

- YOU'LL NEED TO BRING: • MARCH 14 AGENDA
• POLICY ISSUES HANDOUT*
• MARCH 11 MEMORANDUM TO M. BURGER*

*(distributed under separate cover to Senators absent on 3/14)

1990-91
ACADEMIC SENATE
California State University, Sacramento

AGENDA

Thursday, March 21, 1991

2:30 - 4:30 p.m.

Forest Suite, University Union

INFORMATION

1. Spring 1991 Academic Senate Meetings (Tentative Schedule)
Thursdays, 2:30-4:30 p.m.
Forest Suite, University Union (unless noted otherwise)
April 4 CLS 1003 (General Education)
April 11
April 25
May 2
2:30-3:00, '91-92 Nominations
3:00-4:30, '90-91 Senate
May 9
May 16
2:30-3:00, '91-92 Elections
3:00-4:30, '90-91 Senate
2. 1991-92 Budget Update

REGULAR AGENDA

AS 91-16/Flr. INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM PRIORITIES--GUIDELINES FOR
ACADEMIC PLANNING, RESOURCE ALLOCATION, AND
ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT [Responds to AS 90-104]

[Refer to Attachments A-C, March 14 Academic Senate Agenda.]

The Academic Senate recommends adoption of a policy on
"Instructional Program Priorities--Guidelines for Academic
Planning, Resource Allocation, and Enrollment Management" as
proposed by the ad hoc Committee on Resource Allocation Issues
(Attachment C, March 14, 1991, Academic Senate Agenda).

AS 91-19/Flr. 1991-92 COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

The Academic Senate elects school representatives to the
1991-92 Committee on Committees, as follows: [See Attachment
for eligibility by school]

AS 91-20/Flr. GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH AND SPONSORED PROJECTS, PROGRAMS AND FUNCTIONS OF OFFICES OF-- REPORTS OF GRADUATE POLICIES AND PROGRAMS COMMITTEE, FACULTY PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE, RESEARCH AND CREATIVE COMMITTEE, AND AD HOC COMMITTEE ON FACULTY SCHOLARSHIP (Responds to AS 91-11)

[Note: Bring your copy of the reports distributed at the March 14th Senate meeting (copies distributed to absent members under separate cover.)]

The Academic Senate receives the reports submitted by the Graduate Policies and Programs Committee, Faculty Professional Development Committee, Research and Creative Activity Committee, and the ad hoc Committee on Faculty Scholarship, in response to the Senate's request (AS 91-11, adopted February 21, 1991), regarding the proposed consolidation of the offices of Graduate Studies and Research and Sponsored Projects.

AS 91-15(1) INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM PRIORITIES--GUIDELINES FOR ACADEMIC PLANNING, RESOURCE ALLOCATION, AND ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT [Responds to AS 90-104]

[Refer to Attachments A-C, March 14 Academic Senate Agenda.]

The Academic Senate recommends adoption of a policy on "Instructional Program Priorities--Guidelines for Academic Planning, Resource Allocation, and Enrollment Management" as proposed by the ad hoc Committee on Resource Allocation Issues (Attachment C, March 14, 1991, Academic Senate Agenda).

AS 91-15(1) 1991-92 COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

The Academic Senate elects school representatives to the 1991-92 Committee on Committees, as follows: [See Attachment for eligibility by school]

From Senate Bylaws:

B. Committee on Committees

1. **Membership:** The Committee on Committees shall be composed of the Chair and Vice Chair of the Academic Senate, the other five (5) voting members of the Executive Committee, the senior representative to the Senate from the Library electing unit, the senior representative to the Senate from the Student Services electing unit, and one representative from an electing unit within each school elected by the incumbent Senate.
2. **Nomination and election of school representatives:** At one of its meetings, the Academic Senate shall nominate and elect by secret ballot the representative of each of the five (5) schools to the Committee on Committees. Nominations shall be made from the floor; nomination of oneself shall be permitted. No one who is not then a representative of an electing unit from within one of the schools shall be eligible to be nominated to be the representative of that school. Every representative may vote for one nominee from every school. If none of the candidates from a school receives a majority of the votes cast, the Academic Senate shall immediately decide by secret ballot which of the two candidates who have received the most votes shall become the school's representative. As between the two candidates, the candidate who receives the most votes shall be elected.
3. **Meetings:** Each spring the Chair of the Academic Senate shall convene an initial meeting of the Committee on Committees. At a subsequent meeting, the Committee on Committees shall nominate to the Senate candidates to be appointed members of the standing committees of the Senate to serve during the following academic year.
4. **Charge:** Having considered the results of an annual survey of the faculty interest in serving on any one or more of appointed standing committees, the Committee on Committees shall make a recommendation to the Senate specifying who the members of the Senate's standing committees shall be during the following academic year. Between the annual deliberations of the Committee on Committees, the Executive Committee shall nominate candidates to fill the vacancies that occur in the membership of the standing committees.

1991-92 COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

Committee Meeting Schedule:

- #1: Tuesday, April 9, 2:30-4:30 p.m., Adm. 275
- #2: Tuesday, April 23, 2:30-4:30 p.m., Adm. 275

Committee Members:

- | | |
|-----------------|--------------------------------------|
| Juanita Barrera | Chair, Academic Senate |
| Charlotte Cook | Vice Chair, Academic Senate |
| Bob Curry | Member, Executive Committee |
| Ann Harriman | Member, Executive Committee |
| Sue Holl | Member, Executive Committee |
| Sylvia Navari | Member, Executive Committee |
| Gary Shannon | Member, Executive Committee |
| John McClure | Library Senator |
| Fran Toder | Senior Student Services Senator |
| PLUS: | One Senator elected from each school |

Eligible School of Arts and Sciences Senators

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Gwen Amos | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> David Martin |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Huguetta Bach | <input type="checkbox"/> Christine Miller |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Gene Barnes | <input type="checkbox"/> Jack Mrowka |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Joan Bauerly | <input type="checkbox"/> Wayne Muller |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Tammy Bourg | <input type="checkbox"/> Linda Palmer |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Jack Brackmann | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tom Pyne |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Diane Carlson | <input type="checkbox"/> Ane Quade |
| * <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dan Decious | <input type="checkbox"/> Janelle Reinelt |
| * <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Marjorie Gelus | <input type="checkbox"/> Stela Serrano |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ben Glovinsky | <input type="checkbox"/> Richard Shek |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bethania Gonzalez | <input type="checkbox"/> Worth Summers |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Shotaro Hayashigatani | <input type="checkbox"/> Jerry Tobey |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Dennis Huff | <input type="checkbox"/> Nancy Tooker |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Dick Kornweibel | <input type="checkbox"/> Valerie Wheeler |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Jo Lonam | <input type="checkbox"/> Lita Whitesel |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Angus Wright |

Eligible School of Business Administration Senators

- | | |
|--|---|
| * <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ray Brown | <input type="checkbox"/> Kenneth Pacholke |
| * <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Art Jensen | <input type="checkbox"/> William Schuster |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Malcolm White |

Eligible School of Education Senators

- | | |
|---|---|
| * <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Shel Weissman | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Marilyn Winters |
|---|---|

Eligible School of Engineering and Computer Science Senators

- | | |
|--|---|
| * <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Joan Al-Kazily | <input type="checkbox"/> William Mitchell |
| * <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Steven de Haas | <input type="checkbox"/> Don Steward |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Salah Yousif |

Eligible School of Health and Human Services Senators

- | | |
|---|---|
| * <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Eddie Cajucom | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> James Hernandez |
| * <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lynn Cooper | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> John Maxwell |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Louis Elfenbaum | <input type="checkbox"/> Susan Meier |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Suzanne Sutherland |

* elected

California State University, Sacramento
 6000 J Street
 Sacramento, California 95819

MEMORANDUM

MAR 20 1991

TO: Academic Senate
 Campus Community

Academic Senate Review
 413

DATE: March 20, 1991

FROM: Duane Campbell, Professor of Education
 for Bilingual Faculty, Education

SUBJECT: Remedial Education in
 Instruction Program Priorities

We strongly dissent from the position on remedial education articulated in the document *Instructional Program Priorities*. We hear faculty discussions of responding to the financial crisis by transferring "remedial" courses presently taught at CSUS to the community colleges. This position is poorly informed, based upon intellectual fallacies and anti-democratic. It should be rejected by the Academic Senate.

In support of this position, we offer the following. We exist within a class-stratified system established by the California Master Plan for Higher Education. Between the U.C., CSU, and Community College systems, students receive differences in allocations of monies. Some community college courses may offer superior instruction, but the suggested transferring of remedial instruction to the community colleges and reducing our emphasis in remedial instruction is not an appropriate response.

Our society's class-stratified system is inevitably a racially-stratified system. To reduce allocation priority for special preparation programs (i.e., MEP, CAMP, EOP, etc.) will result in transferring more minority students to the community colleges. The substantial negative effects of community college tracking are well documented in *The Diverted Dream* by Brint and Karabel (1989).

The University, because it is publicly funded, has an obligation to promote democracy. Several of the mission statements for the University are directly related to our role in preparing citizens for a democratic society. All of the people of the state pay taxes to fund the University. African American, Latino, and Native American parents are not excused when their taxes are collected even though their children do not enjoy equal access to the publicly-funded universities. In pursuit of our mission, we should reject the arguments for low priority for remedial instruction which will transfer remedial students to the community colleges.

The stratification of our systems are not neutral. Sending students to the community colleges in search of remedial programs fosters saving funds at the University for European Americans at the expense of African American, Latino and Asian students sent to the community colleges. This is patently unacceptable. The community colleges face a budget shortfall similar to our own. Seeking to send our burden to the community colleges is dereliction of our responsibility to building a democratic community.

The document, *Instructional Program Priorities*, uses an extended quote from the *Master Plan Renewed* to argue for more emphasis on remedial work at the community colleges. Please note that all legislation implementing the *Master Plan* was vetoed by the Governor. We believe that the position taken, the basic assumptions for the priorities, has no force of law. The document submitted to the Academic Senate implies otherwise.

For our University to be a community of scholars, we need a broader diversity of representation, not increased segregation. Several of the high priority programs of our University require an integrated student and faculty community. We literally cannot adequately prepare teachers, nurses, social workers, police officers, nor an intelligent citizenry for California's future in a segregated environment. The access programs we presently have are essential components of bringing a diverse and relatively more representative student population to the campus.

Many of the judgements presently made about "remedial" coursework are inadequate. For example, the Math Department makes judgements about who shall be admitted to liberal studies courses based upon passing or not passing a course with a class size of 300. This is a measure of class size, not student competence.

Often a student may need a remedial course in one subject, but is well prepared in others. For example, some students may

*Campbell
 Withdrawn
 Never distributed*

need a remedial course in English writing; at the same time, the students are bilingual or trilingual. They are prepared to study a number of subjects offered only at the University. To reduce the level of priority for remedial work now would exclude these students from the University.

The table used to support decisions about remedial words contained in the Appendix is based upon one position paper used in the debate on the *Master Plan*. Again, the table has no status in law. It ignores the major problems of community colleges as documented in *The Diverted Dream*. We should not vote to accept such far-reaching definitions of remedial work.

The use of measures by math and English to assess a need for remedial instruction reflect the error of using one standard measure of competence. For example, often Vietnamese immigrant students are quite proficient in math, but need work in English. The Math Department regards them as prepared, but the English Department may regard them as remedial.

If we were to use the measure of being able to read, write and speak in at least two major languages, the Vietnamese students would be capable, while many of the faculty in the Math and English departments would be accurately described as remedial. A similar experience occurs with many Spanish-speaking immigrant students. They are rated as remedial by one fixed standard while ignoring their strengths.

The use of one fixed standard, the assumption behind the arguments for a low priority for remedial work, is outdated. Modern psychology, anthropology, and education have moved beyond the use of a fixed, static measure of competence. These disciplines now use a more comprehensive, multifaceted definition of learning. Student learning is inadequately conceptualized when considered as a fixed, static phenomena. We could, for example, argue that all of the social science, humanities and other majors are remedial in math. They simply select a major that does not require advanced math preparation.

It is inappropriate for persons in one discipline, such as math or English composition, to be judging the capabilities of students from other disciplines. It is inappropriate for limited monolingual measures to be used with bilingual and trilingual students. It is arrogant and anti-democratic for persons who read, write and speak only one language fluently, to be judging bilingual and trilingual students based upon narrow, fixed, English-only measures.

The faculty of Bilingual Education are preparing a more detailed, data-based refutation of the arguments made in the document, *Instructional Program Priorities*. It would be a serious disservice to the University community to accept this document and the substantial re-ordering of University priorities without substantial further analysis and debate.

DC/trs

Jan

Policy Issues for discussion of
INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM PRIORITIES--GUIDELINES FOR ACADEMIC
PLANNING, RESOURCE ALLOCATION, AND ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT

Policy Issue:

#1

"At California State University, Sacramento, courses and programs that directly support and lead to the baccalaureate or master's degree in the liberal arts and sciences and professional fields, or the post baccalaureate credential in fields of Education, shall have funding priority over courses and programs that are peripheral to these purposes." (Section II, page 2, lines 20-25)

Under this definition, the following categories of programs are proposed as high priority programs:

- undergraduate major programs
- master's degree and post-baccalaureate credential (i.e., education credential) programs
- service courses that support degree/credential programs
- testing/remediation programs related to G.E. quantitative reasoning and writing requirements
- the General Education Program.

The following categories of programs are proposed as low priority programs (in relation to the above):

- minors (with qualifications)
- certificate programs
- non-critical elective courses
- centers and institutes
- inservice courses
- athletics.

Debate questions:

1. Does the Senate agree, generally, with the policy statement proposed?
2. Should any of the proposed high priority program categories be moved to the low priority category?
3. Should any of the proposed low priority programs categories be moved to the high priority category?
4. No rank order for program categories within the High priority and Low Priority program groups has been proposed. Should a rank order be recommended?

Policy Issue: Undergraduate/Graduate Mix

#2

1. "CSUS is equally responsible for offering graduate and undergraduate instruction." (Section III, page 3, lines 7-8)
2. "CSUS shall attempt to maintain graduate enrollments of at least 20% of total headcount enrollment." (Section III, page 3, lines 9-11)
3. "The proportion of graduate enrollment may be increased above this level (20%)...but shall not exceed 1/3 of total University headcount enrollment." (Section III, page 3, lines 11-15)

Debate Questions:

1. Does the Senate agree, generally, with policy statement #1 above (Note: the policy statement does not preclude the establishment of enrollment limits) or does the Senate consider graduate or undergraduate programs as being a greater responsibility?
2. Should specific enrollment targets (undergraduate/graduate student mix) be established?
3. Are the minimum and maximum enrollment targets recommended appropriate?

Policy Issue:

#3

"CSUS shall, at a minimum, maintain a lower division headcount enrollment of at least 25% of total undergraduate enrollment, and shall set as a long-term goal the achievement of a proportion of lower division headcount enrollment that equals at least 1/3, but no more than 40% of total undergraduate enrollment." (Section III, page 4, lines 3-8)

Debate Questions:

1. Does the Senate agree, generally, that lower division curricula and lower division student enrollment should be maintained at a specified level, or does the Senate wish to recommend that admission priority be given to upper division students to meet enrollment demand?
2. If the Senate agrees that lower division enrollments should be maintained, is the lower recommended appropriate?
3. Should the Senate recommend establishing the long-term goal of increasing lower division enrollment to at least 1/3, but no more than 40% [Note: an alternate would be to make a

recommendation similar to the one proposed for graduate enrollment {i.e., the proportion of lower division enrollment may be increased above this level (25%) but shall not exceed 40% of total undergraduate enrollment}}?

Policy Issue:

#4

"CSUS shall implement fully systemwide policies pertaining to transfers that currently require that transfer students who were not freshman eligible complete the requisite number of units and G.E. requirements in writing and quantitative reasoning, and which, effective Fall 1991, shall require completion of the transfer curriculum." (Section III, page 4, line 10-16)

Debate Question:

Is the proposed policy reasonable or should we allow students to transfer without meeting these requirements?

Policy Issue:

#5

"Undergraduate enrollment shall be limited by the University's ability to provide a general education program that allows students to complete the degree program in a timely manner. Since total undergraduate enrollment may be limited, priorities must be established within the undergraduate major program category to ensure an appropriate balance and mix of major programs." (Section III, page 4, lines 28-34)

Debate Issues:

1. The above policy statement essentially assigns equal priority to undergraduate major programs and the G.E. program. Is this appropriate?
2. If admissions are limited, should admissions to major programs be "controlled"?

[Note: Criteria for determining priorities are addressed under Policy Issue #7.]

Policy Issue:

#6

"While the University is obligated to provide remediation and has identified selected remediation programs as high priority programs, the University shall limit the extent of its involvement in offering remediation, and shall work actively at

the campus, system and intersegmental levels toward decreasing student need for remediation." (Section III, page 5, lines 9-14)

Debate Questions:

1. Does the Senate agree that the University has an obligation to provide remediation?
2. Should selected remediation programs be identified as high priority programs?
3. Should the University limit the extent of its involvement in remediation programs?
4. Should the University work toward decreasing student need for remediation?

Policy Issue: Priorities Within Undergraduate Major Programs #7

"Undergraduate degree programs cannot, however, all receive equal levels of support. Specifically, priority shall be accorded to degree programs that..." (Section IV, page 5, lines 21-23)

Debate Issues:

1. Does the Senate agree to the general principle that all undergraduate degree programs cannot receive equal support?
2. Should priorities be established within the undergraduate degree program category?
3. Are the proposed criteria for determining priorities appropriate? Should some be deleted? Should some be added?

Policy Issue: Minimum Level of Support for Undergraduate Major Programs (Section IV.A, page 5, lines 37-44; page 6, lines 1-30) #8

1. scheduling of core courses and a "reasonable complement" of courses (page 5, lines 42-44; page 6, lines 1-3)
2. definition of "reasonable complement" of courses (page 6, lines 4-19)
3. determination of the number of courses critical to the major and their schedule of offering (page 6, lines 23-26)

4. course enrollment considerations: "For the core courses and those identified as critical enrollment in the class will not be the prime consideration for offering the course. Conversely, high enrollment demand for courses other than core courses and courses identified as critical, does not guarantee that they shall be offered." (page 6, lines 25-30)

Debate Questions:

Does the Senate agree to each of the above provisions?

Policy Issue: Commitment to Offering Graduate Programs #9

1. "The University is committed to offering graduate programs... Graduate study is integral to the mission and responsibility of California State University, Sacramento." (Section IV.B, page 6, lines 33-39)
2. types of graduate programs that "inherently" constitute priorities (Section IV.B, page 6, lines 44-47; page 7, lines 1-4)
3. priorities within graduate programs: "...not all current or potential graduate programs can receive equal levels of support." (Section IV.B, page 7, lines 6-7)
4. criteria for determining priorities (Section IV.B, page 7, lines 8-48)

Debate Questions:

1. Does the Senate agree with general policy statement on graduate programs?
2. Are the types of graduate programs identified as priorities appropriate? Should others be added? Should any be deleted?
3. Should priorities be established within the graduate program category?
4. Are the proposed criteria for determining priorities appropriate? Should some be added? Should any be deleted or revised?

Policy Issue: Minimum Level of Support for Graduate Programs (Section IV.B, page 8, lines 1-43) #10

1. scheduling of core courses and electives (page 8, lines 18-33)

2. determination of the number of courses critical to the program and their schedule of offering (page 8, lines 38-41)
3. enrollment consideration: "Enrollment demand (low or high) shall not be the sole determining factor for deciding whether a course is to be offered." (page 8, lines 41-43)

Debate Questions:

Does the Senate agree to each of the above provisions?

Policy Issue: Service Courses

#11

"The University is committed to offering a sufficient number of service courses to ensure completion of approved programs."
(Section IV.C, page 9, lines 4-6)

Debate Question:

Should service courses be considered a high priority?

Policy Issue: Remediation

#12

1. "Currently, CSUS has determined that it is necessary to provide remedial instruction to ensure that students admitted to the University, but who are not prepared for baccalaureate level courses in writing and quantitative reasoning, have the opportunity to redress these deficiencies ." (Section IV.D, page 9, lines 10-16)
2. "...CSUS shall establish and maintain clearly defined academic floors below which remedial courses will not be offered, set other limits on remediation programs, and shall work toward the goal of decreasing the need for remediation at CSUS." (Section IV.D, page 9, lines 24-29)

Debate Questions:

1. Given the current situation, should CSUS offer remedial instruction?
2. Should remediation programs be included in the high priority category?
3. Should academic floors be established?
4. Should other limits on remediation programs be established?
(Section IV.D.5, page 11, lines 34-47; page 12, lines 1-10)

Policy Issue: Priority Placement of Remediation Programs #13
in Relation to Other University Programs
(Section IV.D.2, page 10, lines 28-44)

Debate Questions:

1. Should remediation programs have higher priority than the courses/programs listed on page 10, lines 30-38? Should others be added? Should any be deleted?
2. Should remediation programs have lower priority than the courses/programs listed on page 10, lines 41-44? Should others be added? Should any be deleted?

Policy Issue: Priorities Within the Remediation Program #14
(Section IV.D.3, page 10, lines 45-49; page 11, lines 1-13)

Debate Questions:

1. Does the Senate agree that the identified remediation programs should be accorded the highest priority among remediation programs?
2. Does the Senate agree that the identified type of remediation programs should be accorded lowest priority in relation to other remediation programs?

Policy Issue: Enrollment Priorities in Remedial #15
COURSES (Section IV.D.4, page 11, lines 14-33)

Debate Questions:

1. Should enrollment priorities be established?
2. Are the proposed enrollment priorities appropriate?

Policy Issue: Policy Considerations Regarding #16
Remediation Programs (Section IV.D.5, page 11, lines 34-48;
page 12, lines 1-10)

Debate Questions:

1. Should any of the policy considerations listed be deleted or revised?
2. Should any other policy considerations be added?

Policy Issue: General Education

#17

1. "Resource support for the G.E. Program shall be sufficient to allow students to complete G.E. requirements in a sequential and timely manner." (Section IV.E, page 12, lines 15-17)
2. "...the priority for each category of general education shall be based on total student need for coursework in the category. The priority for upper division vs. lower division general education courses shall be based on total need for upper division vs. lower division general education courses." (Section IV.E, page 12, lines 20-25)
3. "Student need for courses must be met within each G.E. category, although possibly not in individual courses, or possibly not in the semester of the student's choice." (Section IV.E, page 12, lines 29-32)

Debate Question:

Does the Senate agree with the general principles stated above?

Policy Issue: Priorities Within the G.E. Program

#18

(Section IV.E., page 12, lines 33-45; page 13, lines 1-9)

Debate Questions:

1. Should highest priority within G.E. be accorded to the areas proposed in Section IV.E., page 12, lines 35-41? Should any be deleted? Should any be added?
2. Among G.E. courses where a variety of courses may be used to satisfy the same requirement, should priority be accorded as proposed in Section IV.E, page 12, line 4 and page 13, lines 1-9? Should any be deleted? Should any be added?

Policy Issue: Minors (Section V.A, page 13, lines 16-30)

#19

1. Generally, minors are considered to be in the low priority group of programs (offered by departments that also offer a major program).
2. "...the minor, unless specifically required by another major, shall receive no special consideration for resource support." (page 13, lines 24-26)

3. "A minor which supports a different major will be accorded the same relative priority as the major it supports." (page 13, lines 19-21)
4. "In cases where a minor is not associated with a major program, resource support shall be determined on a case by case basis, using the same criteria established to determine the priority of undergraduate major programs." (page 13, lines 26-30)

Debate Questions:

1. Does the Senate agree that, generally, minors should be included in the ^{high} ~~low~~ priority category ~~(relative to those included in the high priority category)?~~
2. ~~Should the minor be ranked in relation to other programs in the low priority category?~~
3. Does the Senate agree with the proposed distinctions (see 2, 3 and 4 above) within the minor program category?

Policy Issue: *Low Priority Programs*

#20

1. The following program categories ~~(in addition to minors)~~ are identified as low priority programs (Section V, page 13, lines 31-43; page 14, lines 1-38)
 - certificate programs
 - non-critical elective courses
 - centers and institutes
 - in-service courses
 - athletics.
2. The following resource stipulations are proposed for the program categories listed above:
 - a. "Certificate programs in and of themselves shall receive no special consideration for resource support." (page 13, lines 32-33)
 - b. "...the number of non-critical electives offered shall be subject to resource availability. The University may have to reduce the number of non-critical electives offered, even if student demand is high." (page 13, lines 42-43; page 14, lines 1-2)
 - c. Centers and institutes "may receive start up funding from instructional resources to the extent that resources are available... Unless otherwise agreed to..., University support shall be discontinued after the third year." (Section V.D, page 14, lines 11-16)

- d. "In-service courses shall receive no special consideration for resource support." (Section V.E, page 14, lines 18-19)
- e. "Intercollegiate athletics shall be supported contingent upon the availability of resources, following adequate support for academic programs." (Section V.F, page 14, lines 36-38)

Debate Questions:

Does the Senate agree to each of the above policy statements?

Amendments to AS 90-16--

Agreed to at the March 14, 1991, Senate meeting:

Policy Issue #1

1. Section II, page 2, lines 20-31 (Curry, Steward): Add minors to high priority category, as follows:

"At California State University, Sacramento, courses and programs that directly support and lead to the baccalaureate or master's degree in the liberal arts and sciences and professional fields, or the post baccalaureate credential in fields of Education, shall have funding priority over courses and programs that are peripheral to these purposes (e.g., certificate programs, in-service programs). The categories of priority programs include: undergraduate major programs, master's degree and post baccalaureate credential programs, service courses that support major programs, minors, testing and remediation programs related to the University quantitative reasoning and writing requirements, and the General Education Program."

Section V, page 13, lines 16-30: Move Section V.A (Minors) from Section V (LOW PRIORITY PROGRAMS) to Section IV (PRIORITIES WITHIN PRIORITY PROGRAM CATEGORIES), page 13, and reletter as C; IV.C-E become IV.D-F:

AC. Minors

A minor is a pattern of coursework similar to a major, but less comprehensive. As noted previously, selected major programs require a minor in another discipline. A minor which supports a different major will be accorded the same relative priority as the major it supports. Most minors are offered by departments that also offer a major program and the minor consists of courses that are also included in the major. In these cases, the minor, unless specifically required by another major, shall receive no special consideration for resource support. In cases where a minor is not associated with a major program, resource support shall be determined on a case by case basis, using the same criteria established to determine the priority of undergraduate major programs.

Agreed to at the March 14, 1991, Senate meeting:

Policy Issue #3

2. Section III, page 4, lines 3-8 (Jensen, White): Amend as follows:

For these reasons, CSUS shall, at a minimum, maintain a lower division headcount enrollment of at least 25% of total undergraduate enrollment, ~~and shall set as a long term goal the achievement of a~~ The proportion of lower division headcount enrollment ~~that equals at least 1/3,~~ may be increased above this level (25%) but no more than shall not exceed 40% of total undergraduate enrollment.

3. Section IV.A, page 5, lines 24-32: It was agreed that the items labeled 1-8 would be listed alphabetically with bullets and a statement inserted that "no rank order is intended."

...Specifically, priority shall be accorded to degree programs that (no rank order intended):

- ~~5.~~ are of high quality as evaluatd by program reviews
- ~~1.~~ are responsive to regional employment needs
- ~~6.~~ are structured efficiently and derive appropriate levels of benefits for their cost
- ~~4.~~ contribute to an educated citizenry
- ~~7.~~ contribute to balance among programs
- ~~2.~~ for which there is sufficient student demand
- ~~3.~~ respond to the unique characteristics of our location
- ~~8.~~ serve a unique function