

1990-91
ACADEMIC SENATE
California State University, Sacramento

AGENDA

Thursday, December 6, 1990
2:30 - 4:30 p.m.
Forest Suite, University Union

INFORMATION

1. Academic Senate Meetings, Thursdays, 2:30-4:30 p.m.:
December 13, Forest Suite, UU (Regular Agenda)

HAPPY HOLIDAYS!

2. Consideration of the 1989-90 WASC Report (Attached)
Jolene Koester, Assistant Vice President
for Academic Affairs

MOMENT OF SILENCE - RON ALEXANDER
REGULAR AGENDA

AS 90-101/AP, Ex. DROP POLICY

filed
The Academic Senate recommends revision of the drop policy
(page 60, 1988-90 Catalog) for implementation in 1992:

No change in a student's original class registration will be recognized unless it is made on an official form and accepted by the Registrar's Office.¹ ~~Forms should not be left in academic department offices.~~ Students who are absent from class may be replaced on class rolls by students from a waiting list in accordance with individual instructor's policy. However, students will not always be "automatically" dropped if they do not attend a class for which they register. Add/drop practice varies among instructors, departments, and schools. You should inquire about the practice in each of your courses. Failure to drop a course according to University policy as stated below is likely to result in the assignment of a penalty grade of "U" in that course.

~~Within the first two weeks of instruction, students may submit a drop form signed by the instructor or department office. Unless approved drop forms are submitted to the Registrar's Office, students will receive a final grade of U or F in the course(s).~~ During the first two weeks of the semester, a student may drop a course by filing a drop form at the Registrar's Office.¹ Dropping a course during the first two weeks does not require the approval or acknowledgment signature of the instructor or the department. During the third and fourth weeks of the semester, students must inform the course instructor or the department of their intention to drop a course, and must obtain the instructor or department's acknowledgment signature on the drop form.¹ Students are responsible for submitting drop forms to the Registrar.¹ Forms should not be left in academic department offices.¹

All drops after the ~~second~~ fourth week and prior to the end of the twelfth week must have the approval of the instructor and Department Chair and are allowed only for "serious and compelling reasons." (~~usually illness, change in employment schedule, etc.~~). "Serious and compelling" reasons include (but are not limited to) the following:

- a) illness or other medical or emotional problem,
- b) change in employment schedule (including the addition of job due to a significant change in financial situation),
- c) family problems, and
- d) situations that could have serious consequences for the eventual success of the student.

Poor academic performance, in and of itself, is not an acceptable reason for dropping. The instructor may require that the student obtain official written verification (e.g., physician's note) and/or the recommendation of the student's academic or major advisor. In addition to the drop form, the student must submit (to the Registrar's Office) a drop petition which includes a statement of the "serious and compelling reasons" and the necessary approvals.¹

Drops shall not be permitted during the final three weeks of instruction except in cases, such as accident or serious illness, where the cause of withdrawal is due to circumstances clearly beyond the student's control and the assignment of an Incomplete is not practicable. Ordinarily, drops of this sort will involve total withdrawal from the University, except that credit, or an Incomplete may be assigned for courses in which sufficient work has been completed to permit an evaluation to be made. All drops during the final three weeks of instruction must have the approval of the instructor, the Department Chair and School-~~or~~ Division Dean and are allowed only in extenuating circumstances.

Courses officially dropped during the first four weeks of instruction will not be recorded on the student's permanent record. A grade of W will be recorded for courses in which a drop has been authorized after the fourth week of instruction. The Schedule of Classes lists deadlines, dates, and procedures for each semester.

¹By Fall 1992, use of add/drop forms may be discontinued if telephone registration capability is available on the campus. If this should occur, the Academic Senate recommends that catalog copy be revised as necessary to provide appropriate direction to students on use of telephone registration.

FIFTH YEAR ACCREDITATION SITE VISIT TEAM

Aubrey W. Bonnett
Dean
School of Social and Behavioral Sciences
California State University, San Bernardino

Francisco Hernandez
Dean of Student Life
University of California, Berkeley

John W. Moore
President
California State University, Stanislaus

Patricia R. Plante, Chair
President
University of Southern Maine

Carolyn Reid-Wallace
Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs
City University of New York

FIFTH YEAR ACCREDITATION SITE VISIT REPORT

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO

Date of Visit: March 20-21, 1989

PREAMBLE

The Fifth Year Accreditation Site Visit team agreed at the outset that it might be most useful to California State University, Sacramento if it concentrated its attention on but five areas of particular importance in the growth of any institution. Consequently, it examined, with all the care possible in a short period of time, the following areas:

1. Diversity (Standard 1B)
2. Planning and Assessment (Standard 2)
3. General Education (Standard 4)
4. Faculty Development (Standard 5)
5. Student Services (Standard 7)

While clearly not ignoring objective evidence, the team was careful not to ask data to do more than it was ever intended to do. It made every attempt to give climate, and voice, and vision their due.

STANDARDS ONE, FOUR, SEVEN: DEALING WITH DIVERSITY.

Standard 1.B.3.

An institution demonstrates its commitment to fostering the

educational role played by the diversity of ethnic, social and economic backgrounds among its members.

The California State University, Sacramento's self-study documents a significant emphasis on educational equity with a complete description of recent efforts made to increase student, staff, and faculty diversity. The "Statement of University Mission" indicates that the campus will strive to provide an education for all students and will foster multicultural understanding throughout the campus. The university plan further states that the campus is enriched by diversity in its membership and in its curriculum. In addition, the Academic Senate has identified as important the infusion of multi-cultural issues within the curriculum and the goal of an increased diversity within the faculty and student body.

The "University Plan" reveals a series of well-placed initiatives to increase the number of students, staff and faculty from under-represented groups and to launch several programs to assist minority students to complete their studies successfully. The plan also incorporates a monitoring and reporting system whereby informed committees or individual administrators review data on minority participation and develop plans to meet current needs.

The President of the university has also established a

President's Advisory Council on Human Relations. This body will keep watch over the campus racial climate and trace the campus's progress in keeping to its commitment to diversity.

Based on all of the written and verbal information gathered, this visiting team is convinced that the campus leadership has moved beyond the rhetoric of affirmative action toward a vision of cultural diversity as an educational imperative.

Commentary:

The campus adopted its first Educational Equity Report in 1986. It is now able to point to a number of initiatives and programs where diversity is appreciated and fostered: the Faculty Peer Mentor Program, the Faculty Mentor Program, the Science Educational Equity Program, the Minority Engineering Program, the Educational Opportunity Program and the Minority Enrichment Business Program.

However, accomplishments across the university are uneven. For example, the campus has undoubtedly made significant progress in recognizing the relevant issues, in providing specific information about the participation levels of minorities, in raising the cultural awareness of many, in ameliorating conflicts, and in providing various forums for minority group concerns.

However, a number of essential efforts are recent and not fully developed. The team is concerned that some of these efforts may have been spurred by the need to respond to critical events, and, therefore, may not become part of the established campus structure. One indicator of this fragility that may mark impermanence: one administrator has been assigned the responsibility for educational equity reporting, and yet another has been given the task of supervising educational programs and their funding. This team views this separation of functions as artificial and likely to cause confusion and friction around a very serious matter. Another indicator of structural weakness is revealed when one considers that while the university self-study recognizes that English is not the first language for a number of its students, the efforts, however laudable and well-intended, of the Learning Skills Program designed to address this serious issue may not be adequate to the task. Many universities have come to recognize that diagnostic tests and special sections of basic writing courses, though essential, are but part of a needed concerted effort across all courses throughout the curriculum. Consequently, the team worries that the campus may have identified a number of educational equity problems without either fully understanding their seriousness or without having constructed a plan to solve them.

It may be that the educational benefits of cultural diversity,

While important to the campus leadership, have not as yet become of the essence for the campus as a whole. Therefore, the team recommends that the university continue energetically to seek an inner consistency by insuring that the strengths deriving from diversity be acknowledged across all programs and functions-- including governance, planning and budget allocations.

The university's recent successes in approaching diversity have most assuredly been due in part to the extraordinary efforts and determination of its President and dedicated staff and faculty, and to extramural funding from grants for special projects. For example, most of the recent growth of Hispanic enrollees can be traced to one program that spends more than \$350,000 on 80 students. The program addresses real and serious needs, but the campus must not depend entirely on such special programs to attract significant numbers of minority students. Therefore, the team recommends that the campus develop a comprehensive plan to free itself from undue reliance on extramural funding as the major means of achieving its goals in the area of diversity.

Standard I.B.2.

Undergraduate studies ensure ...an appreciation of cultural diversity.

The campus adopted a general education requirement that

includes a course on Race and Ethnicity in American Society. Additionally, it has developed a program (to be implemented in the Fall of 1990) designed to infuse multi-cultural content into the Social Sciences and the Arts and Humanities areas of General Education. Twenty faculty members have agreed to participate in this attempt to transform the curriculum in the project's first year of operation. This team commends these efforts and urges the university to consider establishing a development program that would allow many more faculty an opportunity to engage in research and study for the purpose of increasing and improving multi-cultural content within their courses.

Standard 4.H.3.

The institution actively seeks diversity in its student body.

The campus has recently reorganized to conduct more effective outreach activities for the purpose of increasing the number of under-represented minority students who apply, are admitted, and enroll in undergraduate studies. The campus has established an enrollment management team and increased its efforts in the recruitment of minorities. The campus has also combined the office of affirmative action with that of general recruiting in order to make more efficient use of the resources of both. This team commends the individual educational equity plans established within the colleges of CSUS. The plans are comprehensive and are

designed to assist all minorities within their academic homes. However, while CSUS has had since 1986 specific recruitment and enrollment targets for members of minority groups, there is as yet no well structured overall strategic recruitment and enrollment plan that gives evidence of familiarity with the literature, and that specifically addresses the ways and means of increasing the number of minority students on campuses. CSUS has attempted to compensate for this lack by relying on a series of specially funded, small, focused initiatives. While these efforts serve well the small groups of students involved, it seems clear that the large increases in the minority school populations will be inadequately served by the inappropriate size of these programs. Such inadequate, albeit at times creative efforts, need to become part of a larger enrollment management plan that specifically addresses the characteristics of each minority group.

Enrollment targets and goals since 1987:

	<u>New Freshmen</u>		<u>New Transfer</u>	
	<u>Actual</u>	<u>Goal</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<u>Goal</u>
1987-88	395		1025	
1988-89	415	427	1059	867
1989-90	692	454	1229	1271
1990-91		544		1592

The team also observed that the efforts to increase the diversity of graduate students was limited to the activities within the student affirmative action component of outreach services. This minimal effort is not apt to lift the number of minority graduate students to an acceptable level. Additionally, the university has not to date set enrollment goals for graduate minority students. The team recommends that it consider doing so.

In the spring of 1990, there were 154 minority full-time faculty members. That number constitutes 17.56% of the total full-time faculty. While this percentage exceeds that of many peer institutions, energetic efforts should be directed toward increasing the percentage so that minority faculty can in all departments serve as role models for all students.

Standard 5.D.4

Affirmative action policies are published and communicated to the campus...procedures and results are monitored and reviewed.

The university, through its administrative and faculty leadership, has communicated clearly its commitment to affirmative action and its policies in that regard. The documents that apply are available for review by public bodies and the observance of the policies contained therein are

monitored by several university committees representing staff, faculty, students, and minority advocacy groups.

Standard 7.A.1.

The institution identifies the characteristics and learning needs of the student population and makes provisions for meeting those needs.

The campus has identified several student population groups with special needs and has developed programs to meet those needs. The campus, for example, has established a Disability Support Center that provides a variety of services for students with visual, mobility, and learning disabilities. Through the Dean of Students, the campus now plans to establish a multi-cultural activities center for programming by minority students. The campus has also developed a series of retention services designed for minority students.

However, the team is concerned that the decisions as to what retention activities are to be stressed were seemingly made without adequate research and analysis of student characteristics for each minority group. For example, the majority of retention efforts are geared toward academic advising and remediation. Yet, there are no indicators showing that these are indeed the

primary areas affecting the retention and graduation rates of minority students. Hence, the team recommends that the campus conduct an extensive data collection initiative to determine the exact causes of the less than hoped for graduation rates of minority students. Based on data for those students entering the university in 1980-81 (the only data available), the graduation rate of minority students is 39%. It further suggests the development of a retention plan that includes both academic support and co-curricular activities in support of diversity.

Additional Commentary:

WASC should ensure that a full review of the diversity standards be conducted during the 1995 visit of the university. Since the campus has launched a set of comprehensive programs to increase the diversity of its faculty, staff, and students, a full review of these projects and their consequences in 1995 would encourage this academic community to refine its efforts and to examine closely the results of their initiatives.

While the team did not conduct a close review of the diversity issues as they relate to staff, it did wonder whether too many of the minority staff were confined to affirmative action programs, a number of which are funded by soft monies. The team, therefore, while acknowledging the difficulty of defining "too many" nevertheless recommends that the campus ask itself whether

such may not be the case.

Finally, the team recommends that the university make every effort to include minority students in the student governance structure of the campus. This inclusion would allow minority students to assist in developing an environment that attracts diverse student populations, and that permits minority students to express their cultures with the full support and encouragement of the entire university community. Furthermore, the university would do well to include minority alumni/ae in its recruitment and retention activities. Such individuals have shown themselves to be very effective in contacting prospective students, in hosting student campus visits, and in motivating reluctant students to seek a university education.

STANDARD TWO: DEALING WITH INSTITUTIONAL PURPOSES, PLANNING, AND EFFECTIVENESS.

Standard 2.A., 2.B., 2.C.

An institution is guided by clearly stated purposes, is engaged in ongoing planning, and evaluates its effectiveness.

The purpose of California State University, Sacramento has been clearly articulated in a November, 1989 document entitled, "University Plan." That document characterizes CSUS as a

"regional comprehensive public institution that is authorized to offer educational programs at the baccalaureate and master's levels, and, jointly with the University of California or approved private institutions, at the doctorate level. It fulfills related and public service roles and maintains support services for students." To be certain that it continues to live up to its institutional purposes and to plan for the future, the university has developed a planning process -- one that has undergone considerable refinement since the WASC team visit in 1985. This process is designed to engage a wide range of persons (university faculty, students, administrators, a member of the alumni, a member of the community advisory board) in an ongoing dialogue about the short and long-term future of CSUS.

The WASC 1985 visiting team noted that academic planning resided in a single unit, the University Resources and Planning Council. That Council was responsible not only for the review of academic programs and centers, but also for recommendations for the allocation of resources.

Subsequent to this report, the CSUS planning and assessment process has been refined and to a large extent reconstituted. The University Resources and Planning Council has been abolished, and its functions subsumed under a university-wide committee referred to as CUP -- the Council for University Planning. Much in the manner of the Council it has replaced, CUP consists of

faculty, administrators, students, alumni and members of the community. Its primary purpose is to facilitate policy discussions and to establish budgetary and programmatic priorities that relate to the University's short and long-term future.

CUP, chaired by the Vice-President for Academic Affairs, meets on a weekly basis, from September through December, and February through May. Its primary charge is to provide the President with a set of recommendations that links programs, resources, and priorities coherently and systematically. The following are its specified functions:

1. To develop and maintain a five-year University Plan for programs and facilities, containing goals and objectives.
2. To coordinate the planning processes of all program centers (i.e., to ensure that each program center has a planning process that feeds into and draws upon the University Plan).
3. To review unit plans from academic and support programs and to use this information in developing the University Plan.

4. To report on the extent to which university program centers appear to be achieving their goals and objectives, and on the extent to which these centers support the objectives contained in the University Plan.

5. To recommend to the President a final budget with supporting narrative that reflects the Council's recommended plans and

priorities.

6. To recommend enrollment targets for the university.
7. To update the campus Physical Facilities Master Plan.
8. To develop the annual minor capital outlay program proposal.

Commentary:

In talking with members of the CSUS community, it seems clear that its varied constituents consider themselves heard --that is, faculty, students, staff, all are afforded an opportunity to discuss the many policy-related budgetary and programmatic issues. The tension to which the 1985 team referred by pointing to the conflicts existing between the Administration and the Academic Senate has all but been eliminated. What seems to have replaced an unproductive we/they tension is a healthy academic debate about substantial issues. However, other kinds of tensions are manifest and should be acknowledged and reduced so that all of the time and energy devoted to university planning can yield the rewards that the campus deserves.

To begin with, CSUS might well benefit by re-examining and questioning a planning process driven by a consensus view that all existing academic programs "should be maintained." Such a premise often hampers a university from addressing weaknesses in a serious and meaningful way. The university might be better prepared to meet the challenges of the next decade were it to

establish programmatic priorities based on academic strengths, and institutional and system-wide data that project demographic, social and economic trends.

Additionally, for the purpose of ensuring that academic criteria and goals drive process, the university might choose to review the role of the Vice President for Academic Affairs in establishing priorities, readjusting programmatic/budgetary inequities, and implementing academic plans that will guarantee students contemporary curricula and provide faculty opportunities to respond intelligently to their own and their students' intellectual needs. In many universities, the position of the Vice President for Academic Affairs is the central and pivotal and most influential one in all matters academic.

The university might also find it advantageous to reexamine its organizational flow chart to assure itself that reporting lines and functions are congruent with its central academic mission. For example, a Director of Institutional Studies need not, but often does report to a Vice President for Academic Affairs whose decisions very frequently rely upon the research conducted by that office.

Finally, in order to accomplish its goals, the University's plans should accord with those of the System. For example, it does not seem reasonable for the university to declare new program

initiatives without the necessary resources to support them. It does seem reasonable, however, to hope that a System whose own priorities match those of the campus may find the means to support initiatives and changes that advance these priorities. Forcing units and centers to support new projects or to bring about significant change without allocating funds appropriate to the task encourages cynicism in administrators, faculty, and students alike.

STANDARD FOUR: DEALING WITH GENERAL EDUCATION

Standard 4.B.1, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9.

An institution's undergraduate program includes a general education segment that requires students to master enabling skills and to understand fundamental areas of knowledge.

In its 1985 report, the WASC visiting team made clear that the university needed to pay serious attention to the entire area of General Education. Indeed, in rather strong language, the team wrote: "it could be that no General Education program at all is preferable to the certificate born in discussion and created out of politics and compromise, and which is perceived by many students as merely an annoying obstacle to the earning of a degree."

The same team recommended, *inter alia*, that a carefully chosen external committee be invited to campus to review the GE program and to make recommendations for a more coherent and educationally sound one. California State University, Sacramento, in the intervening five years, has engaged in commendable work in addressing the 1985 team's serious concerns. Much of the success in completing what President Gerth describes as a "massive effort at looking at the fundamentals," emanated from his admirable leadership and that of his administrative team, and from the vision, guidance, and support of the Academic Senate.

In the spring of 1988, the Academic Senate commissioned a review of the university's GE program to be conducted by its own General Education Committee, an external review team, and an internal General Education Review Team (GERT). The most recent and most comprehensive GERT report proposed a number of recommendations for revising the GE program. Most of these recommendations speak to the problem addressed by the 1985 visiting team and are now winding their way through the Academic Senate. Closure on revisions to the General Education Program is expected in the Fall of 1990, and implementation of these changes is scheduled for the Fall of 1991.

However, positive action has already been taken. On March 15, 1990, the Senate adopted a new GE rationale and objectives that commits the entire university to the centrality of the General

Education Program in the education of its students. The objectives for all students include: clear writing and oral expression skills; the ability to use research tools; an understanding of current theory and concepts and knowledge about the nature of the physical universe and the origins and variety of life on the planet; an understanding of the perspectives and contributions to human activities and experiences of peoples from diverse cultures and backgrounds.

This team urges that this new rationale and these objectives be disseminated widely, explained broadly, and mainstreamed into the curricular life of the institution as quickly as possible. Further, the Senate must be commended for its adoption of a three-unit GE course entitled, "Race and Ethnicity" to be implemented in the 1990 fall term. This course has been widely applauded by the President and student representatives, and faculty are now preparing syllabi for review and inclusion in the new GE program.

While the Academic Senate continues to debate the many proposals of the GERT report, this team judges the tone of the discussions to be thoughtful, open, and courageous. However, with all due recognition of the accomplishments already achieved, and with all due respect to the traditional glacial deliberations of academic bodies, this team feels compelled to remind the university that five years have already elapsed since the last WASC report urging

reform. Hence, this team thinks it reasonable to recommend completion of the revision of the GE curriculum by 1991.

Commentary:

While the team congratulates both the administration and the senate in its sincere attempts to structure a GE program that engages the intellect and expands the understanding of all faculty and students, certain areas continue to need special attention.

Students complained, at times bitterly, that high demand courses were offered in insufficient numbers to meet their needs. This failure to meet their academic needs not only placed obstacles to the timely completion of their courses of study, but transformed them into mendicants before their professors. Many stated that they found this role demeaning and indicative of a lack of concern for their welfare. The team urges the administration and the senate to take a firm stand to achieve proper sequencing and offering of courses, and to bring without delay admissions and records in collaborative relationship with academic affairs.

The GERT team, as well as the external team, has debated at length the appropriate responsibilities and reporting functions of the administrator in charge of General Education. The team does not take a position in this debate. It does, however, strongly urge that the new administrator be given a degree of

autonomy and fiscal support commensurate with the effective discharge of his/her responsibilities. Previous administrators have apparently faltered, perhaps in part for lack of freedom and essential resources. The team also recommends that resources in support of this position and in support of the goals of General Education be allocated in a manner that minimizes competition with the legitimate additional needs of the Colleges/Schools.

The team commends the action now being initiated in the Academic Senate to bolster the writing requirements at this institution. This requirement, if and when adopted, will require additional sections of English composition and increased resources in support of the related programmatic changes. The team recommends that the administration, the Academic Senate, and other decision-making bodies work in a collaborative fashion to achieve the goal of advanced literacy for all its students.

The team also commends the university for its new academic advising policy which should add to the quality of the academic experience at this institution. Since the large number of transfer students at the university presents numerous challenges to those who advise in the area of general education, a policy that supports specialized training for faculty and student service personnel is a good policy. The new policy also urges the faculty to play a more active role in advising within the individual departments. Since students are required to obtain

their registration material from departments and are given advising instructions specific to the departments, only those determined to escape advising are likely to do so. The team recognizes, however, that this university, as most universities, continues to struggle to find a means of integrating GE advising into the Colleges/Schools, and continues to exist under a bifurcated system where for the most part advising for the major is done within the departments, and advising for General Education is done centrally.

The university might consider seeking ways to end this bipartite structure. For faculty who establish links between the aims of general education and those of the majors are faculty who help their students achieve an academic experience characterized by intellectual coherence. Those faculty who are already engaged in contributing to the success of the Academic Advising Center might be encouraged to persuade their peers of the value of general education advising within the departments.

The team commends the School of Engineering for working with the Academic Senate in an attempt to comply with Standard 4.B.9. However, it does remind the School that programs that do not allow for the equivalent of two years of study in general education and unrestricted electives, bear the burden of proof that they are meeting the Commission's tripartite goal for a baccalaureate degree. The team requests that WASC continue to

monitor compliance with this standard.

Finally, inasmuch as the Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee and the General Education Committee, in collaboration with the administrator for GE, are given broad, and at times final, power for determining the parameters of this program, great care should be taken to assure that these committees be truly representative of all major segments of the academic community.

STANDARDS FOUR AND FIVE: DEALING WITH RESEARCH AND FACULTY DEVELOPMENT.

Standards 4.D.1., 4.D.1., 5.C.2., and 5.C.3.

Within an institution research, scholarship and instruction are mutually supportive; research policies and practices are clearly communicated; faculty are encouraged to be active in scholarly and creative ways; and expectations of faculty research, scholarship and creative work are supported.

The 1985 WASC accrediting team report contained several recommendations related to the standards dealing with research and creative work. The university is to be praised for having made, in some instances, considerable progress in addressing the issues that compelled the committee to recommend changes.

1. The 1985 team recommended the expansion of programs for the allocation of positions for research, for the funding of travel, and for resources to support scholarly and creative activity. In response, the university has now allocated funds for a program of mini-grants for curriculum development, creative pedagogy, and career enhancement; for instructional development and technology; for attendance at summer institutes; for research travel; for research grant writing; for visiting scholars; and for both university-wide and college/school based grants specifically aimed at supporting scholarly and creative work. In addition, the university has established an office of Research and Sponsored Projects.

A number of faculty are now engaged in the writing of grant proposals. In 1989-90, for example, 72 faculty submitted 117 proposals for external support, and 40 of the 117 were funded and brought to the university 2.5 million for research. Internally, 74 of 128 applications to the campus Research Awards Program were approved. Additionally, through the internal Monetary Grant Program (supported by the university's foundation) 24 faculty out of 64 applicants were granted research awards. In the campus Mini-Grant Program for Creative Pedagogy and Career Enhancement, 76 out of 129 proposals were funded.

This team views these improvements as laudable, but encourages continued and even greater effort along the same lines, so that

an ever larger portion of the faculty begin to compete for both internal and external grants to sponsor its research.

2. The 1985 team also recommended that CSU'S clarify its position on research and make clear that although it retained teaching as its primary mission, faculty research would be supported and rewarded. With the approval and encouragement of the System, CSUS has now formally expanded its mission to include research and now seeks funding to support it.

Commentary:

This team concludes that CSU'S continues to harbor considerable confusion, and tension, and outright disagreement regarding the weight scholarship should be assigned in appointments, promotion, and tenure, and regarding the degree of passion that administrators and colleagues alike would and should consider appropriate in its pursuit. This lack of unity affects both tenured and non-tenured faculty, and might well result in eventual conflicts that could diminish the intellectual growth of the university. Therefore, the team recommends with some sense of urgency that the university address this issue as a matter of high priority. For every single decision linked to appointments and tenure determines as no other decision, and in often irreversible ways, the future of an institution. Hence, in such matters, time is always of the essence.

In deliberations surrounding this issue, administrators and faculty might consider the following suggestions:

1. Arriving at a definition of scholarship that would apply university-wide. A number of peer institutions have already come to accept scholarship so broadly defined as to include not only the advancement of frontier research, but the synthesizing of discoveries, the creative explications of texts, and the application of new knowledge.

2. Editing of university documents to avoid a rhetoric that keeps resuscitating myths that have already been demythologized and that now only serve to mask the issues and to encourage irrational discourse. Scholarship in and of itself has never been known to harm teaching; "teaching universities" are not the only universities that care deeply about teaching; an infinitesimal number of faculty confront the wrenching choice between teaching and research; there is no excellent teaching without scholarship --broadly defined. In the Preface to this institution's 40 year history, for example, the rhetoric that hampers happy solutions and that hardens prejudices is there in bold face: "Throughout its history, we have had to confront the role that research, as opposed [Italics added] to teaching, plays in the life of a regional university." This team suggests that new beginnings demand new language.

3. Establishing a university-wide promotion and tenure review committee that would attempt to maintain uniformly high evaluative standards in all colleges/schools. The present policy, whereby departmental standards are not subject to peer review beyond its borders, might in time lead to divisiveness and militate against a strong identity of the whole.

4. Joining peer institutions across the country which are determined to seek a national identity for regional comprehensive universities that will leave no doubt in anyone's mind of what their mission will be in the 21st century. Such an effort has now been well conceptualized, well structured, and was inaugurated at a national conference at Wright State University in April, 1990. Its agenda is clear and ambitious: to envision the nature of metropolitan universities of this kind for the next century and to rethink the form and texture of the professional lives of their faculties. This team suggests that CSUS attach itself to this movement and keep abreast of its developments through its journal, Metropolitan Universities -- a quarterly designed specifically to debate such matters as the importance of scholarship in the lives of the professoriate.

5. Extending opportunities for scholarly and creative activities beyond the faculty so as to include administrators. The life of inquiry is the life of any university. Hence, perhaps no one

should be exempt from its pain and its glory. Many universities now seek administrator/scholars, especially in its academic areas, and expect these individuals to spend some portion of their time engaged in the pursuit of scholarship shared in the traditional ways: publications, addresses at professional meetings, working as a consultant on national projects and for national boards etc. Some have already extended these expectations to administrators in student services, development and finance.

STANDARD SEVEN: DEALING WITH STUDENT SERVICES

Standards 7.A. and 7.B.

An institution supports a co-curricular environment that fosters the intellectual and personal development of students.

CSUS provides student services that are comprehensive in scope and appropriate to the needs of its increasingly diverse student body.

Professional staff reporting to the newly appointed Dean of Students, and their colleagues reporting to the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs are competent and dedicated to the well being of students. The team found enthusiasm and support among administrators, faculty, and staff for the new Dean of

students. Additionally, the new Dean enjoys an excellent working relationship with the President and has his support.

The President's deep interest in and strong commitment to student services and the quality of student life is well known on campus, and appears to be shared by executive-level administrators and faculty. This collective commitment on the part of campus leaders will undoubtedly facilitate the effective achievement of the institution's student services goals and aspirations.

Since the 1985 accreditation report, the university has taken several actions to enhance its student services. These include, but are not limited to: (1) acting on a comprehensive review of Student Life conducted by an independent consultant; (2) appointing a new Dean of Students; (3) implementing a reorganization of student and educational support services; (4) initiating unit planning activities within student and educational support services; (5) adopting a new academic advising policy; (6) initiating new programs in rape prevention, alcohol/drug awareness and education, community college transfer functions, and minority student retention. As a result of all these activities, a sense of momentum and optimism permeates the area of student services.

In appropriate and thoughtful ways, the university has responded to four recommendations made by the 1985 WASC team:

1. That the student service units undergo periodic program review.

The University Resources and Planning Committee recommended implementation to the President, and the latter expects the concept to be approved in 1990-91. However, the team notes that reviews have already taken place. An independent assessment of student services was commissioned in 1985, and substantive proposed changes were made. In addition, an independent study of the Financial Aids program is now being conducted, and the Health Center is undergoing a self-study for the purpose of specialized accreditation.

This team, however, believes that the university should move with increased liveliness in structuring a comprehensive plan whereby student services programs would be assured of systematic and periodic review.

2. That the university make greater use of students as academic advisors, and that the university involve faculty in their training.

The campus, based on prior and less than successful experiences with peer advising, considered, but chose not to implement this recommendation. However, in 1989, the Academic Senate adopted a

new policy on academic advising. The President has approved the policy and directed its immediate implementation. This new policy articulates a more active role for faculty in the advising of students at the departmental level. As explained above (p. 19), under this new policy students obtain their computer assisted registration material from the departments, and those who fail to adhere to departmental advising policies are given low priority in choice of courses. The intent of the new policy is to give the faculty a central role in the advising of students.

This team suggests that the university needs to define more clearly the role and responsibilities of various and university-wide advising and support services (i.e., Advising Center, Academic Achievement Center, etc.), and needs to differentiate the accountability of these units from that of the faculty within departments. Furthermore, the university should clarify its expectations of faculty in advising; should specify workload criteria that apply; and should implement appropriate incentives and rewards that will encourage faculty participation in an academic advising program of quality.

CSUC gives evidence of taking advising of its students seriously, and should be commended for so doing.

3. That the services to special and under-represented groups be

brought into the mainstream of the university.

Currently, the campus is in the initial year of implementing a new structure for student and educational support services intended, in part, to respond to this recommendation. Administrators and faculty leaders support the new model that will mainstream services for minorities.

However, the new structure needs clarification, for there appears to be only a vague understanding of its structure across the university. For example, some anxiety seems to exist regarding the role and responsibilities of the Academic Achievement Center and the proposed Student Development and Assessment Center. Some in both Centers worry that duties which they view as their own may gradually be assumed by others. Others question the advisability of establishing two Centers and wonder whether a combining of the two might not lead to greater efficiency. Certainly, a potential duplication of efforts is not beyond imagining, and the university should guard against it.

1. That the university consider establishing committees charged with providing oversight of the varied clusters of student services.

The university has not implemented this recommendation. This team recommends that the Academic Senate assume greater

responsibility for the formulation of policies in the area of student life.

Commentary:

The increasing ethnic and racial diversity of the university brings new opportunities and challenges. A Commission on Human Relations is being implemented as a means of encouraging constructive and harmonious relations throughout the campus.

The present student union building is no longer adequate to the needs of the campus. The university is urged to begin planning for an addition to the facility, and the Associated Students should provide leadership in winning support among the student body for this important capital project.

The significant number of older students seem not to be engaged in the life of the campus beyond the classroom. The team recommends that the needs of non-traditional students be assessed and that programs responsive to those needs be structured.

CONCLUSION:

California State University, Sacramento is a vibrant, energetic

institution sincerely dedicated to the welfare of its students, and determined to make significant contributions to its region and to its state. Its administration, under the very impressive leadership of its president, Dr. Donald Gerth, works in harmony with its faculty and students, and serious issues are debated in an appropriate academic atmosphere of civilized discourse.

While this visiting team recommends that certain actions be considered and suggests that certain questions be asked, it commends highly the seriousness and diligence with which the university has addressed and continues to address the fundamental issues tied to diversity, planning and assessment, general education, faculty development, and student services.

Plan for Responding to
1990 WASC Visiting Team Recommendations

Description	What	Who	When
<p>DEALING WITH DIVERSITY</p> <p>1. Institutionalize programs (concern that programs are new) (dependence on extramural funding).</p> <p>EOP CAMP Peer Mentor Mentor Others</p>	<p>1) Address issue of effect of extramural funding</p>		
<p>Curricular/Pedagogical change--- Beyond the Canon</p>	<p>1) FIPSE Grant 2) proposal to extend 3) program for new GE requirement</p>	<p>1) AAVP/Reinelt and Scott 2) Asst VPAA 3) Asst VPAA GE Administrator AAVP/Faculty</p>	<p>1) this AY 2) this AY for next year 3) plan now for workshops, programs, for 91-92</p>
<p>School based Programs</p> <p>Ed Equity positions to Schools</p> <p>MEP SEE MEBP Others</p>	<p>1) Continue to set aside 2) evaluation</p>	<p>Institutional Studies Institutional Studies</p>	<p>continuing this year</p>

Description	What	Who	When
<p>2. Enrollment and retention plan based on characteristics of each minority group</p> <p>indication that current efforts not based on research literature</p> <p>enrollment plan should address characteristics of each minority group</p> <p>retention plan based on extensive data collection to determine the cause for less than hoped for graduation rates</p> <p>retention plan that includes both academic support and cocurricular</p> <p>establishment of enrollment goals for minority graduate students</p>	<p>need overarching plan developed</p> <p>1) based on search of current literature, our enrollment plan should be examined to assure that it reflects characteristics</p> <p>1) collect, analyze data</p> <p>2) evaluation of retention efforts</p> <p>evaluation of current "plan" or development</p> <p>1) collect, analyze data on current graduate students and service area population</p> <p>2) establish realistic goals</p>	<p>AAVP USESS Head</p> <p>AAVP/UEEC GEM</p> <p>Institutional Studies</p> <p>USESS School based programs</p> <p>1) Institutional Studies</p> <p>2) GEM, Graduate Dean/UEEC</p> <p>AAVP USESS President</p>	
<p>3. Structural Weaknesses</p> <p>one administrator assigned equity reporting; another supervises education programs and budget</p> <p>Learning skills courses not sufficient (p. 4) for ESL students</p>	<p>discussion at level of senior administration; with Deans; with Senate</p>		

Description	What	Who	When
4. Sustain efforts toward achieving faculty diversity	<p>continue present efforts</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) funding for opportunity positions 2) Diversity recruitment 3) School level emphasis, concerns 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) AAVP CUP 2) AAVP, FSA Deans, Affirmative Action Committee 3) Dean's Offices 	May, 1991
5. Inclusion of minority students in campus student governance structure	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) work with ASI 2) work with student organizations 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Dean of Students 2) Dean of Students Director of Student Activities 	May, 1991
DEALING WITH GENERAL EDUCATION			
1. Recommends completion of revision of GE curriculum by 1991.	Senate must complete recommendations to President; includes revision and approval of criteria, and approval of procedures.	AAVP/President Senate	May, 1991
2. GE administrator be given autonomy and fiscal support; that resources be allocated in a manner that minimizes competition with the legitimate needs of the other schools.	position description reflects autonomy and fiscal support resource allocation	AAVP President AAVP and VP-Finance	Dec. 90 (?)
3. Care should be taken to make committees (A&S, GE) genuinely representative	Composition and structure now being considered by A&S Curriculum Committee	AAVP/Senate A&S Curriculum Committee	Dec. 90 (?)
4. Programs should be reminded of tripartite structure	Senate resolution on evaluation of exemption New programs developed meeting this guideline	AAVP/GE Committee AAVP	1991-92

Description	What	Who	When
<p>5. Faculty should consider doing GE advising along with academic program advising</p>	<p>policy discussion in Senate</p>	<p>AAVP/Academic Policies Committee and Full Senate</p>	<p>begin in 1991</p>
<p>DEALING WITH RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP</p>	<p>Discussion among the faculty</p>	<p>AAVP/Senate, RCA, FPD, FA, ARTP and GPPC Committees, Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Scholarship</p>	<p>begin in 1990-91</p>
	<p>Discussion among the Deans</p>	<p>Academic Deans</p>	
	<p>Discussion among the faculty</p>	<p>AAVP/Senate, RCA, FPD, FA and ARTP Committees, proposed Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Scholarship</p>	
	<p>Discussion among the Deans</p>	<p>Academic Deans</p>	
	<p>Discussion among the faculty</p>	<p>AAVP/FSA/Senate, RCA, FPD, FA and ARTP Committees, proposed Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Scholarship</p>	
	<p>Discussion among the Deans</p>	<p>Academic Deans</p>	
	<p>Discussion among the Deans</p>	<p>Academic Deans</p>	
	<p>Discussion among the Deans</p>	<p>Academic Deans</p>	
	<p>Discussion among the Deans</p>	<p>Academic Deans</p>	
<p>4. edit university documents to avoid a rhetoric that dichotomizes teaching and scholarship</p>			

Description	What	Who	When
<p>5. additional efforts should be made so that an even larger portion of the faculty compete for internal and external grants</p>	<p>1) evaluation of how research positions are distributed 2) evaluation of Foundation policies on dollars returned to departments 3) current policies and practices</p>	<p>ORSP/Research Committee ?</p>	
<p>6. Join the movement for comprehensive Metropolitan Universities</p>	<p>1) participate 2) disseminate information on campus 3) make available materials to faculty through appropriate Senate Committees 4) encourage faculty involvement</p>	<p>President's Office, AAVP President's Office, AAVP AAVP</p>	
<p>7. Extend opportunities for scholarship to administrators.</p>	<p>policy developed policy considered on administrative access to campus research dollars and faculty professional development dollars</p>	<p>President's Office AAVP/ORSP, FPD, RCA Research Committee</p>	<p>begin in 1990-91</p>
<p>DEALING WITH STUDENT SERVICES</p>			
<p>1. Have a comprehensive plan for the systematic and periodic review of student services programs.</p>	<p>plan for non-academic program review is complete</p>	<p>President's Office</p>	
<p>2. Define more clearly the role and responsibilities of various university wide advising and support services and differentiate accountability of these units from faculty in departments.</p>	<p>should clarification occur through a taskforce made up of representatives from relevant programs</p>	<p>USESS School-based programs Academic Policies Committee</p>	
<p>3. Clarify expectations of faculty in advising, specific workload criteria, and implement appropriate incentives.</p>	<p>clarification should be considered</p>	<p>AAVP/FSA/UARIP, AAVP/Academic Policies Committee</p>	

Description	What	Who	When
<p>4. Academic Senate assume greater responsibility for formulation of student life policies.</p>	<p>assess where Senate <u>should</u> be more involved in student life activities</p>	<p>Dean of Students/ USESS/Academic Senate</p>	
<p>5. Planning begin for an addition to the Student Union.</p>	<p>work with ASI and Student Union to gain support for the idea</p>	<p>Dean of Students</p>	
<p>6. Older students be engaged in the life of the campus beyond the classroom.</p>	<p>Begin to establish priorities for educational programs, enrollment and resource allocation.</p>	<p>AAVP/CUP/Deans/ Senate</p>	
<p>DEALING WITH INSTITUTIONAL PURPOSES, PLANNING AND EFFECTIVENESS</p>			
<p>1. Re-examine and question a planning process driven by a consensus view that all existing academic programs should be maintained. Instead, establish programmatic priorities based on academic strengths and institutional and systemwide demographic data.</p>	<p>Discussion</p>	<p>President Deans</p>	
<p>2. Review role of AAVP in establishing priorities, readjusting programmatic/budgetary inequities and implementing academic plans.</p>			
<p>3. Re-examine reporting lines to assure congruence with academic mission.</p>		<p>President/AAVP</p>	