

IMPORTANT--Bring your August 28 (Academic Senate Retreat) and September 27, 1990, Agenda

1990-91  
ACADEMIC SENATE  
California State University, Sacramento

AGENDA

Thursday, October 4, 1990  
2:30 - 4:30 p.m.  
Engineering 1015

NOTE ROOM

REGULAR AGENDA

Note:

1. Main motions are presented for a second reading, but are subject to amendments at the meeting by adoption of motions introduced by the Executive Committee or motions introduced from the floor.
2. The symbols P, NP, FW in the left-hand margin of an Executive Committee motion indicate whether the motion is forwarded with a Pass or No Pass recommendation or Forwarded Without Recommendation.

Old Business

Carryover items from the Meeting of September 27, 1990.

New Business

AS 90-80A/Ex. FOREIGN LANGUAGE--UNIVERSITY GRADUATION  
REQUIREMENT, BASIC REQUIREMENT IN  
[Page 1, 8/28/90 Agenda]

Seconded motions from the Executive Committee pertaining to AS 90-80:

- Agreed*
- (P) 1. To adopt AS 90-80A as presented on the 8/18/90 Agenda (this places the item on the agenda as a seconded motions subject to amendment or substitution).
  - (P) 2. To amend to require that only candidates for the baccalaureate degree be held to the requirement. Note: If adopted, the text of the motion would be amended as follows:  
"All students graduating from CSU, Sacramento with a baccalaureate degree ~~or master's degree~~ must complete..."

AS 90-80B/Ex. FOREIGN LANGUAGE--UNIVERSITY GRADUATION REQUIREMENT, PROFICIENCY IN

[Page 2, 8/28/90 Agenda]

- (FW) 1. To adopt AS 90-80B as presented on the 8/18/90 Agenda (this places the item on the agenda as a seconded motion). Note: An editorial correction must be made in option 3.b., (Page 3, 8/18/90 Agenda). The section should read as follows:

"In a language not used to satisfy the basic requirement (i.e., CSU admission requirement): satisfactory completion (C- grade or higher) of a minimum of 7 semester units of language (other than the one used to satisfy the basic requirement) from the college level..."

- (FW) 2. To amend AS 90-80B to provide that the requirement may be satisfied in option 3.a. (Page 3, 8/28/90 Agenda) by completion of a minimum of 3, rather than 7, units of coursework from the college level third semester or more advanced courses in the same language used to satisfy the basic requirement. (Note: This amendment was proposed by the Department of Foreign Languages.)

*Carried*

- (P) 3. To amend AS 90-80B to require that only candidates for the baccalaureate degree (delete or master's degree) be held to the proficiency requirement.

*Amendment Carried*

- (NP) 4. To amend AS 90-80B to require that only candidates for the bachelor of arts degree be held to the proficiency requirement.

AS 90-80C/Ex. G.E. CONTENT REVISION--AREA C (DELETION OF SELECTED FOREIGN LANGUAGE COURSES)

[Pages 3-6, 8/28/90 Agenda]

- (P) Option I (deletion of introductory courses only)

[Note: This is the main motion subject to amendment or substitution.]

The Academic Senate recommends that, effective Fall 1992, introductory foreign languages courses (i.e., 1A and 1B) be deleted from Area C. Intermediate foreign language courses (i.e., 2A and 2B) and other foreign language courses may be included in Area C insofar as they meet Area C subarea criteria.

Note: To simplify discussion of the item on introductory (1A, 1B) and intermediate (2A, 2B) foreign language courses in Area C, the Executive Committee presents three basic options for Senate consideration. The options presented at this time do not include language relating to AS 90-80A and 90-80B and resource support

since this would require presenting at least 9 options to cover the likely combinations of actions on AS 90-80A and 90-80B. Instead, appropriate language will be added by amendment at a later time.

To place the item on the agenda, the first option is forwarded (with a pass recommendation) as a seconded motion from the Executive Committee. It may be moved from the floor to substitute one of the other options provided below. Alternatively, if no substitution is made and the option presented by the Executive Committee is defeated, one of the other options may be moved from the floor at a subsequent meeting as an independent motion on the same subject.

#### Other Options (possible substitutes)

##### Option II (deletion of introductory and intermediate courses)

The Academic Senate recommends deletion of introductory (i.e., 1A and 1B) and intermediate (i.e., 2A and 2B) foreign language courses from Area C. Other foreign language courses may be included in Area C insofar as they meet Area C subarea criteria.

##### Option III (retention of introductory and intermediate courses)

The Academic Senate affirms that introductory (i.e., 1A and 1B) and intermediate (i.e., 2A and 2B) foreign language courses may be included in Area C insofar as they meet Area C subarea criteria.

California State University  
Sacramento




The President  
Sacramento, CA 95819-2694

MEMORANDUM

October 3, 1990

TO: The Administrative Council

FROM: Donald R. Gerth 

SUBJECT: Additional Allocations for 1990/91

I have approved a plan for the disposition of the \$1.08 million that is available as a result of the imposition of less than a 3 percent reduction, pursuant to Control Section 3.8 of the Budget Act. The expenditure plan is based on the recommendations from the Council for University Planning concerning priorities, information from the school deans about Spring schedule considerations, and a review of requests from other program centers about special circumstances caused by the imposition of unallocated cuts.

The highest priority for the allocation of these funds is the funding of an adequate spring schedule, including faculty positions needed to staff additional sections in the schedule and associated or direct instructional support for the classes offered. Next in priority is responding to requests from non-instructional program centers to help maintain services which are vital to the support of the instructional program but would be curtailed without additional funding. The third priority area addressed through these allocations includes EASE, faculty professional development, and research. There were also two technical, although not small, adjustments that were necessary to update budget projections and calculations.

Specific allocations are as follows:

1. To the five schools in support of the Spring schedule, \$660,000 is allocated, including \$60,000 for staff benefits. A portion of this augmentation (\$149,000) is funded from enrollment adjustment positions and faculty positions reallocated due to significant underenrollment. The allocations to each school, exclusive of staff benefits, are:

Arts and Sciences	\$420,000
Education	40,000
Engineering and Computer Science	30,000
Health and Human Services	110,000

These increases will allow the schools to respond to most, if not all, of the demand for General Education courses, and to increase support for major programs according to school and department priorities. Resources have not been allocated to respond to all student demand in all programs because of the need to control enrollment generally and the desirability of addressing program size through enrollment planning and the establishment of priorities.

2. To Telecommunications, \$24,471 is allocated for staffing student computer laboratories. This amount will provide support for the labs at last year's level. Additional support for the new labs to be opened in the Spring is dependent upon development of a funding plan for those labs.
3. To Telecommunications, \$30,000 is allocated to restore audio/visual equipment delivery service to the level that had been planned prior to the imposition of the unallocated reduction. This service is vital to the instructional program and necessary to protect the university's investment in its equipment.
4. To Undergraduate Studies and Educational Support Services (USESS), \$15,000 is allocated to restore unallocated reductions imposed on Admissions and Records and Student Financial Aids. This will increase support for evaluations and grant application processing. It should be noted that, in addition to this \$15,000, an increase of \$25,000 for these two areas was provided to USESS in the initial allocations and \$20,000 worth of "relief" to USESS has recently been provided through the waiving of the 2 percent reduction associated with areas within USESS that are protected from reductions by Chancellor's Office policy.
5. To Undergraduate Studies and Educational Support Services (USESS), \$13,000 is allocated to cover the difference between the salary costs of certain Student Affirmative Action staff and the value of their positions as funded in the new system formula.
6. To Academic Affairs, \$10,000 is allocated to cover the cost of outside consultants for the academic program review process. These costs were budgeted to come from the Lottery's Visiting Scholars program, but those funds are no longer available to the campus.
7. For the EASE Conversion project, \$100,000 is allocated to supplement the amount already granted. This will speed up the process of converting campus administrative computing systems

which provide essential support for the class schedule and student information systems.

8. To Academic Affairs, a total of \$174,310 is allocated to support faculty research and faculty professional development, to be divided upon consultation with the Faculty Professional Development Committee. This is enough to restore each program to over 90 percent of the amount originally approved.
9. A technical adjustment results in an augmentation of \$30,000 for Student Affairs. This will correct the inequity of the initial split of resources between USESS and Student Affairs, which has had a negative impact on Student Affairs programs.
10. An updated estimate of the staff benefit savings which accompany the reduction in program center spending levels has a net cost to the University of \$300,000. Previous estimates had assumed that a considerably larger portion of the unallocated reductions assigned to program centers would be accomplished by holding positions vacant, thus generating staff benefit savings. The restoration of portions of the unallocated cuts to some program centers, and the fact that few positions have actually been held vacant combine to generate far fewer staff benefit savings than had been projected.
11. To support the objective of maintaining the class schedule for spring, there are to be no transfers out of allocations for teaching faculty positions.

The total cost of these allocations is \$1,356,781. This exceeds the \$1.08 million in part because of the availability of other faculty positions (enrollment adjustment and reallocated positions). The remaining excess will be covered, if necessary, from University reserves.

It was recommended by the Council for University Planning, as well as by others, that in light of the possibility of additional cuts to the campus budget, a contingency plan be developed for recovering the amount of additional allocations if it becomes necessary to do so. We have identified sources of funds (primarily library materials) that will be given up, if necessary, in order to guarantee that the additional funds provided in support of the Spring schedule will not be taken back, short of what some would call a major catastrophe. No such guarantee can be provided, however, for the other allocations. In the event of major additional reductions to the campus budget, the amount of those additional allocations may have to be recovered from the recipient program centers.

I believe this plan represents a reasonable approach to proceeding, under conditions of uncertainty, to serve our student population and to pursue our most important programmatic objectives.