

1992-93
ACADEMIC SENATE
California State University, Sacramento

AGENDA
Thursday, April 22, 1993
Forest Suite, University Union
2:30-4:30 p.m.

INFORMATION

- 3.1. Report of ad hoc Committee on Senate Structure and Function (Attachment A)
Sylvia Navari, ad hoc Committee Chair
- 4.2. Review and comment on CSUS Strategic Plan themes being developed by the Council for University Planning ("Capital Campus," "Diversity," "Enrollment Planning"-- Attachments B-D)
- 1.3. Summary of activities of CSUS Athletics Advisory Board, 1992-93
Rose Leigh Vines, Chair, CSUS Athletic Advisory Board
2. *Grade Appeal Process*
4. Mark Your Calendars! Spring Schedule of Regular Senate Meetings, Thursdays, 2:30-4:30 p.m., Forest Suite, University Union:
5. April 29
May 6, 13, 20 and 27 (finals week, if needed)

CONSENT CALENDAR

AS 93-27/Ex. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS--UNIVERSITY

Interim Dean, School of Engineering and Computer Science, Advisory Committee for the Selection of:

GEETHA RAMACHANDRAN, At-large

KATHERINE FERRARA, Affirmative Action Representative



California State University, Sacramento

SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95819-6036

ACADEMIC SENATE



M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: April 15, 1993

TO: Academic Senators
Department Chairs

FROM: ad hoc Committee on Structure and Function:
Andrew Banta, Engineering and Computer Science
Juanita Barrena, Arts and Sciences
Steve Buss, Arts and Sciences
Mike Fitzgerald, Arts and Sciences
Cecilia Gray, Administration
Sylvia Navari, Health and Human Services (Committee
Chair)
Jerry Tobey, Arts and Sciences

SUBJECT: Committee Report and Recommendation

=====

The ad hoc Committee has completed its work and forwards to you a brief synopsis of its process and findings/conclusions. As a result of its work, the committee is proposing several changes in the structure of the Academic Senate. However, due to the issues facing the Senate, the Executive Committee voted to postpone actions on these proposals until the Fall. In the meantime, the ad hoc Committee wishes to disseminate the results of its deliberations and requests written comments on proposals prior to the end of this semester. Please share this report with your faculties and ask them to send responses to the Senate Office (Adm. 262; Mail Zip 6036) by May 20.

PROCESS

The Committee took its direction from the Senate Retreat held in August, 1993. The results of that retreat are appended hereto. In short, the results of the retreat suggested a reduction in the number and type of Senate committees and a call for improving the communication within the Senate itself.

As a preliminary undertaking, the Committee reviewed and discussed the reports and documents listed below:

1. the 1992-93 Senate Retreat data
2. the Constitution and By-Laws of 15 sister campuses

After reviewing and discussing the above, the Committee embarked on three additional courses of action:

1. it began looking at, discussing, and proposing alternative committee structures for the Senate; and
2. it developed and disseminated to all faculty a questionnaire designed to explore the perceived functions of the Senate and the quality of the Senate's performance (questionnaire, issued December 1, 1992, and results are in Appendix); and
3. it invited 360 faculty, randomly selected by school, to participate in small group discussions about the Senate--its structure, function, performance, and suggestions about how it might improve (invitations issued November 20, 1992, and small groups held December 8-10, synopsis of results in the Appendix).

The committee published its preliminary findings in the Bulletin of February 8, and the Chair gave a brief, but similar, report to the Senate during its meeting in early February.

The committee published its definitive ideas in the Bulletin of March 15, and distributed these same ideas to all chairs of Senate committees with a request to review and comment.

Based on the comments received, the ad hoc Committee finalized its recommendations on March 30, 1993.

FINDINGS/CONCLUSIONS

The data from the various sources is in the Appendix in the following order:

- Senate Retreat
- Questionnaire with quantitative data
- Summary of written comments
- General comments from the small groups

Based on the data, the ad hoc Committee concluded that any proposed changes or actions address the following objectives:

- * reinvigorate the Senate
- * place Senate at the center of university governance
- * strengthen the leadership role of the Senate as the representative voice of the faculty
- * reduce the bureaucratization of the Senate
- * improve communication within the Senate
- * improve communication from the Senate committees to the Executive Committee and the Senate
- * strengthen the role of Senate committees and minimize the Senate's reinventing/rehashing of the work of its committees
- * focus the Senate's agenda on substantive policy matters within its purview and reduce involvement in details of curricula and procedural matters
- * emphasize the role of the Senate as the representative voice of the faculty as a whole in matters of Universitywide concerns rather than a forum for representing departmental concerns
- * reestablish importance in the work of the Senate so that participation in the Senate is not viewed as useless
- * who does the Senator represent, him/herself or department in voting matters

In light of these objectives the ad hoc Committee proposes the following changes in the Constitution of the Faculty and the By-Laws of the Senate (what each change is intended to accomplish is also briefly noted):

- * Chair of the Senate should be leader of all the faculty and thereby elected at large from the faculty;
- * change the electing units from departments to schools in order to streamline the Senate and stop the turf/territorial imperative that currently pervades the Senate; but
- * maintain the voice of departments by allowing departments to bring seconded motions to the floor of the Senate (by a majority vote of the department's faculty);
- * to improve the functioning and status of Senate committees, create three standing policy committees and identify all others as working committees that are time limited and task specific; and
- * modify the Executive Committee so that the chairs of the three standing policy committees are voting members of Executive Committee (the Executive Committee would be the three committee chairs, two Senators at large, the Chair

- and Vice Chair of the Senate--this will definitely improve communication between the major policy committees and the Executive Committee)
- * require the Senate Chair to call two General Faculty meetings/year;
 - * recognize the importance of Emeritus Faculty by making them members of the Faculty and the Senate (albeit non-voting);
 - * modify the existing participation of Student Service Professionals to coincide with reality (Academically Related Student Service Professional positions are almost extinct and all Student Service Professionals are academically related);
 - * to articulate the importance of Senators, there is a requirement that each Senator serve on one of the three policy committees or a working committee of the Senate;

Immediately attached hereto is a "Summary of Proposed Amendments" written and presented in the form we would recommend be used as a ballot in a referendum.

SN:j
Attachments
cc: President Gerth
Senate Committee Chairs

**SUMMARY OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS
TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE FACULTY AND
THE BY-LAWS OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE**

The Academic Senate adopts the following revisions to the constitution of the Faculty for submission to a faculty referendum. **Note: This is not an omnibus bill. Except where separate motions are specifically linked, motions may be adopted or rejected independently.**

Proposed Constitutional Changes

1. *To approve one editorial and one substantive amendment to Article I, Section 2. Membership:*

- a. Editorial change: Identify the membership of the faculty by type--"voting" and "non-voting/ex-officio."
- b. Substantive change: Shall Emeritus Faculty be added to the membership of the Faculty as non-voting/ex-officio members?

2. *To approve substantive amendments to Article I, Section 5, Meetings:*

- a. Shall the Chair of the Academic Senate be required to call two General Faculty meetings during each academic year?
- b. Shall "an action to refer to the Senate" be a permissible action at General Faculty meetings?

3. *To approve a substantive amendment to Article I, Section 6, Qualifications to Vote:*

Shall Academically Related Student Service Professionals be removed from the voting membership of the general faculty (i.e., in elections of the Faculty organization, but not the Senate)?

4. *To approve editorial revisions in Article II, Section 1, General:*

The...of the Faculty organization. The Academic Senate shall be the body of representatives...the membership of the organization known as The Faculty of CSUS.

5. *To approve a substantive addition "E" under Article II, Section 2, Powers:*

Shall the Academic Senate have the prerogative to review and comment upon all non-instructional matters as they affect the academic mission of the University?
 [Note: This addition is related to an existing provision--last sentence in Article II, Section 2.A.]

6. *To approve editorial and substantive amendments to Article II, Section 5, Membership of the Academic Senate (existing Section 5.A is divided into Section A, voting and Section B, ex-officio/non-voting):*

- a. Editorial change: The membership shall be identified as "voting" and "ex-officio/non-voting" members.
- b. Substantive change: Shall the Chair of the Academic Senate be elected by the voting membership of the faculty?
- c. Editorial change: The voting membership shall be the representatives of the electing units as defined in Article II, Section 5.C of this Constitution. Election procedures shall be specified in the By-Laws of the Academic Senate.
- d. Substantive change: Shall "Emeritus Faculty" be added as ex-officio/non-voting members to the Academic Senate?
- e. Substantive change: Shall non-voting student representatives be reduced from three (3) to one (1)?
- f. Substantive change: Shall non-voting staff representatives be reduced from two (2) to one (1)?

8. *To approve substantive changes to Article II, Section 5, B, Representatives of Electing units:*

- a. Shall the electing units be changed from "academic departments or divisions" to "the officially designated schools of the university"? [Note: Not to lose the voice of departments, a provision empowering departments to bring seconded motions to the floor of the Academic Senate is proposed for your approval in the By-Laws, Section II.B, Business Meetings.]
- b. Shall schools have the right to create within themselves sub-units or divisions among their departments for purposes of nominating candidates for election to the Academic Senate?

- c. The number of Representatives of each electing unit shall be determined based on a ratio of 1 representative/25 full time individuals (Faculty or SSP).
 - d. Shall Athletics be included in the electing unit of Temporary Faculty?
 - e. Shall the representative of the electing unit known as Temporary Faculty be reduced from four (4) to two (2)?
 - f. Shall the representatives of each electing unit be elected at large by and from the electing unit? However, in no case shall more than two (2) representatives of the electing unit/school be from the same department?
9. *To approve substantive changes in Article II, Section 6, Terms of Office:*
- a. Shall the term of the Academic Senate Chair be changed from one (1) year to two (2) years?
 - b. Shall the terms of the Senate Chair be limited to two consecutive terms?
 - c. Shall the term of office of a Senator be change from two (2) to three (3) years?
 - e. Shall the terms of an Academic Senator be limited to two (2) consecutive terms.
10. *To approve a substantive amendment to Article II, Section 7. Recall (linked to passage of 6.b of this ballot).*

Shall the recall procedure be as follows?

The Chair of the Academic Senate, who has been elected by the faculty at large, may be removed from office by a 2/3 voting majority of the faculty at large. A recall election shall be conducted within ten (10) instructional days following presentation to the Judicial Review Board of a recall petition signed by twenty-five (25) percent of the members of the faculty eligible to vote in general elections of the faculty; or the Academic Senate may, by a 2/3 majority vote of the eligible representatives, submit to faculty referendum the question to remove the Chair from office. The Chair shall not be subject to recall more than once in any academic year.

Proposed Changes to the By-Laws

Changes in the By-Laws of the Academic Senate are normally made by the Academic Senate without referendum, but because several proposals are far reaching, that is, they are concerned with the conduct of the unit that represents The Faculty (the Senate itself)

and the role and responsibility of Academic Senators, the Academic Senate submits these revisions to the Bylaws to referendum for approval or rejection. [Note: This is not an omnibus bill. Except where separate motions are specifically linked, motions may be adopted or rejected independently.]

1. *To approve substantive changes in Section II, B, Business Meetings:*

Shall academic departments or divisions, on the basis of a majority vote of the eligible faculty of the academic department, have the right to bring seconded motions to the floor of the Academic Senate? [Note: This change is linked to approval of the proposed constitutional change of electing units, Article II, Section 5.B of the Constitution.]

2. *To approve a substantive change to Section III, A, 3 (Offices of the Academic Senate, Officers and Executive Committee):*

Shall the five members of the Executive Committee be changed from five (5) elected at large by and from the Academic Senate to the three (3) chairs of the major policy committees of the Academic Senate (Curriculum, Faculty Affairs, and Academic Policies and Student Affairs) and two Academic Senators, all of whom are to be elected at large by and from the Academic Senate?

3. *To approve substantive changes to Section IV, Committees of the Academic Senate:*

Shall Section IV, Committees of the Academic Senate, be amended to read as follows?

The Committees of the Academic Senate shall be the Executive Committee, the Committee on Committees, three standing **policy** committees (Curriculum, Faculty and Staff Affairs, and Academic Policies and Student Affairs), and such other working committees as the Academic Senate may establish (the policy committees and other committees are described below. These descriptions would be added to the By-Laws. There are no changes in the charge or membership of the Committee on Committees):

a. Curriculum Committee

- 1) *Membership (7 Senators and 5 faculty at large): Of the 7 Senators, 3 must be from departments with graduate programs.
- 2) *Charge: [DRAFT IN PROGRESS--will be disseminated upon completion.]

b. Faculty and Staff Affairs Committee

- 1) *Membership (7 Senators and 5 faculty at large):
- 2) *Charge: [DRAFT IN PROGRESS--will be disseminated upon completion.]

c. Academic Policies and Student Affairs Committee

- 1) *Membership (7 Senators and 5 faculty at large): Of the 7 Senators, 1 must be a Student Services Professional and of the 5 faculty at large, 1 must be from the Student Services Professionals.
- 2) *Charge: [DRAFT IN PROGRESS--will be disseminated upon completion.]

d. Other Committees

The Academic Senate may create working or ad hoc committees as deemed necessary by the Senate upon recommendation by the Executive Committee. All working or ad hoc committees shall be task and time specific and shall be attached to one of the Senate's three standing policy committees and each shall report to the Senate through its designated standing committee. The Academic Senate shall act upon recommendation of policy and receive interpretation of policy only when such recommendations or interpretations come from one of the standing policy committees of the Senate by way of the Executive Committee. [Note: Any existing working committees requiring elections, i.e., G.E. Course Review, Research and Creative Activity, etc., will be maintained in accordance with their charges and procedures.]

4. *To approve a substantive addition to the By-Laws, a Section VI, entitled, "Role and Responsibilities of Senators":*

- a. Role--the role of an Academic Senator shall be to communicate with and represent his/her electing unit at meetings of the Academic Senate in a manner reflective of the will of his/her constituents.
- b. Responsibilities--the responsibilities of Academic Senators are several:
 - 1) Each Senator is required to serve on one of the Senate's Standing Policy Committees or one of the working committees of the Standing Committees, or a University Committee.
 - 2) Each Senator is expected to participate in duly held Senate meetings and to represent the collective sense of his/her constituents.

SENATE STRUCTURE AND FUNCTION:
PERCEIVED PROBLEMS & RESPONSES
ARTICULATED AT SENATE RETREAT, '92

PROBLEM #1: Responsibilities of Senators

There is confusion re the following:

- A. Responsibilities as representatives of a constituency: To what extent should we 1) inform constituents re Senate issues and 2) attempt to determine the position of a majority of constituents on issues prior to voting?
- B. Responsibilities of Senate representatives to standing committees: To what extent should Senators serve as liaisons between their committee and the body? How should their role differ from that of appointees from each school or at large appointees?
- C. Responsibilities in Senate meetings: Are Senators expected to present the views of their constituents, or themselves, or both?

RETREAT RECOMMENDATIONS

- c 1) Place "big" issues as first reading items and sort through them in relation to their relevance for consultation with constituents.
- tf 2) Roles and responsibilities of Senate appointees to standing committee should be specified.
- tf 3) The following structural changes in committees should be considered:
 - a. Senate elect chair and vice-chair of standing committees
 - b. Senate representatives to committees serve as chair and vice chair
 - c. reduce number of committees and subset some under others
 - d. increase number of Senate members on major policy committees
 - e. expand membership of major policy committees with non-Senate members; have ad hoc or standing subcommittees chaired by member of the major policy committee, with most members from outside. (EX: Major policy committee = Educational Policies, with subcommittees for undergraduate programs and policies, graduate programs and policies, and academic policies. Chair of each subcommittee is member of Educational Policies.)
- fd 4) Have to be both--report the sentiment of the unit, but vote and represent your own views

APPENDIX

REPORT OF THE

ad hoc COMMITTEE ON SENATE STRUCTURE AND FUNCTION

April, 1993

PROBLEM #2: Role of Senate in university governance:

There is confusion and sometimes perceived conflict re the relationship of the Senate to:

- A. The Council for University Planning.
- B. The Council of Deans.
- C. The Vice President for Academic Affairs' Office.
- D. The Budget Allocation Group.
- E. The Office of Faculty and Staff Affairs.
- F. The CFA.
- G. School governance structures.

RETREAT RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1) Communication--Senate members are communicators
- 2) Collegiality--both ways, actions speak louder than words
- 3) Informal Interface--policy leads to implementation
- 4) Not a policy group, see CUP
- 5) ? does it have a role in governance
- 6) See M.O.U.
- 7) See Task Force

THERE MUST BE COMMUNICATION BETWEEN ALL THESE GROUPS

PROBLEM #3: Orientation of new senators:

It takes new senators a year to feel comfortable enough with what's going on to participate in debates. There is a lack of orientation to the following:

- A. Senate Constitution & By-laws.
- B. Senate and University committees.
- C. University administrative structure.
- D. Robert's Rules of Order.
- E. Action language vs. discussion language.

RETREAT RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1) Distribute at or before orientation and give brief comment
- 2) Distribute committee charges and explain
- 3) Distribute organization chart, review, and explain work flow
- 4) Continue Mentoring Program

PROBLEM #4: Professional Identity:

The Senate does not pay enough attention to issues such as

- A. Professional vision and ideals: what do we think we are doing here? What are we striving for, as professionals in this institution of higher education?
- B. Building a sense of community and shared ideals among faculty, and between faculty, staff, and administration.

RETREAT RECOMMENDATIONS:

FAC A1) Could clarify identity

A2) Could use Faculty Handbook (to be developed) to articulate and communicate identity--include vision "things", need to know "things", and how to implement "things"--study handbooks from other campuses for ideas

FAC B1) Community

- a) could use more of
- b) especially need a faculty club
- c) study institutions who do better
- d) occasional broad appeal convocations
- e) narrower interdisciplinary talks
- f) social activities/parties

PROBLEM # 5: Senate committees:

- A. Senate members of committees do not see themselves as providing a liaison function to and from the body.
- B. The body is largely ignorant of committee agendas or committee recommendations until the latter are received in final form.
- C. Committee recommendations often confuse policy and procedure.

RETREAT RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1) Reduce the number of committees
- 2) Chairs to be members of Senate
- 3) Chairs to be members of Ex. Committee
- 4) Have regular liaison report to Senate
- 5) Never mind consensus or one recommendation--report the opinion clusters
- 6) Special committees for in-depth analysis
- 7) Require School Reps on Ex. Committee

PROBLEM #6: Relationship of the Senate to the faculty at large:

- A. There is widespread ignorance/apathy about the Senate.
- B. There are widespread negative perceptions of the Senate as irrelevant, dominated by a small vocal group, etc.

RETREAT RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1) Develop Faculty Handbook, include Senate information;
- 2) Cover Senate activity in Bulletin by "framing the debates" and not just including agenda and actions;
- 3) Chair and Vice Chair of Senate to maintain a "presence" among Faculty by making presentation in departments;
- 4) Streamline Senate meetings, particularly paying attention to time allotted for speakers/open forum; move more to consent calendar.

PROBLEM #7: Relationship of the Senate to university committees:

- A. University committees have no reporting relationship to the Senate or other faculty bodies.
- B. The role of faculty serving on university committees is unclear. To whom are they accountable? Whom do they represent?
- C. There is overlap/lack of clarity in the charge to specific university and senate committees.

RETREAT RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1) What is a University Committee? Out of a total of 44, 5 seem especially significant (but need full list): CUP, Academic Telecommunications, Campus Ed. Equity Comm., Lottery Fund Allocations, Aids Advisory Board.
- 2) Request that the Executive Committee be informed re critical issues being discussed in CUP, so that EC can provide Senate input to CUP's deliberations
- 3) Senate appointees to CUP represent Faculty--if not a senator take back infor. to respective department for support and transmittal to Senate via department Senator.

PROBLEM #8: Contributing to the quality of the professorate:

The Senate pays infrequent attention to sensitive professional issues such as:

- A. Periodic review" of full professors.
- B. Expectations for faculty performance.
- C. RTP criteria and standards.
- D. Professional Leave Policy.

RETREAT RECOMMENDATIONS

- FAC 1) We should obtain more information RE: the extent to which the items listed (and others) do in fact lead to diminished quality of the teaching faculty.
- FAC 2) Senate should develop process for identifying plus correcting factors which reduce the quality of teaching.

PROBLEM #9: Contributing to the quality of the academic program:

The Senate pays infrequent attention to sensitive academic issues such as:

- A. Defining standards and evaluating the quality of academic programs.
- B. Setting standards and expectations for student performance.

RETREAT RECOMMENDATIONS--NOT DISCUSSED

PROBLEM #10: Contributing to the quality of student life:

The Senate pays infrequent attention to its responsibilities for:

- A. Monitoring the effectiveness of student advising.
- B. Promoting faculty involvement in student life.
- C. Developing recommendations on student services.

RETREAT RECOMMENDATIONS

- APC A1) What is the effect of new policy of requirement that departments distribute CAR forms?
- APC A2) Would it be helpful to share information as to how departments manage academic advisement?
- APC A3) Consider recommending policies to promote consistency among departments.

- c B1) Promote faculty involvement by publishing information on student groups which need faculty advisors.
- fd B2) Cooperate with issue related events--encourage student attendance by dismissing classes (EX. ROTC, war in the Middle East)
- C1) Is this even an areas that the Academic Senate should enter?

c = consent
 tf = task force
 fd = floor debate
 FAC = Faculty Affairs Committee
 APC = Academic Policies Committee

December 1, 1992

Response Requested
 By December 16, 1992

Dear Colleague,

The Academic Senate, through its ad hoc Committee on Senate Structure and Function, is doing its own version of a "self-study." Your participation is respectfully requested and urgently needed. Please complete this survey (right now--it takes 10 minutes), fold it in half, staple edge, and drop in the campus mail.

1. We would like to know what you think the Senate a) should be doing, b) is doing, and c) how effective it is re the things it is doing. Below is a list of roles and functions. In Column "A" place a check mark () next to those things you think the Senate should be doing; in Column "B" place a check mark () next to those things you think the Senate is doing; and in Column "C" identify how effective the Senate is re the things it is doing. For Column C, Effectiveness, use the grading of "A-F" and our euphemism "I" for "Don't Know."

	A B C		
	Senate Should (Mark " ")	Senate Does (Mark " ")	Senate's Effectiveness (Mark A, F, or I)
a. Be the voice of the faculty			
b. Be the forum for faculty debate on matters pertaining to the University			
c. Be the official communication mechanism of the faculty			
d. Develop and recommend curriculum			
e. Evaluate curriculum			
f. Develop and recommend academic policies			
g. Evaluate academic policies (e.g., add/drop, grading)			

6. Please use the remaining space (attach additional sheets if need be) to provide any additional comments or evaluative statements that you think would be helpful in our "self-study" efforts.

	A	B	C
	Senate Should (Mark " ")	Senate Does (Mark " ")	Senate's Effectiveness (Mark A-F or I)
h. Develop and recommend academic procedures (e.g., grade appeals)			
i. Evaluate academic procedures			
j. Develop and recommend capital improvements			
k. Develop and comment upon the CSUS budget			
l. Recommend the allocation of CSUS operating funds			
m. Recommend the allocation of operating funds pertaining to the instructional program			
n. others--list any other roles or functions you think pertain and mark the columns accordingly			

2. Do you understand the Senate as a forum for faculty debate?
Yes No Do not know and to speak openly?
3. Do you feel free to go to Senate meetings and to speak openly?
Yes No Not sure
4. This question has four (4) parts. Please answer each part:
Do you think the Senate is important to:
 - a. The University's achievement of its mission?
Yes No Don't know
 - b. Your School's achievement of its mission?
Yes No Don't know
 - c. Your Department's achievement of its goals/objectives?
Yes No Don't know
 - d. You, as an academician?
Yes No Don't know
5. Demographics
 - a. Have you ever been a Senator?
Yes No
 - b. Have you ever served on a Senate committee (including subcommittees)?
Yes No
 - c. Are you (check one):
Tenured Probationary Lecturer
- d. Please place a check mark () next to your school

A&S E&CS
H&HS SBA
EDUC
- e. Do you know who your Senator(s) is (are)?
Yes No Unsure

Thanks for your time!

Sylvia Navari, Academic Senate Vice Chair and
Convener, ad hoc Committee on Senate Structure and Function

Fold, staple, and drop in CAMPUS MAIL.

SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS FROM QUESTIONNAIRE

- Senate to be more critical of administration and not so willing to climb into bed. Far too much collusion.
- a) Only Senate can speak for faculty, b) Bylaws and procedures should promote fair and efficient evaluation and development of policy, c) Senate digresses into micro-managing, d) provide forum for faculty to air points of view.
- A majority of all eligible faculty should be required to vote on certain issues. If 50% +1 cannot be obtained, then a collective will does not exist. Example of issues: scholarship, vision statement, strategic plan, priorities.
- a) Senate involved in things it should not be involved in AND is ineffective in areas it should be doing, b) until it lets administrators run University, CSUS is determined to be a second rate institution, c) voice of faculty is raised to block innovative ideas.
- Senate is too large to be effective. Each school should elect one and only one senator.
- Senate is simply not important to me. It behaves inefficiently, biasedly.
- Senate should never speak for the faculty in matters that are not University specific.
- Democracy is painful at times. The Senate, as a form of democracy, was and is often painful to experience.
- Need to work on innovation in curriculum across academic disciplines.
- I'm new here so I don't know much about the Senate.
- Extensive comment: gets bogged down in bureaucracy; problem is to make Senate work--particularly committees; problem with committees on curriculum (including G.E. Course Review) because members are poorly informed, lack expertise; since the Senate is an academic senate (not faculty senate), role is compromised.
- Keep up the good work and continue to do all that you can to boost faculty morale and "save" faculty from "?"
- a) Reevaluate use of Senate committees to streamline system, b) provide greater autonomy for each committee, c) there is much redundancy in things done.
- Overall Senate is doing alright.
- a) Senate is prone to micro-managing, b) term limits for the longer lived, longer ?, no longer effective
- a) Committee structure good but Senate the forum for self-aggrandizement. Good of students is lower priority than FTE, b) Senate to close to union, c) sick of tendency to "personalize" controversy.
- Senate is tool of administration--it keeps Senate occupied with low level work just to keep Senate off President's back.
- I ranked Senate very low because it gets involved in micro-managing. It takes political stands on issues it should not. It attempts curricular evaluations in which it has no expertise.
- Senate should maintain position as a leader in the academic sphere. Concern that faculty on the Senate believe our curriculum should reflect job market when it should teach students to think. Concern that we might become a trade school.

SUMMARY OF ALL SENATE SURVEYS

	Does	Shld	Effec	"I's"
1a Be the voice of the faculty	98	83	C	14
1b Be the forum for faculty debate	100	90	C+	15
1c Be official comm of faculty	73	60	C	18
1d Develop and recommend curriculum	35	45	C+	20
1e Evaluate curriculum	56	61	C+	23
1f Develop and recommend policy	93	88	B-	14
1g Evaluate academic policy	89	84	B-	19
1h Develop and recomm procedures	89	81	B-	28
1i Evaluate academic procedure	84	70	C+	31
1j Develop and recomm cap. imprvmts	47	21	D+	22
1k Develop and comment budget	60	34	C-	21
1l Recomm alloc of operating funds	48	20	D+	17
1m Recomm instruct funds	55	23	C-	19
1n Other	4	-	-	-

	Yes	No	Don't Know
2 Senate as debate forum?	95	12	9
3 Free to speak at Senate?	74	31	11
4a Important to mission?	90	12	11
4b Important to Sch mission?	71	36	17
4c Important to Dept mission?	49	54	14
4d Important to you?	56	46	16

	Yes	No
5a Have you been senator?	69	53
5b Served on Senate committee?	97	25

	Probationary Lecturer			
	Yes	No	LIB	OTHER
5c Are you?	89	19	10	
	A&S	E&CS	H&HS	SBA

	Yes				No				Unsure	
5d School?	58	8	21	13	14	3	4			

5e Do you know your senator?	100	12	2
------------------------------	-----	----	---

3/8/93

- Weaknesses of the Senate are in the process/outcomes. Senators operate with too much of "territorial imperative" and the discussions are often long-winded, repetitive. Senate should monitor courses where students perform, e.g., athletes, musicians, dancers because they can be exploited.
- The Senate is not the only forum for debate. The physical structure of the room is not conducive to debate; the politics and hidden agendas dominate the discussions and place non-allied groups at a disadvantage. The chair has too much power. Might establish Allied Councils representing five schools so that faculty can have better understanding and sensitivity to the unique needs of the schools.
- The ineffectiveness of the Senate is obvious in its recent revision of general education. Instead of truly looking at redirection or innovation in terms of condensing or collaborating on G.E. coursework, the entire project consisted of nest feathering and turf protection of Arts and Sciences departments.
- Too much time is spent at Senate meetings with long and boring debates on less significant issues. Matters should be prioritized (maybe by Executive Committee) as to importance and time limits assigned. Then the important matters at the end of the meeting would not be so likely to receive less attention than is needed. Senate needs to carefully examine which matters it should deal with, recognizing that some issues should be left to Administration, CUP and/or CFA.
- Too much time is spent on issues like parking when more substantial issues should be debated.
- The Senate is not in "tune" with issues that relate to my role. "They" must not be busy enough teaching if they have so much time to deliberate and debate for months some of the same issues.
- Students need to get more involved!
- I usually don't know what items the Senate is discussing and often find out too late to make any difference. For example, graduation requirements for language and additional English writing requirements accomplished before faculty knew what was happening.
- Senate should eliminate parallel decision-making and always act as watchdog over the antics of the Central Administration.
- It should resist being seduced into becoming a resource secretariat to the administration.
- Senate should hire and fire the president, vice presidents and other high level administrators. Senate should monitor their performance.
- Schools and departments need a similar governing mechanism to review Senate decisions and policies and report directly to the faculty.
- The Senate is an arm of Arts and Sciences.
- The Senate is irrelevant.
- The Senate is disorganized, unfocused and undisciplined, and the Senate does not, and does not appear to want to, represent all schools.
- Senate oversteps bounds and has too many self-serving factions.

GENERAL COMMENTS FROM SMALL GROUPS

Senate Performance - Average (C)

- it gets bogged down in minutia
- it micro-manages
- involved in issues it should not be involved in (like trying to run the University)
- nothing of substance gets done in either the Senate or the committees
- does not focus on substantive policy issues

Senate Structure

- too large
- too many committees
- committees have no autonomy
- too much parallel and duplicative work
- nothing gets done in either the Senate or the committees
- see notes from memorandum of 1-4-93

Faculty Relations (vis-a-vis Senate)

- need more general faculty meetings
- need better communication among faculty
- much apathy among faculty towards Senate for lots of reasons: Arts and Sciences controlled, control by a few, does not accomplish anything, does not engage all faculty, no continuity in committees, too many faculty do not know what Senate is/is not, untenured faculty afraid to speak openly in Senate meetings (were told by senior faculty to be senators for purposes of retention)
- Senate needs to help boost faculty morale

Senate Membership Needs Revamping

- too large; too turf oriented; does not communicate effectively with all the faculty (more general faculty meetings and convocations); needs to make each faculty member feel included

Senate should focus on building morale of faculty.

Institutional Status

Draft Theme Paper on "Capital Campus"

Opportunities and Challenges

California State University, Sacramento faces a tremendous opportunity to achieve greater distinction by virtue of its location in the state capital.

As a regional University, CSUS is obligated to be a university of, not simply in, its particular location. Its mission includes a dedication to address the educational and cultural needs of the people in the region and it in turn reaps the benefits of the region as a "learning laboratory" for its students and faculty. With a region that encompasses the capital of the largest state in the nation, we face an opportunity unequalled by most universities of our kind. Our region serves as the nexus for the official work of the executive and legislative branches of state government. In addition, the capital attracts varied and extensive quasi-public and private organizations and activities that seek to affect the direction of the state's economic, social, and cultural development. As an additional asset, the citizens of our region are more than casually interested in civic and public affairs. This environment creates a unique learning laboratory for our students and faculty and provides myriad opportunities for our faculty to share their expertise in ways that will enhance the state's future.

CSUS functions in an increasingly competitive environment. We must compete with other institutions of higher education, including many in our own system, for the best students, staff, and faculty. We must compete with other state agencies for the public tax dollar. And we must compete with institutions of all kinds for private financial support. The challenges of this competitive environment are heightened by a nationwide trend toward increased accountability by higher education institutions for the dollars they receive. We need more than ever before to convey to our constituencies the very real benefits of our academic enterprise. A strong competitive advantage, such as that provided by our location in the state capital, can serve us well in this competition for human and financial resources.

We face several challenges in developing the university as a capital campus. One major challenge is to build upon and develop our natural strengths in capital-related programs in an inclusive way so as to allow broad participation across the campus. There are opportunities in every school for significant capital-related activities. Second, the capital campus orientation must not be pursued at the expense of other comparative advantages we enjoy, e.g. academic telecommunications capability, significant international connections. Third, we must engage in capital-related programs and activities without being caught up in partisan politics. And finally, we must convert this advantage into significantly increased revenues so that capital campus activities do not occur at the expense of other high priority programs and initiatives in the University.

Designating this university as the "capital campus" is not a new idea. A review of historical campus publications finds frequent mention of CSUS as the "capital campus." Official campus stationery has previously proclaimed this identity. Our current mission statement uses the label as well. However, this could be interpreted as just a statement of geographic fact, not a recognition of the responsibilities and opportunities attendant to designation as a capital campus.

Our academic programs already take frequent advantage of the capital location to create learning laboratories for our students. For example, undergraduate student internships in the School of Arts and Sciences are overwhelmingly linked to state government and quasi-governmental offices. The "Sacramento Semester" Program in the Department of Government has placed undergraduates from throughout the CSU system in state government internships since 1976. Cooperative education placements in the School of Engineering and Computer Science are often with firms and government agencies that work on problems of major significance to state agencies, such as mass transportation and earthquake safety. Placements of Nursing, Criminal Justice, and Social Work students are frequently with government agencies involved in issues of statewide policy significance. Other examples abound.

Our degree programs themselves have been responsive to our location. Two examples of this are (1) the International Business concentration in the BS program in Business Administration, in response to the international dimensions of the state's economy, and (2) the Masters program in Anthropology which educates contract archaeologists whose work is directly linked to the expenditure of public dollars for transportation and other "infrastructures". Again, there are many such examples.

The scholarly activities of many of our faculty draw on the unique advantages of the capital location. For example, Geology faculty worked with the California Department of Health Services to develop a water well training facility on campus. English department faculty work on the California Literature Project which serves as a statewide resource on literature. Faculty in all schools receive state grants and contracts to apply their expertise to a wide array of issues of interest to state government, some individually and some through centers or institutes.

Within the last decade several new initiatives have been developed that link the campus to state government. Campus faculty provide leadership and teach students at the post baccalaureate level who serve as fellows for the State Senate and Assembly and for the Executive branch. A new masters degree in Public Policy and Administration was started in 1989 in response to demand from capital employers. The Center for California Studies has greatly expanded the role of CSUS in the development of California-related curriculum throughout the CSU system and the promotion of greater understanding by public officials and the state's citizens of issues concerning the state's future.

Despite these many involvements by our students and faculty in activities germane to the

capital, there has been little coherence to our capital-related efforts and a good deal of resistance by segments of the University community to expanding those efforts. Much of the faculty activity is done through individual connections; little is coordinated at the school or University level. In addition, much of the contribution of our faculty and students goes unnoticed by the campus at large and unpublicized to the region. There is fear that a concerted capital orientation will undermine the traditional liberal arts focus and give undue privilege to selected academic programs.

Strategic Options

The principal choice facing us in our planning is the extent to which we develop our comparative advantage of location in the state capital. This involves two separate decisions. First, to what extent do we bring together, and bring to the University as an institution, the various capital-related activities that are already in existence? We could leave capital connections to develop as a result of individual faculty initiative or we could provide a framework to support faculty in these endeavors and to encourage interaction among those faculty and students who choose to pursue such involvement. Second, to what extent do we expand the capital-related programs and activities in which we engage? The growing problems of the state and the increasing capacity of our institution could support expanded capital-related programs and activities if we so chose to undertake them.

Vision

CSUS will be known throughout the state and beyond as a leader in educational programs, scholarship, and service as they each relate to issues of salience to the state's future. Undergraduate and graduate students in academic programs spanning all five schools will make good use of the learning laboratories provided by state and state-related agencies and organizations. The strong liberal arts foundations of our University will be enhanced, not threatened, by the capital campus orientation. Our faculty will be viewed by government, business, and the news media as sources of knowledge and expertise in a broad range of areas of use to furthering the prospects of the state of California. The campus will be a center for conferences, workshops, and cultural events of significance to the future of the state of California.

Recommendations

Stemming from the two main strategic options outlined above, the following approach concentrates, in the short-term, on giving greater focus and direction to ongoing capital-related efforts and moving, in the long-term, to expand such efforts:

Short-term (1-2 years):

1. Complete a directory of CSUS programs and initiatives already underway that

demonstrate our capital campus orientation; disseminate the directory on- and off-campus.

2. Create a clearinghouse of CSUS faculty and students with expertise in areas useful to policy makers, governmental employees, and others interested in state government issues; disseminate on- and off-campus.
3. Sponsor forums on campus for faculty, students, and staff already involved or interested in capital campus activities.
4. Begin an active campaign to publicize to the Sacramento region our capital campus activities (beyond the dissemination of the directory and clearinghouse).
5. Identify a lead person on campus (not a new position) to give coherence to the various capital campus programs and activities on the campus.
6. Establish a mechanism for ensuring that capital campus initiatives do not entail ethical problems for the University.

Long-term (3-10 years):

1. Increase the grant and contract activity in support of capital-oriented projects for faculty and students.
2. Develop increased fund raising capability based on promotion of the capital campus concept.
3. Establish in each school one or more councils of persons from the state government community (broadly defined to include people from outside government who follow state policy issues) and school faculty to exchange ideas about how each school can orient its programs and activities to the capital.

rates of students by contributing to a supportive environment and providing models of success.

The challenge of maintaining harmony among a diverse campus community is becoming increasingly clear as incidents of intolerance occur all too frequently on college campuses and generally across the land. Multi-culturalism is a natural consequence of diversity, as individuals take the opportunity to express their identity as members of groups. The challenge is to support and foster expressions of group identity and ensure that they do not threaten the whole of the institution by manifesting exclusionary or balkanizing tendencies, but, in fact, enrich it. This striving for pluralism is an opportunity as well as a challenge, since education within a pluralistic community is a broadening experience for all members.

A principal way for a university to achieve pluralism is to build and maintain a curriculum which does not exclude anyone or discourage anyone from learning. This challenge extends to specific disciplines, i.e. we do not want underrepresented students to feel excluded from some academic programs and choose others in disproportionate numbers as a result. The opportunity to meet these challenges has increased tremendously as more has been learned about the diverse cultures which make up our region and about how curricula can be conveyed to diverse populations.

Institutional Status

The University has considerable data on representation which show that the University is generally making progress toward meeting numerical representation goals for students, faculty, and staff. However, representation goals with respect to the enrollment, retention, and graduation of students are in a state of transition. Existing goals are stated in terms of year-to-year increases, which is problematic in times of significant enrollment decline. A new definition of "underrepresented" given us by the Chancellor's Office will result in an adjustment of campus representation goals to be stated in terms of benchmarks of "underrepresentedness." It appears that, regardless of the precise goal, graduation rates of all underrepresented groups are more problematic than enrollment or retention. Organizational structures on campus appear adequate for setting representation goals and monitoring progress toward their attainment. At this time there is no monitoring of representation by discipline and there is a wide variation in the extent to which various major programs enroll students from underrepresented groups. With regard to representation goals for faculty, the steady erosion of state funds poses a threat to the retention of junior faculty, many of whom were hired with special attention to the contribution they would make to diversity in the University community.

Somewhat more problematic is the status with regard to the campus climate and co-curricular programs. While there are numerous co-curricular programs aimed at supporting diverse campus groups, there is, on the one hand, strong demand for more such programs to serve as "home bases" for various groups, and, on the other hand, a view that fragmentation and competition among such programs diminishes the effectiveness of this approach. Efforts to better integrate these programs into the mainstream of campus programs are ongoing but few

Draft Theme Paper on Diversity

Introduction: Definition of Terms

This theme addresses a number of important concepts, which are best defined before presenting the body of the paper. The Planning Committee does not presume that these are universally accepted definitions. Rather, we want to be clear about how we used the terms in crafting the discussion paper:

diversity: an objective condition of numerical representation of a variety of groups, with no social or cultural implications.

multi-cultural: the condition of many distinct cultures coexisting without any being so dominant as to suppress any other (diversity is a pre-condition for multi-culturalism). "Culture" is broadly conceived to include those based on ethnic, national, sexual orientation, religious, or disability differences.

pluralism: the condition in which numerous distinct groups and cultures coexist within one society or institution and in some sense are unified (e.g. the former Yugoslavia is "multi-cultural" but is not "pluralistic").

affirmative action: active assistance to individuals from underrepresented groups to overcome the significant institutional and social barriers to achieving diversity. (This paper does not focus on affirmative action.)

Opportunities and Challenges

We see three dimensions to diversity: (1) representation, (2) the nature of the campus community, including co-curricular offerings, and (3) the curriculum. Each dimension has unique opportunities and challenges.

The challenge of representation derives from the demographic imperative by which California will have a majority of minorities by 1997. Maintaining a university that did not matriculate and graduate students from traditionally underrepresented groups at reasonable rates would indeed be a disservice to the diverse population of the state and region. Moreover, the diversity of the region provides an opportunity to enrich the academic programs and life experiences of all those in the campus community and to pave the way for a more harmonious society. The challenge of representation applies to faculty and staff as much as to students, for the same reasons as well as the additional one that a diverse workforce can improve the success

Vision

We view balanced representation of diverse populations in our faculty, staff, and student body as a necessary precondition to achieving a multi-cultural and pluralistic campus community, not as a goal in itself. Our vision extends well beyond the accomplishment of statistical diversity. We seek a campus community where differences enrich the lives of all members, where all individuals feel respected, where all feel an affinity with the whole institution, and where the integrity of the institution is not threatened by the salience of group membership. We envision a university moving pro-actively to accomplish this vision in the near future. Curricular activities responsive to all populations are an essential part of this vision. We seek as well a curriculum that discourages no one from the pursuit of their educational goals and that includes culturally diverse content where appropriate.

Recommendations

Short-term (1-2 years):

1. Institute special retention efforts for junior faculty, particularly those from traditionally under-represented groups.
2. Expand efforts to infuse multi-cultural content into the curriculum with particular emphasis on major programs that have had historically low enrollments of underrepresented students.
3. Institute faculty and staff training programs on inter-cultural communication and sensitivity.
4. Increase opportunities for inter-cultural contacts across the university.
5. Expand faculty professional development activities in the area of effective pedagogy in a multi-cultural classroom.
6. Complete and act on recommendations of educational equity assessment.

Long-term (3-10 years):

1. Significantly improve graduation rates of all underrepresented student groups.
2. Meet representation goals for graduate students.
3. Establish a research capability to study issues of diversity in California and the region.
4. Consider developing stronger and larger academic programs in the study of diversity issues, in concert with the research unit mentioned above.
5. Establish a framework and perhaps a timetable for moving toward greater consolidation of support services. Study efforts of other universities in this area.
6. Incorporate issues of diversity and cultural pluralism into the academic program review process.

resources are devoted to emphasizing the "wholeness" or the "pluralistic" aspects of the campus community. CSUS enrolls international students from over seventy countries, who tend to feel they have no "home base" equivalent to those provided to groups of American students. A multi-faceted assessment project of campus educational equity programs is underway as is a study of the "campus climate". Both should help set directions for improving the degree to which the co-curricular programs and the overall climate enhance the university experiences of all students.

With regard to curriculum, a Race and Ethnicity graduation requirement has been instituted. The "Beyond the Canon" program has worked with faculty to infuse multi-cultural content into the curriculum of General Education courses in a small number of disciplines and is intended to expand to other disciplines. There has been significantly less effort expended on diversifying the curriculum in the majors. There continues to be strong resistance in many departments to such change. The issue of effective pedagogy has been given only a modicum of attention, primarily through the Faculty Professional Development program. There are small academic programs covering women's and ethnic studies that have not been developed into areas of strength and priority within the University.

Strategic Options

The major choice in the dimension of representation is the emphasis given to achievement of strict numbers representation as a goal. Are we to be satisfied simply by meeting demographic quotas or is there to be a consensus to move well beyond an emphasis on legal mandates and statistics (i.e. the counting of differences) to a striving for multi-culturalism and pluralism?

With respect to the campus community and co-curricular offerings, the choice concerns how proactive the University intends to be to achieve a pluralistic community. We can continue the current posture of fostering multi-culturalism by offering an array of support services for various groups and holding cultural events in recognition of cultural differences. Or, we can escalate such efforts and give more emphasis to achieving pluralism, perhaps to the point of mandating inter-cultural communication training for faculty and staff and re-structuring co-curricular programs to reward cooperative efforts.

A similar choice regarding level of effort pertains to the curricular dimension of diversity. We could continue the pace of gradual change, aided by the turnover in faculty, or we could accelerate the pace of change by expanding efforts to diversify the curriculum of major programs and engage large numbers of faculty in efforts to adapt pedagogy to a diverse environment. A separate choice involves the academic disciplines that explicitly study issues of diversity. Should such programs be identified as potential areas of excellence and given the resources and attention necessary to develop that potential?

Draft Theme Paper on Enrollment Planning

Opportunities and Challenges

As a strategic theme, enrollment planning addresses opportunities and challenges in terms of 1) growth and access, 2) balance and mix, and 3) non-traditional enrollment.

Growth and access are legally, demographically, and socially mandated. We are legally mandated to accept high school graduates from the upper one-third of their graduating classes. Since there is abundant demographic evidence that the number of high school graduates is expected to increase annually for at least the next fifteen years, the number of eligible applicants will continually grow. In the social sphere, there is evidence that college level education provides benefits to the individual and to society in excess of its cost. As society needs educated citizens to continue to function effectively, access to education is vital. So too is access to re-education, since the skills that are learned today are obsolete tomorrow. So the need for educational access makes the need to grow imperative.

In defining the desired balance and mix of our institution, we decide who we are and how we will serve our various stakeholders. Our goals will be expressed in terms of student level (undergraduate:graduate, lower division:upper division), in terms of ethnic and cultural diversity, and in terms of the number and size and scope of academic programs.

Enrolling students in alternative instructional modes will allow us to better serve the modern needs of the population in our service area. Establishing alternative ways of delivering educational products and services to students throughout (and even beyond) our service region will be necessary as our institution grows and evolves. These additional modes of delivery can reduce the need for students to commute long distance to campus, and they will allow CSUS to remain competitive with other institutions who may wish to offer services in our region.

Institutional Status

Growth and access are currently being restricted by the bounds of budget and conventional thinking. Students demand for services from the CSU system have been artificially constrained because the State of California has not been providing funding to conduct education as usual. No one in the State, System, or Institution has yet proposed a viable long-term plan for dealing with the opportunities and challenges posed by the growing demand for access, perhaps because no one is quite ready to suggest innovative, and hence risky, changes. CSUS' planning is constrained because our plans must be subordinated to plans of the CSU System and the State of California.

Our definitions of balance and mix are in their infancy. In addition, there are limited "tools" that can be applied to effect the balance and mix that we ultimately desire. The *Policy on Instructional Program Priorities (IPP)* ranges for student level (undergraduate:graduate; lower division:upper division) are threatened by forces inside as well as outside the institution. The undergraduate to graduate balance is endangered, in part, because of campus ambivalence towards graduate education. Because of fee differentials and a campus life that does not appeal to full-time, four-year students, we are unable to attract sufficient numbers of qualified lower division students to meet our undergraduate-balance goals. With respect to ethnic and cultural diversity, our student population is generally diverse, and is becoming more representative of our source population. The diversity theme of the strategic plan addresses the representation issues. Finally, our recent attempts to use the *IPP* to define the number, size, and scope of academic programs have met the obstacles of campus politics and inter-program conflict.

Non-traditional instructional opportunities abound. However, there are significant questions to be addressed in terms of compensating, motivating, and preparing faculty and staff to address these opportunities. Studies show that there is significant regional demand for programs to be offered in off-campus sites/centers. Telecommunication adjuncts show great promise in improving instructional delivery efficiency. With our media personnel and resources, CSUS has a tremendous competitive advantage in the telecommunications area.

Strategic Choices

The choice regarding growth and access is between adopting a reactive or a proactive stance. A reactive stance is one where the enrollment plan is offered after the budget is determined; i.e., "budget drives enrollment," and hence access to admission and classes is restricted. On the other hand, a proactive stance starts with the enrollment plan and then goes after the resources necessary to achieve the plan. Resource options are not limited to State general funds but may instead include external augmentations--student fees, contributed funds, revenue from use of campus resources--so that growth and access strategies can be accomplished. We recognize that acquiring additional funding will not be easy, but we may have no other choice if we opt for pro-actively providing for growth and access.

Our choices on balance and mix of programs are more numerous. First, can we and should we be a four-year and graduate institution? If so, we must take action to attract larger numbers of lower division undergraduate students and larger numbers of graduate students. Can we come to grips with our Instructional Program Priorities? Can we support these priorities with appropriate enrollment management tools?

With respect to alternative instructional delivery locations and modes, we must realize the potential of the diverse alternatives. Which programs shall we offer at which remote sites and centers? Which courses and programs shall we offer via telecommunications? What

proportion of the total campus effort should be devoted to alternative locations and to alternative modes.

Vision

California State University, Sacramento is a comprehensive, regional university offering full (four-year) undergraduate and graduate educational programs. We are committed to a growth strategy—one that responds to the increasing demands for education and re-education services from people in our region. We will be proactive in seeking the wherewithal to support these essential services. We are committed to having a diverse, multicultural population; and we are committed to developing the basic structure necessary to attract, retain, and graduate such a diverse population. CSUS will offer, support, and maintain a wide-range of academic programs with highest priority accorded to those programs that respond to the mission of the University and to needs of the CSUS service region. Finally, CSUS will adapt to the realities of the modern age by supplying alternative instructional delivery locations and modes--those which will obviate the need for so many students to commute long distances to the central campus.

Recommendations

Short-term (1-2 years)

1. Continue to consolidate the organization focusing on improving CSUS' efficiency and effectiveness. Develop alternative revenue sources so that growth and access needs can be met without sole reliance on State appropriations. Work with others to effect changes at the State and System level that support CSUS' strategic plan.
2. Charge the enrollment management function with developing enrollment strategies (exploring and recommending options for recruitment, admission, retention, and graduation) and evaluating the effectiveness of enrollment management efforts in meeting campus goals.
3. Develop the tools that are necessary for CSUS to be able to better manage enrollment strategies: use financial aid in recruitment, admission, and retention; effect changes (master plan) that permit flexible responses to balance and mix challenges/opportunities; and ensure that adequate support systems are available (e.g., telephone registration, integrated student information systems, student survey systems).
4. Develop a "Teaching Across the Miles" program to prepare faculty to teach their courses at alternative locations and/or via alternative modes.

Long-term (3-10 years)

1. Follow the consolidation phase with a combination strategy of diversification (off-campus sites/centers and telecommunications) and concentrated growth (improving, expanding CSUS' academic programs).
 - a. Offer alternative location/modes so that students can enroll in courses and programs offered at remote sites and centers and/or via telecommunications.
 - b. Enhance outreach activities in order to attract additional graduate and lower division students.

4/22/93
From Mary Niles

I would like to comment on the state of the physical facilities of the university, specifically on lack of maintenance. The campus is dirty.

The classrooms in which I teach are dirty: the floors do not look as if they have been swept in days and scrubbed in weeks. I find dirty food and drink containers on the desk where I am to set my books and papers. Containers and papers litter the floor where chairs for students are. Chalkdust shrouds the AV equipment that is on semester loan, so much so that I can hardly handle the machines, and some of them fail to work because they are clogged with dust.

Halls and stairwells are dirty. My office is in Mendocino hall, and I teach there as well. A relatively new building, Mendocino Hall has dirt-clogged stairwells and halls whose walls already are soiled from students standing with their feet resting up against them. The other day I happened to go into the Social Science building, where I had an office until two years ago. The building is appallingly dirty - dirty. The restrooms are close to filthy. I would not use the restroom if necessity did not prevail. Towel dispensers had been taken off the wall and the holes left unplugged. In Mendocino Hall the restroom I use has no personal hygiene materials; the machines are never filled, left open and empty.

The dirt is so bad that I fear for my health and the health of our students.

I know that we are in a time of financial hardship. But when I see the amount of paper used for the silliest reasons - to announce the week's menu in a campus eatery - I cannot help wondering if there might be funds somewhere for the essential job of keeping this physical plant clean and in working order. It is short-sighted and foolish not to maintain the physical plant now. If not, we'll be sorry down the road.

I feel as if I am existing in a "third world country."

To be forwarded to approp. admin.
for response & action.

DEPARTMENT OF HUMANITIES

SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95819-6083

California State University, Sacramento

