ex. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS

Research and Scholarly Activity Committee:  
ROSALIND VAN AUKER, Library, 1991 (repl. B. Palmer)

AS 89-52/Ex. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS (University)

Parking Task Force: CHARLOTTE COOK, Faculty Member  
PETER URONE, Faculty Member

University Committee for Persons with Disabilities:  
ELIZABETH STEVENSON, Instructional Faculty

AS 89-53/CC, Ex. COURSE DESCRIPTIONS, CATALOG COPY FOR

The Academic Senate recommends approval of the following  
"Guidelines for Catalog Course Descriptions":

**GUIDELINES FOR CATALOG COURSE DESCRIPTIONS**

Use the following criteria for course catalog descriptions.  
The descriptions should:

1. provide an overview of the course purpose in one or two brief sentences or phrases.
2. describe course content in specific terms; i.e., list the major course topics in brief phrases.

3. be approximately 40-80 words in length.
4. specifically state the number of units granted for the course and the number of lecture and/or laboratory hours per week. Courses which count for full time enrollment but not graduation should be identified as such. Courses that are graded Credit/No Credit should also be identified as such.
5. provide information on prerequisites, corequisites, etc. in a consistent order; e.g., prerequisites, corequisites, required concurrent enrollment, standard language for "corequisites." A suggested form is "Prerequisites: Math XX, YY and ZZ; concurrent enrollment in Math ZZZ permissible." Note: "corequisite" is not listed in many dictionaries.
6. explain enrollment restrictions such as class level requirements, course open to majors only or non-majors only, course not open to students who have completed a specific similar course, and instructor's permission in lieu of completion of a prerequisite being acceptable or unacceptable.
7. use some common wording for required concurrent enrollment. Suggested wording is: "concurrent enrollment in XX is required."
8. use a consistent style within programs; in particular, all course descriptions within a program should be complete sentences or not complete sentences, but not a mixture of both in any one description or within a given program's offerings.
9. include instructional method only if it is pertinent to the course or is unusual; e.g., a self-paced course in math.
10. include CAN (California Articulation Number) designation if applicable.
11. specifically include when the course is offered by indicating semester references for all courses. Include one of the following references: "offered every semester," "Fall only," "Spring only," or "not offered every semester."
12. omit ambiguous phrases such as "additional topics as time permits."

13. use standard abbreviations consistent with the class schedule for all subject designations; e.g., abbreviation "ECON 1A" should match the class schedule abbreviation.
14. not include any reference to G.E. categories; these designations appear in each semester's Class Schedule.

We suggest the following text sequence for catalog copy:

- Number
- Title
- Content Description
- Lecture and Lab Hours per Week
- Prerequisites and Concurrent Enrollment Requirements
- When offered
- Credit/No Credit
- Enrollment restrictions, if any
- Designation (when applicable) that course may be taken for workload credit toward full-time enrollment status, but is not applicable to the baccalaureate degree.
- Number of Units

#### CONSENT--INFORMATION

##### AS 89-46/Ex. TEACHER/SCHOLAR: SUMMER INSTITUTE FOR CSU FACULTY

The Executive Committee, on behalf of the Academic Senate, recommends that the Faculty Professional Development Committee review the applications and make recommendations to the Campus Coordinator on faculty to attend the June 12-16, 1989, Teacher/Scholar: Summer Institute for CSU Faculty.

##### AS 89-47/Ex. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS (University)

The Executive Committee, on behalf of the Academic Senate, recommends the following faculty members be appointed to serve on the Search Committee for the Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs:

GEORGE CRAFT, History  
SCOTT FARRAND, Mathematics  
ANN HARRIMAN, Organizational Behavior and Environment  
ANNE-LOUISE RADIMSKY, Computer Science

#### REGULAR AGENDA

##### AS 89-50/Flr. MINUTES

Approval of Minutes of the regular meeting of March 9, 1989, and the special meeting of March 16, 1989.

*Carried*

AS 89-36/UARTP, Ex. UNIVERSITY ARTP POLICY--AMEND SECTION 5.05.B (Criteria for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion)

[Refer to April 27 Agenda.]

*Carried*

AS 89-37A/Ex. UNIVERSITY ARTP POLICY--AMEND SECTION 5.05.B (Criteria for Retention, Tenure and Promotion) [substitute motion for AS 89-37 below]

[Refer to April 27 Agenda.]

*VOID*

~~AS 89-37/UARTP UNIVERSITY ARTP POLICY--AMEND SECTION 5.05.B (Criteria for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion)~~

[Refer to April 27 Agenda.]

*Carried*

AS 89-38/AP, Ex. DISCIPLINARY ACTION NOTATION POLICY

[Refer to April 27 Agenda.]

*Carried*

AS 89-31/CC, GPPC, Ex./Flr UNIVERSITY PROGRAMS, FUNDING CRITERIA FOR, AND DEFINITION OF TERMS USED IN FUNDING OF ACADEMIC AND ACADEMICALLY RELATED PROGRAMS

The Academic Senate endorses the "Proposed Funding Criteria for University Programs", the "Recommended Definitions of Terms To Be Used in the Funding of Academic and Academically Related Programs," and the "Guidelines for Funding Academic and University Planning and amended by the Curriculum Committee and the Graduate Policies and Programs Committee, as shown in Attachment A (this is a revision of Attachment C of the 4/13/89 Senate Agenda).

*Carried*

AS 89-44/Ex. NAMING OF CAMPUS FACILITIES (Supercedes AS 69-193)

[Refer to April 27 Agenda, Attachment F.]

*VOID*

AS 89-48/Flr. SENATE BILL 510 ("Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations: Organizational Security")

[Refer to April 27 Agenda, Attachment B.]

*Refer to FIS Affrs*

AS 89-49/Flr. FACULTY ALLOCATION MODEL (AS 88-103), RECONSIDERATION OF

[Refer to PM 88-10, Attachment B]

*Carried*

AS 89-54/RSAC PRESIDENT'S AWARD FOR SCHOLARLY ACHIEVEMENT

*y=14  
n=11*

[The Executive Committee forwards this action item to the Senate with a "No Pass" recommendation.]

The Academic Senate recommends the establishment of a President's Award for Scholarly Achievement, as follows:

The purpose of this award is to recognize and honor one faculty member each fall for significant contributions in research or creative activity made within the previous one to three years. In addition to the recipient of the award, up to two faculty members may also be awarded Honorable Mention. Unlike the Outstanding Scholar awards, which tend to be given for the accumulated contributions of a lengthy career, the emphasis here is on work done within a short time span--by either new or veteran faculty members.

The recipient of the award shall present a lecture which will allow both public recognition of distinguished work and the opportunity for fruitful exchange of ideas among peers.

Nominations may be made to the Office of Research and Sponsored Projects, either by the individual or by a colleague, and should take the form of a letter describing in detail the candidate's recent accomplishments and offering any other pertinent information. The Committee for Research and Scholarly Activity will then select the recipient on the basis of the letter of nomination, the record of accomplishment, and any supporting materials that have been supplied. Supporting materials (copies of books, articles, etc.) for candidates who become finalists will be requested by the Committee if none have been forwarded. Evidence of excellence will include such factors as dissemination in refereed forums, or evidence of broad (national, international) recognition among knowledgeable peers--supplied, for instance, in the letters of recommendation.

*Carried*

AS 89-55/AP, Ex. DISRUPTIVE STUDENTS POLICY

The Academic Senate recommends adoption of the following policy statement "Dealing with Incidents of Disruptive Student Behavior in the Classroom":

DEALING WITH INCIDENTS OF  
DISRUPTIVE STUDENT BEHAVIOR IN THE CLASSROOM

I. Preamble.

This document is intended to help <sup>as</sup> ensure each student and course instructor at CSUS that the classroom environment is

*X*

supportive of teaching and learning by providing procedures for dealing with the problem of the student who is perceived to be disruptive in the classroom. The document is also intended to provide due process in the treatment of the student who is involved in an incident of disruptive behavior in the classroom. Should any provision of the policy appear to be in conflict with existing legal statutes or administrative regulations or should the policy be silent on an issue, those statutes and regulations shall govern.

II. Definition.

A disruptive student is a student who engages in behavior in the classroom that interferes with the process of teaching and learning.

III. Procedure for Dealing with Incidents of Disruptive Behavior.

- A. Any student whose classroom behavior is judged by the instructor to be disruptive shall be informed by the instructor that his/her actions are disruptive. The instructor shall explain how the behavior disrupts the teaching/learning process, inform the student that if the behavior continues it will be reported to the Campus Student Discipline Coordinator, and request that the student cease the behavior. This explanation and request may take place in the classroom at the time of the behavior or at another time and place deemed appropriate by the instructor (e.g., during office hours).
- B. A student may be dismissed by the instructor from any class period in which disruptive behavior persists following the instructor's request that it cease. Attendance at subsequent class periods is allowed unless the disruptive behavior continues. If the student refuses a request by the instructor to leave the classroom following persistent disruptive behavior, the University Police should be called.
- C. If, at anytime, the instructor believes the student poses a physical threat to him/her or to other students, the University Police should be called.
- D. If a student's disruptive behavior continues following the request that it cease, the instructor shall refer the case to the Campus Student Discipline Coordinator for handling. The Coordinator will deal with the case according to established student discipline procedures. Disenrollment from the class is a discipline sanction that may be used.

- E. A student involved in an incident of disruptive behavior who believes he/she has been improperly treated may seek relief through established department, school, and university student grievance procedures.
- F. If a course instructor is unsatisfied at any point in the handling of an incident of disruptive behavior prior to its final resolution, he/she should contact the Campus Student Discipline Coordinator to discuss the matter.
- G. If the final resolution of the incident is unsatisfactory to the instructor, he/she may request an administrative review by the Dean of Students and the dean of the instructor's school. If agreement between the deans cannot be reached, the matter shall be referred to the Vice President for Academic Affairs for resolution.

*Dejected*

AS 89-56/GPPC, Ex. MASTER'S DEGREE, TIME LIMIT FOR COMPLETION OF

*y=10  
n=11*

The Academic Senate recommends that exceptions to the seven-year limit for completion of a master's degree be permitted to allow departments to establish five- or six-year limits. Requests for exceptions shall be submitted on a Program Change Proposal reviewed through the normal procedures for review of program changes.

The Academic Senate further recommends that in cases where departments have established a special time limit students be allowed to apply for extensions beyond the special time limit as long as the time period for completion does not exceed seven years. Mechanisms for reviewing and approving such extensions shall be developed within the department.

*Carved*

AS 89-57/GPPC, Ex. NINE-UNIT CORE

The Academic Senate recommends that the following be added (underlined portion) to the CSUS "Policy and Procedures for Initiation, Modification, Review and Approval of Courses and Academic Programs," page 17, regarding the nine-unit core:

"Undergraduate degree programs are expected to include at least five courses with no fewer than fifteen units that are common to the degree program. Graduate degree programs are expected to include at least three courses with no fewer than nine units, excluding independent study, field work, and the culminating experience, that are common to the degree programs. Exceptions to this nine-unit core requirement will be considered on a program by program basis. In no case shall a department have less than six units of core requirements.

*delete  
① maintain  
② Hall  
Agreed*

RECOMMENDED DEFINITIONS OF TERMS  
TO BE USED IN THE FUNDING OF ACADEMIC AND ACADEMICALLY RELATED PROGRAMS

Program Centers are a collection of campus academic or administrative units that have been combined for the purpose of planning and resource allocation. Each Program Center has a chief administrative officer that heads the unit. For example: School of Arts and Sciences, Division of Student Affairs, the Library.

University Centers and Institutes (title used interchangeably on CSUS campus) are those entities or units created within the University to administer one or more activity which is related directly to the academic mission of the University, such as

- 1) enhance the conduct of faculty research and scholarship;
- 2) promote the instructional programs of the university;
- 3) enhance the university's ability to obtain external funding;
- 4) provide for and coordinate public service programs.

Instructional programs are not normally offered by a center although the activities of a center may be related to a department's or school's instructional program. For example: Center for California Studies, Critical Thinking Resource Center, Real Estate and Land Use Institute.

Academic Departments/Units are those entities or units created within a School and organized around one or more related disciplines to administer academic programs. For example: Dept. Anthropology, Environmental Studies.

Academic Programs are courses of study leading to a specific educational or academic objective, e.g., a credential or certificate, a major, a minor, or a degree program. Academic Programs may be either disciplinary or interdisciplinary in nature.

Interdisciplinary Academic School Programs are developed by the faculty of more than one academic department/unit within a School and administered by that School. For example: Interior Design Major, Film Studies Minor, BA Degree Government/Journalism.



Interdisciplinary Academic Inter-School Programs are developed by the faculty of more than one School and administered through a School designated by the Vice President for Academic Affairs. For example: Women's Studies Minor, Gerontology Certificate, MA Degree in International Affairs.

Academically Related Programs are programs, including Centers and Institutes, that encourage or support scholarly and creative activities, promote student development, provide professional or community services, or otherwise support, but do not offer, academic programs.

Academically Related School Programs are those that are tied in a substantial way to one or more academic programs within a School. Such School programs are developed and administered by the faculty and staff within a single school. For example: English Tutoring Center, Center for Small Business, Achievement Institute, Polymer Research Institute.

Academically Related Inter-School Programs are those academically related programs that are tied in a substantial way to academic programs in two or more Schools, but whose jurisdictional interests are contained within the sponsoring Schools. Inter-School Programs may be developed and staffed by individuals from a number of Program Centers, but are administered through a School designated by the Vice President. For example: Accelerated College Entrance Center, Assistive Device Center, Gerontology Center.

University Programs are those academically-related programs that:

(a) transcend the jurisdictional interests of, or generate benefits which go significantly beyond, any single Program Center; (b) are tied in significant and broad ways to the overall mission and goals of the University; and (c) promote the instructional mission of the University through faculty and student research and scholarship and/or public service.

This definition may apply to some Centers and Institutes, established through existing University procedures (PM 87-04), as well as other academically related programs and activities that are not established Centers and Institutes.

**GUIDELINES FOR FUNDING ACADEMIC AND ACADEMICALLY RELATED PROGRAMS**

- I. Centers and Institutes may receive for up to three years support from University-wide resources to help establish their activities and functions. After the start-up period, Centers and Institutes are expected to be self supporting.\* However, if Program Centers wish to help support these entities after University funding has expired, Program Centers may do so out of their own budgets. In determining what support, if any, is appropriate, Program Centers may consider how central the Center's or Institute's activities are to the mission and goals of the Program Center, and how these activities rank among its other program priorities.
- II. Academic Programs, including Interdisciplinary Programs, are to receive funding through the Program Center that administers them.
- III. Academically Related School Programs, including Inter-School Programs, are to receive funding, if any, through the Program Center that administers them, unless they meet the conditions of a University Program.
- IV. University Programs must satisfy all of the following conditions:

A. Definition of Programs

1. Transcend the jurisdictional interests of, or generate benefits which go significantly beyond, any single Program Center; and/or
2. are tied in significant and broad ways to the overall mission and goals of the University, and/or
3. promote the instructional mission of the University through faculty and student research and scholarship and/or public service.

*(1) Jarran  
(2) Maste  
agree*

This definition may apply to some Centers and Institutes, established through existing University procedures (PM 87-04), as well as other academically related programs and activities that are not established Centers and Institutes.

- B. The program must fulfill reporting and review requirements specified by PM 87-04, in cases of Centers and Institutes, and, in the case of other programs which are not established Centers or Institutes, must submit annual reports of activities, expenditures, and progress toward meeting goals and objectives.
- C. An annual budget request must be submitted through the Program Center that has been designated by the Vice President for Academic Affairs as the lead administrative unit for the program.

\*Exception to the rule is noted in Guideline IV.

### Priority for Funding University Programs

The selection of University Programs for funding will be made within available resources, according to the approved University budget process. In establishing priorities among programs which meet the eligibility criteria stated above, the following factors will be considered:

1. The degree to which the program speaks to one or more of the University's goals and objectives, and the breadth of its potential impact on the University community and the region;
2. Demonstration of distinction, or its potential, in either (1) scholarship, research, or creative activity, or (2) university or community service;

In addition to the above factors, continuing university programs must also provide information regarding the following:

3. Demonstration of significant achievements in fulfilling its stated goals and objectives;
4. Evidence that the program is administered efficiently;
5. Evidence that previously-allocated University funds have been spent effectively (if applicable) and that the budget proposal reflects real needs.

Endorsed by Academic Senate Curriculum and Graduate Policies and Programs Committees: February 27, 1989, as an amendment to the statement approved by URPC: March 25, 1988

FACULTY ALLOCATION PROCESS  
October 17, 1988

PRINCIPLES OF A FACULTY ALLOCATION PROCESS

1. The instructional program should be the highest priority in the allocation of faculty resources.
2. The faculty allocation process should be based upon accepted workload factors, and agreed-upon data sources that measure those factors.
3. Academically related programs and activities may be supported with faculty resources, consistent with approved University plans, but only to an extent that does not threaten the quality of instructional programs or the meeting of campus FTE targets.
4. The process should provide appropriate initial funding as recommended through the consultative process for approved new programs, after which funding will come from within the school's base allocation.
5. The process should consider mode and level and student/faculty ratios as reasonable indicators of comparative school needs, once anomalies inherent in the formula are adjusted for.
6. The process should provide for equitable adjustments for factors that prevent schools from using their faculty resources as efficiently as would otherwise be possible, when such factors are beyond the control of schools.
7. The process should provide an incentive for schools to manage their faculty resources as efficiently as possible; this allows schools to retain positions conserved through scheduling, provided FTE targets are met and curricular integrity is preserved.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED FACULTY ALLOCATION MODEL

There are five steps to the proposed faculty allocation process:

1. Set the Parameters by Determining Uses of Faculty Positions in Current Year and Those Available for Next Fiscal Year  
This step includes determining the use of all faculty positions in the current year. This includes the distribution of faculty among

the Schools, and other set aside positions such as those used for instructionally related activities, salary savings, University reserve. In addition, the faculty positions that are required to fund new academic programs approved for implementation during the next fiscal year, and the positions required to support approved program coordination will be calculated and listed along with the current year's usage. Finally, the positions available for the next fiscal year will be listed.

In order to provide a starting point for examining the instructional faculty allocations for the next fiscal year, it is assumed that the number of positions for the above purposes will be the same as in the current fiscal year, plus those needed to fund approved new programs and approved program coordination. This is merely an assumption to allow us to proceed to examine the highest priority--Instruction. After the next three steps are taken, which all involve the need for instructional faculty, the "set aside" allocations can be finalized in light of the needs of the instructional program.

2. Adjust for Anomalies in Mode and Level Formula

The mode and level formula which generates faculty positions to the University produces a student/faculty ratio which can be calculated for each school. In general, this ratio provides a reasonable basis for comparing the relative needs of the schools for instructional faculty. However, a few anomalies in the formula distort the ratios in some cases. For example, some supervisory courses generate more or less faculty resources than are typically used to support supervision. The Vice President for Academic Affairs, in consultation with school deans, will designate adjustments, up or down, in school faculty allocations to take account of these anomalies.

3. Adjust for Special Instructional Needs

The previous step adjusts for factors inherent in the mode and level formula that cause those student/faculty ratios to be unreasonable. This step adjusts for those factors inherent in the structure of the University which prevent the mode and level SFRS, however reasonable, from being implemented. There are at least four such factors which cause faculty resource requirements to differ significantly from mode and level generation:

- a. departments with more tenure track faculty than the number of base instructional positions their enrollments generate under the allocation model;
- b. part-time faculty salaries which exceed the salary dollars available from vacant positions;

augment some of the special University programs that are funded from "set aside" faculty positions, then those allocations could be increased accordingly.

#### ADVANTAGES OF THE PROPOSED FACULTY ALLOCATION MODEL

1. The model is fair, in that after making adjustments for agreed-upon factors which affect faculty workload, all schools receive an equal percentage of their mode and level student/faculty ratios (i.e. an equal percentage of the positions they generate to the University). In addition, factors which fall unequally among the schools (e.g. facility constraints) will be shared equally under the proposed model.
2. Schools will know in advance how allocations are being determined and what factors are to be considered relevant to the decision.
3. The trade-off between instruction and the "set aside" uses of faculty resources can be demonstrated and will therefore be easier to evaluate than under the current process. For example, a proposal to allocate an additional 20 positions for faculty development would, under the previous example, reduce the base instructional faculty position pool to 899.4 and reduce the percentage of mode and level that could be funded from 89 percent to 86.6 percent. For a school that was to receive 100 positions, this would mean a loss of 3 positions. By providing the means to make such comparisons, the proposed model will foster more informed decision-making.

c. faculty constraints which artificially limit the size of courses and cause additional sections to be needed;

d. course and programmatic factors which cause course enrollments to be considerably below or above those indicated by the funding formulas.

Based upon acceptable justification provided by school deans and the Vice President for Academic Affairs, adjustments in school faculty allocations will be made to take account of these factors. Such adjustments will provide only partial compensation for identified factors, in order to give schools the incentive to solve these problems internally.

#### 4. Calculate Base Instructional Allocation

After the first three steps have been taken, the majority of faculty positions will remain to be allocated. These positions will be allocated to schools as an equal percentage of their mode and level student/faculty ratios, using information from the prior academic year. For example, in 1988/89 the University will receive 1,019.4 instructional faculty positions for a budgeted FTE of 18,250, i.e. our mode and level student/faculty ratio Universitywide is 17.9. If we set 90 positions aside for instructionally related uses and allocate 10 to adjust for mode and level anomalies and special instructional needs, we are left with 919.4 positions for the base instructional allocation. This equates to an SFR of 19.85, which is 11 percent higher than our budgeted SFR. These 919.4 positions, then, are enough to make base instructional allocations to each school using an SFR that is 11 percent above each school's mode and level SFR. Put in another way, we can allocate each school 89 percent of the faculty positions its enrollment generates.

#### 5. Reexamine "Set Aside" Allocations in Light of Instructional Allocations

The highest priority for the use of faculty positions is instruction. The proposed model starts by assuming that a number of positions will be set aside for instructionally related uses in order to provide a starting point for examining the adequacy of the instructional faculty allocations. After the instructional faculty allocations have been determined, pursuant to steps 2, 3, and 4, as described above, the "set aside" positions can be finalized. If it appears that maintaining "set aside" allocations at the current-year level will threaten the instructional program or the meeting of FTE targets, then the "set aside" allocations will be revisited and reduced accordingly. If, on the other hand, the instructional program can "afford" to transfer some positions to