

**Note: You'll want to bring the following attachments: 4/27/00 Attachment E and 5/4/00 Attachments B-1 and B-2**

1999-2000  
FACULTY SENATE  
California State University, Sacramento

**AGENDA**

Thursday, May 11, 2000  
Foothill Suite, University Union  
3:00 -5:00 p.m.

**OPEN FORUM**

**CONSENT CALENDAR**

**FS 00-47/Ex. WRITING AND READING SUBCOMMITTEE (Amends FS 99-10; FS 00-21)**

The Faculty Senate amends the membership of the Writing and Reading Subcommittee of the Curriculum Policies Committee as follows:

The Writing and Reading Subcommittee of the Curriculum Policies Committee shall comprise one member from the English department and one member from each college serving three-year, overlapping terms, and the Coordinator of the Writing Program or designee, the Learning Skills Program Director or designee, and the Director of the Center for Teaching and Learning, ex officio.

**FS 00-48/CPC, Ex. CURRICULUM REVIEW—DEPARTMENT OF ETHNIC STUDIES**

The Faculty Senate receives the commendations and recommendations (Attachment A) of the Curriculum Policies Committee on the program review of the Department of Ethnic Studies and recommends that:

1. The B.A. degree program in Ethnic Studies be approved for six years or until the next program review, and
2. The minor in Ethnic Studies be approved for six years or until the next program review.

**FS 00-49/CPC, Ex. CURRICULUM REVIEW—DEPARTMENT OF MUSIC**

The Faculty Senate receives the commendations and recommendations (Attachment B) of the Curriculum Policies Committee on the program review of the Department of Music and recommends the approval of the B.A., B.M. and M.M. degrees in Music be extended for two

*moved  
to list  
under  
First  
Reading*

years. While the Program Review Team recommended a six year approval, doing so was contingent upon the Dean of the College of Arts and Letters and the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs verifying completion of specific recommendations contained in the program review. The Faculty Senate recommends a two year approval. Upon successful completion of these recommended actions, a request can be made to the Faculty Senate to extend approval for the years remaining until the next program review.

FS 00-50/CPC, Ex. CURRICULUM REVIEW—COLLEGE OF BUSINESS  
ADMINISTRATION

The Faculty Senate receives the commendations and recommendations (Attachment C) of the Curriculum Policies Committee on the program review of the College of Business Administration and recommends that the undergraduate and graduate programs in the College of Business Administration be approved for a period of six years or until the next program review.

FS 00-51/CPC, Ex. PROGRAM CHANGE PROPOSALS

The Faculty Senate recommends approval of the following program change proposals:

B.A. Geography: Reorganizes the major by adding two specialized concentration options for students who choose to receive a Geography B.A. with an emphasis on either physical geography or cartography, geographic information systems and planning rather than the general geography degree.

Gerontology Minor: Reorganizes the minor requirements to allow students to choose between two courses based on their interests and career paths. Reduces the minor by three units and makes it more consistent with other university minors.

Regional and Continuing Education—Graduate Certificate (of Academic Achievement) in Gerontology: The program targets those already working with older adults and addresses the need for more education in gerontology due to the increase in the older adult population.

FS 00-52/CPC, Ex. PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS

[*Note: See Attachment D for background.*]

The Faculty Senate recommends that the CSUS Program Review Process be amended to include the following:

Units preparing for a program review which have had a recent (within two years) national accreditation review shall answer all of the Self-Study Guideline questions; however, the accreditation self-study and visitor report may be used to answer some or all of the Self-Study Guidelines questions. Academic Affairs and the Program Review Team may, a) accept proposed substitutions, or b) accept some of the substitutions and request further information.

FS 00-53/APC, Ex. SATISFACTORY PROGRESS STANDARDS

[Note: See Attachment E for background.]

The Faculty Senate recommends that the CSUS policy on "Satisfactory Progress Standards" (adopted June 6, 1996) be amended as follows [double underlined = additions]:

III. PROCEDURES FOR STUDENTS WHO FAIL TO MEET SATISFACTORY PROGRESS STANDARDS

...

A. PROCEDURES FOR STUDENTS WITH GPA AND UNIT DEFICIENCIES

If it is determined that a student's GPA is below a 2.0 (3.0 or graduate students) the student will be required to complete a **Required Advising Form for Financial Aid** with an advisor before any aid can be awarded. Any student reaching a seven-unit deficiency will become ineligible for financial aid but shall have access to the appeals process (See Section IVA.1). Students with a major or taking units for a major will be expected to meet with an advisor in the major department. If the Academic Advising Center (or the EOP or Admissions offices, where applicable) verify that the student's advisor in the major department is unavailable, the student may meet with a general advisor for the advising and signature described above. In such cases a copy of the signed form will be sent by the signer to the student's major department. The student will be required to meet with a major advisor for additional consultation and possible adjustment to the student's class schedule. This form signed by the major advisor as an indication of final approval must be returned to the Financial Aid Office in order for the student to be eligible for subsequent financial aid. Students who are undeclared will meet with an advisor in the Academic Advising Center or in the EOP Office if they are EOP students. The advisor will assist students with strategies regarding how to improve the GPA. These strategies will be outlined on the **Required Advising Form for Financial Aid**. The Advising Form will then be signed by both the advisor and the student before being returned to the Financial Aid Office. Once the agreement is returned, the financial aid check can be disbursed. Student progress in reducing grade point deficiencies in accordance with the **Required Advising Form for Financial Aid** will be monitored at the end of the Spring Semester of the subsequent academic year.

...

In addition, the Senate recommends that the Academic Advising Office and the Financial Aid Office develop a form to be sent to the student's major department, in the case where faculty are not consulted prior to preliminary approval of a student's program.

**REGULAR AGENDA**

*Carried*

FS 00-41/Flr. MINUTES

Approval of Minutes of April 27 (#14), 2000.

*Carried*

FS 00-46/Flr. MINUTES

Approval of Minutes of May 4 (#15), 2000.

**SECOND READING**

*[Action may be taken]*

*Carried*

FS 00-39/Ex. BUDGETARY PROCESS, FACULTY SENATE INFORMATION ABOUT THE CSUS

- WHEREAS, Budgetary decisions are central to the ability of the University to fulfill its academic mission; and
- WHEREAS, Widespread concern has been expressed by CSUS faculty members about lack of understanding of the current budgetary process; and
- WHEREAS, A Faculty Senate governance group met during the 1999-2000 academic year to discuss ways to improve faculty involvement in the campus budgetary process; and
- WHEREAS, The governance working group developed a set of recommendations aimed at enhancing faculty knowledge about the budgetary process and ability to provide input about the budget under consideration; therefore be it
- RESOLVED: That the Faculty Senate endorses the proposals contained in the governance working group's "Recommendations Regarding Faculty Senate Input on the Budgetary Process;" (*April 27, 2000, Faculty Senate Agenda Attachment E*) and, be if further
- RESOLVED: That the Faculty Senate urges that, to the extent feasible, the CSUS Administration and the Faculty Senate Chair implement for the 2000-01 academic year the recommendations contained in the above report.

**FIRST READING***back to  
Ex Com  
agreed**[Discussion only—unless extended by majority vote; no action.]**FS-00-49/ Curric. Review - Dept. of Music***FS 00-43A/FPC, Ex. FACULTY MERIT INCREASE (FMI) PROGRAM--PRINCIPLES,  
CSUS**

The Faculty Senate recommends adoption of a statement of principles, providing the rationale for the campus "Procedures for Implementing the Faculty Merit Increase (FMI) Program" (Attachment F).

**FS 00-43B/FPC, Ex. FACULTY MERIT INCREASE (FMI) PROGRAM--PROCEDURES,  
PART I, CSUS (Amends FS 99-56)**

The Faculty Senate recommends adoption of the following procedures for implementation of the 2000-2001 Faculty Merit Increase Program at CSUS:

**GENERAL GUIDELINES**

FMI criteria will be available to all faculty in advance of their decision to participate and to submit a Faculty Activity Report. Each Department and Program must develop and publish the criteria they will use to evaluate their faculty and to decide upon the awards to be given. Each Department and Program will inform its faculty of the schedule of activities to be performed in evaluating and making FMI awards.

**CHOICE OF CATEGORIES**

Within the categories of faculty activity set forth in the bargaining agreement, each faculty member may decide how to be evaluated. Faculty may choose to be evaluated for the quality of:

1. Teaching
2. Teaching and Scholarship
3. Teaching and Service to the University and Community
4. Teaching, Scholarship and Service to the University and Community

The choice of category shall not affect the maximum award to which an individual faculty member is eligible. Each Department and Program shall devise a system for evaluating and ranking the applicants within the categories chosen and the Department or Program Committee shall publish this system before faculty submit their Faculty Activity Reports.

While faculty members are allowed to choose the category(s) for evaluation, each shall address all aspects of their job assignment in their Faculty Activity Report.

FS 00-43C/FPC, Ex. FACULTY MERIT INCREASE (FMI) PROGRAM--PROCEDURES,  
PART II, CSUS (Amends FS 99-56)

The Faculty Senate recommends adoption of the following procedures for implementation of the 2000-2001 Faculty Merit Increase Program at CSUS:

### **GENERAL GUIDELINES**

It is desirable that the Deans and the President will follow the judgements of the Departments or Programs in recommending FMI awards. Exceptions will be made where there are compelling reasons for acting otherwise. Such compelling reasons would include instances where 1) the FMI award process could be characterized as capriciously or arbitrarily made, and 2) the FMI award clearly was not reflective of the person's demonstrated performance.

FMI money is allocated to Departments and Programs on the basis of FTEF. In those cases when a Department or Program is able to make larger awards due to a low number of faculty applying for FMI awards, money may be moved by either the Dean or President to correct relative inequities between that Department or Program and others.

In such cases when a Dean or the President moves money, a published, written explanation must go out to the campus community detailing what amounts have been moved, where it was moved, and the rationale for doing so.

The Department level review committees or the chairs, Deans, and the President shall not systematically reduce the potential for part-time faculty within a unit to receive FMIs simply because of their part-time status.

### **AWARDS BY DEANS AND THE PRESIDENT**

Deans may recommend an FMI award independent of the award recommended at other levels based upon value added by a faculty member to the College through service performed. Similarly, the President may make an FMI award independent of the award made at other levels based upon value added by a faculty member to the University through service performed.

### **FULL DISCLOSURE**

The Department or Program must include a statement of the criteria and the process used when forwarding their list of recommended FMI awards to their Dean.

The names of those recommended, those who receive awards and the size of the awards must be made public. The Department or Program must disclose to individual faculty member the basis for their FMI award. In addition, the Dean must disclose to the individual faculty member the basis for the Dean's reduction or elimination of their FMI award. Likewise, the

President must disclose to the individual faculty member the basis for the President's reduction or elimination of their FMI award. The disclosure at all levels will not be made public.

*Moved to 2nd reading  
Carried*  
FS 00-16A/Ex. BACCALAUREATE LEARNING GOALS, CSUS

The Faculty Senate receives the "Report on CSUS Baccalaureate Learning Goals" and thanks the Faculty Senate Working Group on University Learning Goals—

Jude Antonyappan (Social Work)  
Margaret Cleek (Organizational Behavior and Environment)  
Jackie Donath (Humanities)  
Cid Gunston-Parks (Teacher Education)  
James Hill (Chemistry)  
Jennifer Lundmark (Biological Sciences)  
Fred Reardon (Mechanical Engineering)—

for their work.

FS 00-16B/Ex. BACCALAUREATE LEARNING GOALS, CSUS—EXPECTATIONS OF UNDERGRADUATE LEARNING

The Faculty Senate recommends approval of the six categories of "Expectations of Undergraduate Learning"(revised 5/9/00; see Attachment G):

1. Competence in the Disciplines
2. Analysis and Problem Solving
3. Communication
4. Information Competence
5. Cultural Legacies
6. Values and Pluralism

In addition, the Faculty Senate recommends the undertaking of a two-year "pilot project":

The objective of this effort would be to determine if these goals provide a means for judging the quality of our academic programs and, where indicated, for guiding decisions directed at improving the quality of our academic programs. This effort would provide evidence as to whether these goals are actually meaningful, manageable and sustainable and whether they provide us with a means for understanding 1) what students really "know and learn" as part of their baccalaureate studies and 2) how the "work" of the academy can best provide the experiences that allow our students to "know and learn".

A plan for conducting this "pilot project" will be developed by the Working Group on University Learning Goals and presented to the Senate in the fall of 2000. Those involved would include, among others, Institutional Studies, the General Education Program and Graduation Requirements Committee, and the Curriculum Policies Committee, and the Council for University Planning. An interim report would be provided to the Senate in the spring of 2001 and a final report in the spring of 2002.

To 2nd Reading Carried

FS 00-44/APC, Ex. GRADE APPEAL PROCESS—APPEAL OF VIOLATIONS OF PROCEDURE (Amends FS 00-13)

[Note: See May 4, 2000, Faculty Senate Agenda Attachment B-1 for background.]

The Faculty Senate recommends amendment of the CSUS Grade Appeal Process with the addition of Section VIII, Appeal of Violations of Procedure (May 4, 2000, Faculty Senate Agenda Attachment B-2).

**INFORMATION**

1. Tentative Spring 2000 Faculty Senate meeting schedule [Note: Additional meetings may be scheduled]:  
May 18
2. Reminder to mark your calendars: Senate Retreat, Wednesday, August 23, 2000
3. Senate Home Page: <http://www.csus.edu/acse/> or CSUS Home Page then Administration and Policy then Administration then Faculty Senate



**PROGRAM REVIEW REPORT FOR THE  
ETHNIC STUDIES DEPARTMENT IN THE  
COLLEGE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES AND INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDIES**

**Commendations to the Ethnic Studies Department on:**

1. Its dedicated faculty, many of whom are highly effective in their work both in the university and the community;
2. Its outreach activity to local ethnic communities;
3. Its cooperation among the four programs within the department;
4. Its enthusiastic leadership by Chair Otis Scott;
5. Its efforts to bring the multicultural perspectives to more and more segments of the University, as in their community involvement and outreach, and the general education offerings;
6. Its excellent student advising packet for Ethnic Studies majors including the newsletter "News & Views."

**Recommendations to the Ethnic Studies Department:**

1. Develop a planning document outlining campus and community partnerships through interdisciplinary and cross-disciplinary courses. The planning document should address developing greater links with other department majors through requiring concentrations, internships, or "minors" either inside the college or across college lines (page 7).
2. Develop strong ties with the College of Education at CSUS to meet the need for public school teacher training through multiculturalism and comparative culture courses (page 7).
3. Undertake a thorough curriculum review to decide on a rotation of course offerings in relation to the respective programs within the department (page 8).
4. Establish standing committees for long-range planning and community relations (page 8).
5. Consider seeking grants through CSUS Office of Research and Graduate Studies, and CSUS Center for Teaching and Learning in the area of faculty professional development and curriculum development (page 11).
6. Establish an advisory council to exploit the opportunity of city/state resources and constituency of Sacramento as the capital (page 13).
7. Develop a five-year plan for faculty hires (page 14).

**Recommendations to the Dean of the College of Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies:**

1. That the Dean adopt a high priority in adding a new faculty position in the Chicano Studies Program (page 7).
2. That the Dean together with the Chair and faculty of the department develop a long range plan for replacement of faculty due to the high number of impending retirements from group II and group III faculty members (page 8).
3. That the Dean consider appointment of group I faculty to fill the needs of the departmental offerings rather than joint appointments within the college or inter-college joint appointments (page 8).
4. That the Dean consider providing assigned time for the program directors in the areas of Pan-African Studies, Native American Studies, Asian-American Studies, and Chicano Studies (page 14).
5. That the Dean consider earmarking money for Ethnic Studies acquisitions in the media library (page 14).
6. That the Dean consider allotting more office space to the ES Department (page 15).

**Recommendations to the Academic Senate:**

1. That the Bachelor of Arts degree program in Ethnic Studies be approved for another six years, or until the next program review.
2. That the minor in Ethnic Studies be approved for another six years or until the next program review.

**SUMMARY OF COMMENDATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN  
THE ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW REPORT FOR THE  
DEPARTMENT OF MUSIC**

**Commendations**

The Program Review Team commends

1. the department for its many contributions to the Strategic Goals of the University.
2. the Department of Music for its student and faculty performances on campus which help to expose the campus to artistic creativity.
3. the faculty and its Chair for the successful conversion of the Master of Arts to the Master of Music degree.
4. the Chair for his cooperation and goodwill during the Program Review process.
5. the faculty for their commitment to the education of their students.
6. the department for its enthusiastic and dedicated students.
7. the department for its strengthening of its undergraduate programs.
8. the department for its dedicated faculty, for their collegiality, and for its new hirings which have brought new energy to the department.
9. the department for its faculty's distinguished record of creative activities and participation in professional organizations.
10. the department for its comprehensive publications which assist students in planning their academic careers.
11. the department for its exceptionally strong program of student advising and for its support of its students.
12. the department for its programs and activities that encourage and support student socialization and participation in professional activities.
13. the department for the numerous strengths in its curriculum.
14. the department for its progress in developing a comprehensive assessment program.

15. the Chair for his effective leadership and for his successful fund raising efforts on behalf of the department.

### **Recommendations to the Department of Music**

#### The Program Review Team

1. concurs with the outside consultant's recommendation that the visibility of the music program needs to be enhanced in the Sacramento area in order to publicize the many excellent music programs on campus. To that end the Program Review Team also concurs with the outside consultant's recommendation that the department examine the possibility of a campus-wide student referendum to create funding for publicity, including broadcast advertising, for selected campus performances. (pp. 3-4)
2. recommends that the department stop the practice of not including the co-requisites of Music 100 and Music 142 in the total number of units required for the BA and stop the practice of not including the co-requisite of Music 100 in the total number of units required for the BM by the end of Spring, 2000 and file a report to that effect with the Dean of the College of Arts and Letters. (p. 7)
3. recommends that the Department of Music do one of the following options: place the requirement of Music 100 within existing courses in the BA degree; devalue the course to .5 units and delete 4 units elsewhere in the degree; keep the requirement and delete 8 units elsewhere in the degree; delete the requirement. (p. 7)
4. recommends that the Department of Music do one of the following options: place the requirement of Music 142 within existing courses in the BA degree; require participation in the large performance ensembles but not give academic credit for it; devalue the courses to .5 units and eliminate four units elsewhere in the degree; keep the requirement and delete 8 units elsewhere in the degree; delete the requirement. (p. 7)
5. recommends that the Department of Music do one of the following options: place the requirement of Music 100 within existing courses in the BM degree; require concert attendance but do not give academic credit for it; reduce the unit value to .5 and eliminate 4 units elsewhere in the major; keep the requirement reduce the major elsewhere by 8 units; eliminate the requirement. (pp. 7-8)
6. recommends that if Music 100 continues to be a required course in the BA and/or BM degree, it should be graded credit/no credit. (p. 8)
7. recommends that the department conduct a study to determine the optimum balance between its BA and BM degree programs. This study should include a survey of the ratios of BA to BM degrees in other comparable music programs in the CSU system. A copy of this study,

the options considered, and the decision reached shall be submitted to the Dean of the College of Arts and Letter and to the Provost and Vice-President for Academic Affairs by the end of spring, 2001. (pp. 11-12)

8. recommends that the department develop a comprehensive plan to attract underrepresented student groups into the department programs. This plan should include, but not be limited to, the following:
  - a. hiring an ethnomusicologist who would emphasize the study and performance of ethnic music;
  2. have the department's Admission Counselor interview underrepresented students who have left the program to determine causes;
  - c. direct the department's Admission Counselor to work with the University Recruitment and Outreach Program to extend recruitment efforts beyond the boundaries of traditional high schools;
  4. have the Admissions Counselor coordinate outreach efforts with other campus program involved in minority outreach and recruitment, including the Education Opportunity Program (EOP), the Science Educational Equity Program (SEE), the Minority Engineering Program (MEP), the College Assistance Minority Program (CAMP), the Cooper-Woodson College Enhancement Program, and the CSUS Chicano Teatro, Bilingual Education, Ethnic Studies, Asian American Studies, and Chicano Studies academic programs;
  - e. have the Chair of the department discuss with the Chair of Ethnic Studies the possibility of a joint appointment between Music and Ethnic Studies to develop courses in multicultural music and history in the Americas;
  6. target local schools with large minority populations and create outreach activities at these schools, such as solo and small ensemble performances and visits by department faculty and minority music majors and to talk to students about the music programs at CSUS;
  - g. perform a comparison to other CSU campuses with similar programs to see if reducing the performance emphasis in the BA might attract a more socio-economically diverse student population.

Copies of this plan are to be submitted to the Dean of the College of Arts and Letters and to the Provost and Vice-President for Academic Affairs by the end of fall semester, 2000, for implementation in spring, 2001. A progress report on the results of this program is to be submitted to the Dean of Arts and Letters and to the Provost and Vice-President for Academic Affairs in spring, 2003. (pp. 12-13)

9. recommends that the department examine its scheduling of classes to determine if it is meeting the needs of its students. This study should include but not be limited to the following:

1. the frequency of offering Music 14: Basic Piano and scheduling some sections of it in the late morning and early afternoon;
  - b. the frequency of the offering of Music 201: Introduction to Graduate Studies;
  3. conduct a survey of music majors to determine if there is sufficient demand to offer the core requirement courses in the afternoon and evening;
  - d. offering Music 9: Music of World Cultures every semester;
  5. creating more flexibility in the scheduling of pre-requisite courses;
  - f. determining ways to lessen the amount of time that students must be on campus each day.  
(pp. 13-14)
10. concurs with the consultant's recommendation that the department undertake a careful study of the attrition rates of their undergraduate music majors to determine the causes of attrition and to develop a plan of action to improve the rate of retention and graduation. This study should include, but not be limited to the following issues:
1. a comparison of the retention and graduation rates of students enrolled in the Bachelor of Arts to those enrolled in the Bachelor of Music;
  - b. a comparison of retention and graduation rates to similar programs in the CSU system;
  3. interviews with students who fail to graduate and with students who change majors to determine cause;
  - d. a comparison of the retention and graduation rates of native (freshman) students with those of transfer students, with special attention to the reason that the retention rates of transfer students in music are lower than in the College of Arts and Letters as a whole;

As a result of this study the department shall develop a specific plan of action to improve the retention and graduation rates of its majors. A copy of this study and the proposed plan of action if needed shall be submitted to the Dean of the College of Arts and Letters and to the Provost and Vice-President for Academic Affairs by the end of Spring semester, 2001. (p. 16)

11. recommends that all faculty revise their curriculum vita to include information on courses taught and service to the department, college, and the university. (p. 17)
12. recommends that the department continue to pursue aggressively affirmative action policies in all hirings in order to make progress in meeting the CSU Strategic Plan's goal of obtaining a faculty "that broadly reflects the diverse population of the region we serve." (p. 17)
13. recommends that the department consider the hiring of an ethnomusicologist when it decides to expand the offerings in its relevant programs. (p. 17)
14. recommends that the Chair of the department continue discussions with the Chair of the Ethnic Studies program on seeking a joint appointment with Ethnic Studies. (p. 17)

15. recommends that the department perform a comprehensive and complete review and revision of its Bachelor of Arts degree. This review and revision should include, but not be limited to, the following issues:
  - a. revise the University Catalog and student handbooks to ensure that they provide an accurate and easily understandable account of the requirements for the degree;
  2. following the recommendation of the outside consultant, adjust the performance requirements for each concentration so that students desiring a concentration in liberal arts or a "combination" degree have no applied advanced music requirement and no junior or senior recital;
  3. reduce the level of piano proficiency (Music 14) to a one semester requirement;
  - d. in light of the revision of the degree create new hiring priorities. (pp. 21-22)
  
- 16 recommends that the department allow Music 143: Jazz Ensemble to count as a Music 142 Large Performance Ensemble. (p. 22)
  
17. recommends that the department perform a comprehensive review and revision of the Bachelor of Music degree which should include, but not be limited to, the following issues:
  1. revise the University Catalog and student handbooks to ensure that they provide an accurate and easily understandable account of the requirements for the degree;
  2. clarify in the University Catalog and in the Undergraduate Student Handbook that in the Theory/Composition concentration that 16 units of applied music are required;
  3. consider making the admission standards for the degree more selective in order to ensure an optimum balance between the number of students enrolled in the BA and BM degrees;
  4. consult with the Dean of the College of Arts and Letters and with the Provost and Vice-President for Academic Affairs about the possibility of counting Music 3 and Music 7 towards the General Education requirements;
  5. conduct a systematic and comprehensive survey of graduates of the program in cohorts of five, ten, and fifteen years since graduation to include questionnaires, telephone surveys, and focus groups, in order to determine what careers they are pursuing and their connection to the Bachelor of Music. (p. 22)
  
18. recommends that the department perform a comprehensive review and revision of the Master of Music which should include, but not be limited to, the following issues:
  1. following the outside consultant's recommendation, discontinue the concentrations in Music Education and Music History and Literature because of lack of student interest;
  - b. offer a section of Music 201: Introduction to Graduate Studies every semester;
  3. following the outside consultant's recommendation, provide Graduate Student and Teaching Assistant stipends and scholarships in order to create a cadre of graduate students who are pursuing their degree on a full-time basis. (pp. 22-23)

19. recommends that the department conduct a comprehensive and complete review of Music 8: Basic Music to include, but not be limited to, the following issues:
  1. divide the course into two separate courses, one for students in Liberal Studies, the other a course in area C2 of General Education;
  - b. limit enrollment in the existing course to students majoring in Liberal Studies and Child Development, Plan B;
  3. consult with the Chair of Teacher Education, the Chair of Child Development, and the Coordinator of Liberal Studies to ensure that the curriculum of the course meets their students' curricular needs;
  - d. develop a syllabus that reflects curricular needs and use that syllabus in all sections of the course in order to ensure curricular consistency;
  5. consider using Teaching Assistants to staff some sections of the course, supervised by a full-time faculty member;
  - f. offer sufficient sections to meet student demand. (p. 23)
20. recommends that the department perform a systematic study of a representative number of student transcripts of students who have graduated over the past five years in order to determine the cause of the large number of extra units taken by both native and transfer students in both the BA and BM degree and develop a plan to reduce the number of extra units taken. (p. 23)
21. recommends that the department appoint an ad hoc committee to design a credential program that can be completed in four and one-half years. (p. 23)

The review and revision of the Bachelor of Arts, the Bachelor of Music, and the Master of Music is to be completed by the end of spring, 2001. At that time the department shall forward a copy of the revised programs to the Dean of the College of Arts and Letters and the Provost and Vice-President of Academic Affairs along with a report of the options considered and the reasons for the decisions made. The department shall also submit a report to the Dean of the College of Arts and Letters and to the Provost and Vice-President of Academic Affairs on the actions taken on recommendations # 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 and the reasons for those decisions by the end of spring, 2001. (p. 23)

22. to assist the department in its on-going creation of a final assessment program, makes the following recommendations:
  1. conduct a thorough and comprehensive survey of alumni, employing on-campus focus groups as well as questionnaires and telephone surveys to determine the effectiveness of the curriculum in preparing graduates for their careers;
  - b. revise the "student competencies" of the working draft of the department's Assessment Plan to distinguish between the competencies in performance, history theory, and



- supporting areas required of students enrolled in the Bachelor of Arts degree and students enrolled in the Bachelor of Music degree;
3. create two different sections of the proposed capstone course, Music 110B: Capstone Literature and Analysis Presentation and Paper, one for students enrolled in the Bachelor of Arts degree and one for students enrolled in the Bachelor of Music degree;
  - d. complete the design of the capstone course, Music 197: Music and Business.

The completed assessment plan is to be submitted to the Dean of the College of Arts and Letters and to the Provost and Vice-President of Academic Affairs by the end of spring, 2001 to be implemented in fall, 2001, with a description of the process used to create the plan and an explanation for its decisions. (p. 24)

23. recommends that the department create the position of Vice-Chair to assist the Chair with the day-to-day operations of the department, including the creation of the schedule of classes and the scheduling of events. (p. 25)
24. recommends that the department create an Executive Committee to assist the Chair with the operation of the department and to help with policy development and long-range planning. (p. 25)

#### **Recommendation to the Dean of the College of Arts and Letters**

The Program Review Team recommends to the Dean of the College of Arts and Letters that the Department of Music be allowed to require that all perspective music majors must complete an audition before being able to declare music as their major. (p. 15)

#### **Recommendation to the Faculty Senate**

The Program Review Team recommends the approval of the BA, BM, and MM degrees in Music be extended for six years or until the next program review. This recommendation is contingent on completion of those recommendations to the Dean of the College of Arts and Letters and to the Provost and Vice-President for Academic Affairs which must be completed by spring, 2001. (p. 27)

11-10-99

**SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN  
THE ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW REPORT FOR THE  
COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION**

**Mission and Goals (p. 3)**

1. The College of Business Administration refine the Mission Statement and Goals to ensure consistency between all goals and the mission.
2. The Mission Statement be revised to reflect the Vision Statement under development, and expanded to reflect the current role and purpose of the College of Business Administration.

**Students (p. 14)**

1. The Departments of Management Information Science and Organizational Behavior and Environment investigate the causes of low graduation rates and identify means for improvement.
2. The College of Business Administration track the probation rate of students to determine causes and identify methods to improve the rate of success.
3. All departments within the College, and in particular, Accountancy review the Class Schedule to ensure adequate access to classes for students, e.g., use Fridays to schedule classes.
4. The College consider expanding the operational hours of the Degree Programs Center and the Graduate Programs Office to increase access for evening-only students.
5. All departments review required prerequisite coursework for the concentrations to ensure adequate preparation for the complexity of upper division coursework.

**Faculty (p. 19)**

1. The College of Business Administration make a concerted effort to increase the gender and ethnic diversity among faculty in the College.
2. The College design faculty development and hiring plans which account for the "aging" of faculty.
3. The process for determining faculty qualifications, academic and professional, and their currency be centrally systemized with consistency across departments; the process needs to include a common definition of terms and should include a review of the

appropriateness and methods of using faculty development plans to determine academic qualifications as set forth by the AACSC.

4. Faculty scholarship within the College be expanded to include increased publications in refereed journals.
5. The College establish mechanisms to determine how and when teaching evaluation data are used to improve teaching effectiveness.
6. The College develop a process that allows students the opportunity to provide feedback to instructors and the College regarding course work, e.g., course evaluation, not teaching evaluation.
7. The College investigate the students' concerns related to cheating, and determine means to resolve this concern.

#### **Academic Programs (p. 27, 28)**

1. Teaching strategies across the undergraduate curricula be evaluated and modified accordingly to promote active student learning.
2. The Accountancy Department review and revise the content of ACCY 1, Accounting Fundamentals, for currency and complexity in order to prepare students for upper division course work in accounting.
3. The Management Information Science Department provide students an opportunity to develop computer skills in MIS 175, Computer Information Systems for Management.
4. The number of units and specific degree requirements for the undergraduate concentration in Human Resources Management be reviewed to determine adequacy and appropriateness in preparing students for the work setting.
5. The College formalize a method(s) to secure feedback from employers regarding graduates' preparation for work.
6. The College continue to secure student and community input in determining future curricular plans, development, and evaluation.

#### **Student Outcomes (p. 28)**

1. The College review and revise learning objectives to ensure measurability.
2. The College develop resources to assist faculty in differentiating between course objectives and student outcomes.

3. The College determine how the results of the standardized tests, the ETS and the SBI, will be used to evaluate teaching effectiveness and program development, and develop plans for improvement accordingly.
4. The College demonstrate use of the assessment findings to improve programs.

#### **Resources (p. 33)**

1. Support services for evening students be evaluated for appropriateness and enhanced as feasible.
2. The College evaluate the adequacy of instructional technology support for the faculty and students.
3. Collaboration between the College and the Library be established to ensure input by the College in determining business focused expenditures.
4. Resources for faculty appointments be increased in order to facilitate the recruitment of qualified faculty in a highly competitive environment.
5. An appropriate base budget be determined for the College reflective of faculty performance demands and student contact hours.

#### **Governance (p. 33)**

1. Committee structure within the College overall and the departments be reviewed to determine appropriateness related to number of committees on which faculty serve.
2. Graduate students, as well as an undergraduate students, be provided an opportunity for representation on the Academic Programs Committee.

#### **Approval**

It is recommended that the undergraduate and graduate programs in the College of Business Administration be approved for a period of six years or until the next program review.

5-5-00



**CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO**  
Faculty Senate  
Curriculum Policies Committee

**MEMORANDUM**

May 8, 2000

To: Bob Buckley, Chair  
Faculty Senate

From: Ann Haffer, Chair  
Curriculum Policies Committee

Re: Program Review Policy for Nationally Accredited Programs

**Issue:**

The Academic Council of the College of Health and Human Services has requested that academic units participating in a national accreditation process be allowed to submit a current self-study document and reviewers' report to the Program Review team and request a waiver of all or part of the University review process.

**Background:**

This year the Curriculum Policies Committee has approved four waivers to programs preparing for Program Review allowing them to use their self-studies for national accreditation, along with any needed supplementary materials, rather than preparing a separate self-study for university review. One program requested a complete waiver of the University review process pointing out that the program had been reviewed twice by the State, and a national accreditor. The program chair questioned the need for spending money on the University review team. This request was not approved by the CPC.

Most accreditors are recognized by the Department of Education (DOE) and must therefore address the standards held by the DOE. Accreditation, therefore, is generally a very rigorous process requiring that programs meet high standards; not just basic standards. Also, the accreditation process is costly both in resources and in time. If accreditation has been recent, it is very inefficient and unproductive to duplicate self-studies.

The Curriculum Policies Committee considered completely waiving the review process for accredited programs but rejected that possibility. Instead the committee decided that

if programs supplemented their self-studies with any elements required by the University Program Review Guidelines that were not in the accreditation self-study that this would be sufficient.

**Committee's Recommended Action:**

The CPC proposes the following policy: Units preparing for a program review which have had a recent (within two years) national accreditation review shall answer all of the Self-Study Guideline questions; however the accreditation self-study and visitor report may be used to answer some or all of the Self-Study Guideline questions. Both Academic Affairs and the Program Review Team may, a. accept proposed substitutions or, b. accept some of the substitutions and request further information.

**Arguments in favor**

The recommended process will significantly reduce the preparation time and costs for accredited programs, yet will not reduce the quality of the University program reviews.

**Arguments against**

Programs may be reluctant to supply additional information.



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO

FACULTY SENATE

TO: Bob Buckley,  
Chair, Faculty Senate

FROM: <sup>GW</sup>Greg Wheeler,  
Chair, Academic Policies Committee

DATE: May 8, 2000

SUBJECT: Satisfactory Progress Standards

Tom Griffith, Director of the Academic Advising Center, asked the Academic Policies Committee to examine the current policy used to establish student eligibility for financial aid. The Satisfactory Progress Standards specify that if a student has a GPA below 2.0 or has a unit deficiency they must complete an "advising form for financial aid". This form is to be completed with the student's major advisor or in the Academic Advising Center if the student is undeclared. In recent years, advisors in the Academic Advising Center, Admissions and EOP have signed student advising forms when students were unable to find advisors in their major. This practice has helped remove an impediment to students, but has raised questions about the importance and role of the major advisors.

The Academic Policies Committee met with Tom Griffith, Director of Academic Advising and Linda Clemons, Director of Financial Aid. They are in concurrence with our conclusions. APC recommends clarification of the important function of the major department advisors in developing and recommending an academic plan for students. We recommend that III. A. of the Satisfactory Progress Standards (Attached) approved by President Gerth, June 6, 1996, be amended as follows [recommended additional language is double underlined]:

III. PROCEDURES FOR STUDENTS WHO FAIL TO MEET SATISFACTORY PROGRESS STANDARDS

...

A. PROCEDURES FOR STUDENTS WITH GPA AND UNIT DEFICIENCIES

If it is determined that a students GPA is below a 2.0 (3.0 or graduate students) the student will be required to complete a **Required Advising Form for Financial Aid** with an advisor before any aid can be awarded. Any student reaching a seven unit deficiency will become ineligible for financial aid but shall have access to the appeals process (See Section IVA.1). Students with a major or taking units for a major will be expected to meet with an advisor in the major department. If the Academic Advising Center (or the EOP or Admissions offices, where applicable) verify that the student's

advisor in the major department is unavailable, the student may meet with a general advisor for the advising and signature described above. In such cases a copy of the signed form will be sent by the signer to the student's major department. The student will be required to meet with a major advisor for additional consultation and possible adjustment to the student's class schedule. This form signed by the major advisor as an indication of final approval must be returned to the Financial Aid Office in order for the student to be eligible for subsequent financial aid. Students who are undeclared will meet with an advisor in the Academic Advising Center or in the EOP Office if they are EOP students. The advisor will assist students with strategies regarding how to improve the GPA. These strategies will be outlined on the **Required Advising Form for Financial Aid**. The Advising Form will then be signed by both the advisor and the student before being returned to the Financial Aid Office. Once the agreement is returned, the financial aid check can be disbursed. Student progress in reducing grade point deficiencies in accordance with the **Required Advising Form for Financial Aid** will be monitored at the end of the Spring Semester of the subsequent academic year.

...

The APC further recommends that the Academic Advising Office and the Financial Aid Office develop a form to be sent to the student's major department, in the case where faculty are not consulted prior to preliminary approval of a student's program.

Attachment



California State University  
Sacramento



The President  
Sacramento, CA 95819-6022

June 6, 1996



MEMORANDUM

TO: George H. Wayne, Vice President  
Student Affairs

FROM: Donald R. Gerth *Don Gerth*

I have at hand the proposal from the Student Economic Support Committee and your recommendation of June 3, 1996 concerning the revisions of the Satisfactory Progress Standards for Financial Aid.

I am approving this recommendations as outlined in your memorandum.

cc: Chair R. Bruch  
Director Linda Joy Clemons

SATISFACTORY PROGRESS STANDARDS  
June 6, 1996\*

To remain eligible for financial aid, a student must be making progress in the course of study he or she is pursuing. Satisfactory progress is measured at the end of spring semester in terms of maintenance of good academic standing and successful completion each year of a specified percentage of coursework attempted. In addition, students are expected to complete degree requirements within a specified maximum number of units.

Failure to make progress in accordance with the standards of Satisfactory Progress specified below may result in termination of financial aid. These standards comply with federal regulations and Financial Aid Policies and Guidelines of The California State University, are applicable to all students on financial aid at California State University, Sacramento and apply to all programs of financial aid (including grants, loans and work study) provided by the State of California and/or Title IV (Federal).

**I. ENROLLMENT STATUS FOR FINANCIAL AID**

**A. Full-time and Part-time Enrollment Status**

Enrollment status for all students (undergraduate, graduate, education/service credential candidates, and other postbaccalaureate students) is determined as follows:

Full-time	12 or more weighted units
3/4 time	9 - 11 weighted units
1/2 time	6 - 8 weighted units

**B. Weighted Units**

For the purpose of determining enrollment status for financial aid, course units are weighted as specified below:

<u>Course Type</u>	<u>Weighted Units</u>
Prebaccalaureate and other non-degree courses (see Part C of this section)	1 Weighted Unit
Courses taken for audit (see Part C of this section)	0 Weighted Unit
Undergraduate lower division and upper division courses taken for credit	1 Weighted Unit

I. B. Weighted Units (continued)

Graduate courses taken for credit  
(courses numbered above 200,  
including credential courses  
numbered in the 300 series) (See  
Part C of this section

1.5 Weighted Units

C. Restrictions

1. Prebaccalaureate and other non-degree courses up to 30 units of Prebaccalaureate level courses and other non-degree courses may be credited toward the level of enrollment for financial aid eligibility. These units are also counted toward units attempted and units completed in determining satisfactory progress. Failure to complete these units may result in a financial aid unit deficiency (see Section IIB). Units of coursework of this type in excess of 30 units are given a weight of zero (0) in determining enrollment status. For example, if a student who has already completed 30 units of this type of coursework enrolls for 12 units which includes 9 units of upper division courses and another 3 unit Prebaccalaureate level course, the student's enrollment status is 3/4 time.

2. Courses Taken for Audit

Courses taken for audit are not credited toward a semester load in determination of enrollment status for financial aid.

3. Undergraduate Students Taking Graduate Level Coursework

Graduate courses which are not applicable to an undergraduate degree will not be considered for payment for ANY undergraduate awards, i.e., SEOG, EOP, Cal Grants, Pell Grant, etc.

D. Sample Calculations of Enrollment Status

The following examples serve to illustrate how weighted units are used in the determination of enrollment status for financial aid.

Schedule 1

<u>Course</u>	<u>Units</u>	<u>Grade Type</u>	<u>Weighted Units</u>
Govt 1	3	Cr	3
Chem 4	3	Audit	0
Eth St 100	3	Cr	3
Bio Sci 10	3	Cr	3

## I. D. Sample Calculations of Enrollment Status (continued)

Enrollment Status for financial aid = 9 weighted units, 3/4 time.

Schedule 2

<u>Course</u>	<u>Units</u>	<u>Grade Type</u>	<u>Weighted Units</u>
Bio Sci 292	3	Cr	4.5
Bio Sci 220	3	Cr	4.5
Bio Sci 169	4	Cr	4

Enrollment Status for financial aid = 13 weighted units, full-time.

## II. SATISFACTORY PROGRESS STANDARDS

### A. GRADE POINT STANDARDS

Students who fail to maintain the grade-point standards specified below develop a grade-point deficiency and are not considered to be making satisfactory progress (See Section IIIA).

#### · Undergraduate Students

A GPA of 2.0 must be achieved by the end of the first year and maintained thereafter.

#### · Credential/Conditionally Classified or Classified Graduate Students

A minimal overall GPA of 3.0 must be maintained.

#### · Unclassified Graduates/Second Bachelors

A minimum overall GPA of a 2.5 must be maintained.

### B. UNIT COMPLETION/UNIT DEFICIENCIES

For students receiving financial aid for full-time enrollment, successful progress toward a degree shall be measured by units completed as follows:

#### 1. Expected Unit Completion Schedule

## II. B. 1. Expected Unit Completion Schedule (continued)

### Undergraduate Students

end of the second semester (first year)	18.0 units
end of the fourth semester (second year)	39.0 units
end of the sixth semester (third year)	60.0 units
end of the eighth semester (fourth year)	84.0 units
end of the tenth semester (fifth year)	108.0 units
end of the twelfth semester (sixth year)	132.0 units

### Graduate Students

end of the second semester (first year)	15.0 units
end of the fourth semester (second year)	30.0 units
end of the sixth semester (third year)	45.0 units

For students receiving financial aid for less than full-time enrollment, proportional adjustments for units completed will be made.

#### 2. Determination of Unit Deficiencies

Regular session courses, including repeat courses, Prebaccalaureate level and non degree courses, are included in units attempted.

They are considered as units completed if the following grades are received:

1. A, B, C, and D grades
2. CR (credit)

They are not considered as units completed if the following grades are received:

1. F grades
2. NC (no credit)
3. W (withdrawal)
4. I (incomplete)
5. U (unauthorized withdrawal)

Courses with the following grades shall be considered as units completed on a temporary basis with the final determination as noted:

1. RD (report delayed) Registrar will replace with a grade.
2. SP (satisfactory progress) to be replaced with an appropriate final grade within one calendar year of date of first enrollment.

## II. B. 1. Expected Unit Completion Schedule (continued)

Students who fail to complete the number of units specified in the Expected Unit Completion Schedule (Section II B.1) develop a unit deficiency and are not considered to be making satisfactory progress (See Section IIB).

### C. UNIT MAXIMUMS

Students who exceed the unit maximums specified below will become ineligible for financial aid. The unit limit applies even if the student changes majors. Students will be notified when they have reached the minimum number of units required for the degree. A graduation petition will then need to be filed before any additional aid can be awarded (See Section IIIB). If at the end of the next year, the unit maximum has been reached but the degree requirements have not been completed, the student will have to appeal to have aid extended (See Section IIIC). If the unit maximum has still not been reached, however, aid will be continued without appeal.

#### Undergraduate Unit Maximums:

All coursework must be completed in 155 semester units or 125% of the units required for the student's specific baccalaureate degree objective, whichever is more. All coursework count toward the unit maximum. Up to 30 units of pre-baccalaureate level and non degree courses taken at CSUS are excluded from the allowable unit maximum. Units of this type in excess of 30 will be counted.

Regional and Continuing Education certificate programs are at the undergraduate level and coursework must be completed within 125% of the units required for the students specific certificate objective. All undergraduate coursework counts toward the unit maximum.

#### Graduate Unit Maximums:

All coursework must be completed in 50 semester units or 150% of the units required for the student's specific graduate or credential objective. Education/service credential candidates are considered graduate students and must meet the graduate standards.

## III. PROCEDURES FOR STUDENTS WHO FAIL TO MEET SATISFACTORY PROGRESS STANDARDS

Students in continuous enrollment who do not make satisfactory progress in accordance with the standards will receive written notification from the Financial Aid Office at the end of each academic year. This notification will advise students of their unit deficiency.

III. PROCEDURES FOR STUDENTS WHO FAIL TO MEET SATISFACTORY PROGRESS STANDARDS (continued)

or grade point deficiency and of the corrective action to be taken to allow continued receipt of financial aid. (See Section IIIA).

Students who are nearing the minimum number of units (beginning with 124) required for their degree will also receive written notification from the Financial Aid Office and be informed of the procedure for continuation of financial aid. (See Section IIIB).

A. PROCEDURE FOR STUDENTS WITH GPA AND UNIT DEFICIENCIES

If it is determined that a student's GPA is below a 2.0 (3.0 for graduate students) the student will be required to complete a Required Advising Form for Financial Aid with an advisor before any aid can be awarded. Any student reaching a seven unit deficiency will become ineligible for financial aid but shall have access to the appeals process (See Section IVA.1). Students with a major or taking units for a major will be expected to meet with an advisor in the major department. Students who are undeclared will meet with an advisor in the Academic Advising Center or in the EOP Office if they are EOP students. The advisor will assist students with strategies regarding how to improve the GPA. These strategies will be outlined on the Required Advising Form for Financial Aid. The Advising Form will then be signed by both the advisor and the student before being returned to the Financial Aid Office. Once the agreement is returned, the financial aid check can be disbursed. Student progress in reducing grade point deficiencies in accordance with the Required Advising Form for Financial Aid will be monitored at the end of the Spring Semester of the subsequent academic year.

At the time of review one of two things will occur, depending on the type of satisfactory progress deficiency.

GPA/Unit Deficiency:

- (1) The GPA must be a 2.0 the subsequent year.
- (2) Students with a 4-6 unit deficiency will receive a warning letter. Every year all applicants receive the policy that a 7 or more unit deficiency disqualifies them from Financial Aid.

B. PROCEDURE FOR STUDENTS WHO HAVE REACHED MINIMUM NUMBER OF UNITS FOR THE DEGREE

Students who have reached the minimum number of units required for the degree will be required to submit an approved graduation petition to the Office of Evaluations before any additional aid will be awarded.

**C. PROCEDURES FOR STUDENTS WHO HAVE REACHED THE UNIT  
MAXIMUM FOR THE DEGREE OR CERTIFICATE**

Students who have reached the unit maximum for the degree or certificate will have to complete the formal appeals process (See Section IV).

**IV. FORMAL APPEALS (FOR AN EXTENSION OF FINANCIAL AID  
ELIGIBILITY)**

**A. APPEALS DOCUMENTATION**

**1. FOR GPA AND UNIT DEFICIENCIES:**

The student will be required to prepare a comprehensive written statement outlining the circumstances that caused them not to meet the Satisfactory Progress Standards. The circumstances must be extenuating and supported by documentation (doctor's letter, etc.). In addition, they will also need to state what steps they are taking to ensure that they make progress from that point forward. The student may submit additional documentation to support the appeal (e.g. letters from an academic advisor).

**2. For Unit Maximum**

The student will be required to prepare a comprehensive statement outlining and documenting the circumstances that caused them to exceed the unit caps. In addition, they will need to state specifically when they plan to graduate and identify the courses that must be taken to complete degree requirements. The student may submit additional documentation to support the appeal (e.g. letters from an academic advisor). All paperwork will be returned to the Financial Aid Office for review.

**B. LEVELS OF APPEAL\*\***

The Appeal process regarding Satisfactory Progress Standards for the University consists of two levels of appeal available to any student who does not meet the standards.

**1. First Level Review -- Financial Aid Office**

All appeals will be reviewed by a Financial Aid counselor. If the counselor considers the circumstances specified as extenuating and beyond the student's control and the appeal is supported with appropriate documentation, the counselor may approve the appeal. Appeals denied by a counselor shall be forwarded immediately to the Financial Aid Appeals Board for a second level review. Students whose appeals have been denied at the first level will be notified of the action and informed that the appeal



has been forwarded to the Financial Aid Appeals Board for a second level review.

2. Second Level Review -- Financial Aid Appeals Board
  1. The Financial Aid Appeals Board will receive appeals that have been denied by the Financial Aid Counselor along with a brief written statement from the counselor of the reasons for denial of the appeal and all pertinent files and documents.
  2. Financial Aid Appeals Board will approve or deny the appeal based on documentation provided in the file. In some cases, the board may request that the student provide additional documentation and/or appear in person prior to rendering a decision. Approval of an appeal shall require the affirmative vote of a majority of seated members.
  3. In cases where the Board denies an appeal, the student will be notified and provided the option of providing additional documentation.
  4. The Board shall reconsider its decision in light of additional information provided by the student and render a decision. As in the initial Appeals Board review, approval of an appeal shall require the affirmative vote of a majority of seated members.

#### Financial Aid Appeals Board

The Financial Aid Appeals Board consists of six individuals; three Student Service Professionals, including at least two who do academic advising within their assignments; two instructional faculty members; and one student. No person from the Financial Aid Office may serve on the Board.

Each faculty and student service professional member will be appointed to a three year term, and the student a one year term. Any member of the committee may be reappointed for subsequent terms of three years each (or one year in case of a student).

Two of the Student Service Professionals are to be recommended by the Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs, Educational Equity and Student Retention, and one by the Vice President For Student Affairs; faculty by the Academic Senate; and students by the Associated Students. Appointments are made by the President.

\*Supersedes the November 6, 1987 policy on Satisfactory Progress Standards.

\*\*Supersedes February 20, 1992 Presidential Approval of Satisfactory Progress Appeals Process.

\*\*\*Supersedes April 1, 1994 policy on Satisfactory Progress Standards.

**PROCEDURE FOR IMPLEMENTING  
THE FACULTY MERIT INCREASE (FMI) PROGRAM**

Faculty Senate Agenda  
May 11, 2000

**STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES**

In the all too likely event that the Chancellor refuses the campus request to

- Suspend the FMI Program during the 2000-2001 academic year
- Join with CFA to truly assess the effectiveness and the cost of the current program
- Revise the faculty compensation system in such a way as to elicit the support and active participation of all faculty,

The California State University, Sacramento Faculty Senate establishes the following seven principles as a framework for establishing the California State University, Sacramento FMI Procedures.

1. The FMI Criteria should be established and published.
2. The primacy of the Department or Program should be honored in establishing criteria, evaluating and making FMI awards.
3. Evaluation criteria should be consistent and published at all levels.
4. Decisions should be based on knowledge of faculty performance and merit.
5. Compelling reasons should be the basis for overriding the Department or Program decisions.
6. College Deans and the President may augment FMI awards.
7. Fairness and equity require full disclosure.

**PRINCIPLES**

**1. The FMI Criteria should be established and published.**

The FMI criteria should be available to all faculty in advance of their decision to participate and to submit a Faculty Activity Report. Consequently, at the start of the annual FMI process, each Department and Program must develop and publish the criteria they will use to evaluate their faculty and to decide upon the awards to be given. Furthermore, at the start of the process the Departments and Programs must inform their faculty of the schedule of activities to be performed.

**2. The primacy of the Department or Program should be honored in establishing criteria, evaluating and making FMI awards.**

Having established their evaluation criteria, the Department or Program to which the faculty belongs generally knows best both the absolute and relative value of each of its members. Honoring such evaluations allows each Department or Program to encourage the kind and variety of academic performance they require of their members. For example, a given department may want to strengthen its commitment to scholarly research and thus may choose to reward faculty who excel in this category more generously. Another Department or Program may wish to encourage more service, while another wishes to encourage the scholarship of teaching. The FMI Program should allow Departments and Programs to reflect their own values and to promote their own perceived needs.

**3. Evaluation criteria should be consistent and published at all levels.**

Deans or the President should use the evaluation criteria developed and published by the Department or Program when performing a separate evaluation of the Department's or Program's FMI awards.

To do otherwise allows the College and/or University to ignore the Department's or Program's criteria and to evaluate the Faculty Activity Reports using different criteria than that which guided faculty preparation of the Reports.

#### **4. Decisions should be based on knowledge of faculty performance and merit.**

In most cases, for Deans or the President to change a Department or Program FMI award to any faculty member presumes knowledge of that person's actual merit without direct knowledge of that person's actual performance. Without the collaborative associations afforded by membership in one's academic unit, the true value and contribution of its members can only be presumed. Furthermore, if we assume that evaluations are made comparatively, a change by a Dean or the President overrides not only the Department or Program decision about the one faculty person, but the decisions about all others. Deans or the President can not know the relative value of each member of a Department or Program.

#### **5. Compelling reasons should be the basis for overriding the Department or Program decisions.**

Therefore, both the faculty member's Dean and the University President should honor the Department's evaluation and designated merit awards, except where there are compelling reasons for acting otherwise. Such compelling reasons would include instances where the FMI award could be characterized as capriciously or arbitrarily made and/or clearly not reflective of the person's demonstrated performance. Additionally we recognize that higher levels of review may need to correct inequities across departments based on the relative number of people applying for FMI awards. That is, it would be unfair for FMI applicants from a specific department to receive especially high awards simply because few departmental faculty members had applied for an FMI.

#### **6. College Deans and the President may augment FMI awards.**

Often faculty add value directly to the College through the service they perform on behalf of the Department. In such occurrences the value and consequent merit of such faculty may only be recognized at the College level, requiring the Dean to make an award independent of the awards made at other levels. Similarly, faculty may directly add value to the University through the service they perform, again, on behalf of the Department. In such occurrences the value and consequent merit of such faculty may only be recognized at that level, requiring the President to make an award independent of the awards made at other levels.

#### **7. Fairness and equity require full disclosure.**

The FMI process must be characterized by openness. The names of those recommended, those who receive awards, and the size of the awards must be public knowledge. In addition, the rationale used for making awards must be clearly communicated. In those cases where an award is reduced or eliminated, the reasons must also be communicated to the affected faculty person. Furthermore, a fair and equitable appeal process requires that appellants be provided with a clear explanation of all actions taken.

5/9/00

## CSUS Baccalaureate Learning Goals

Prepared by the Faculty Senate Working Group on University Learning Goals  
(Fall 1999/Spring 2000)

### **BACKGROUND/RATIONALE:**

Several forces, both internal and external, have led to the development of these learning goals for recipients of a CSUS baccalaureate degree.

Groups and individuals we loosely define as "external stakeholders" have been the most vocal advocates of changes in the ways we conceive and evaluate our degree and the programs that support it. Our most recent WASC accreditation involved the development of broadly conceptualized student outcomes and preliminary efforts to document our institutional effectiveness through assessment. CSU system initiatives first proposed as part of the "Cornerstones" plan for reformation of the baccalaureate have metamorphosed into a system-wide proposal for key performance indicators of "continuous improvement." The language of "accountability" has entered the vocabularies of the governor, the state's legislators and the publics we serve most directly---students, parents and employers.

However, the impetus for the development of campus-based student learning goals and meaningful program assessment and evaluation has not been merely a reactive response to "outsiders'" demands. The 1994 *CSUS Strategic Plan* noted that in order to meet the campus' goals for high quality academic programs, the campus community needed to "revise the academic program review and evaluation process to focus on teaching, learning and improving desired student outcomes." As a result of this recommendation, the academic program review process was revised, and the Faculty Senate approved a University assessment policy. In the fall of 1998 and the spring of 1999, CSUS faculty collaborated with colleagues from a number of disciplines at CSU Chico and San Francisco State University, in a project that developed common learning outcomes for two General Education requirements----written communication and quantitative reasoning. The results of their efforts were presented to the Chancellor and the statewide Academic Senate. In fall 1999, during the Senate retreat, a working group on assessment was organized. Additionally, in the fall of 1999, the Senate was asked to reconsider and revise the Academic Programs theme of the *Strategic Plan* and the assessment policy that underpins it. These two activities have propitiously coincided with two additional campus initiatives that are firmly rooted in the values of our campus community. One, the first program review of General Education, since 1988, has begun the collection of data about the effectiveness of this central component of the university curriculum. The second, our participation in a nation-wide project to create an on-line institutional portfolio, funded by the Pew Charitable Trust, led to a faculty and outside stakeholders' survey of fundamental learning goals for the baccalaureate degree. The results

of that survey and consultations with departments and individual faculty members form the basis of the proposal that follows.

Our campus is poised to undertake a major step in formalizing and making explicit the values, knowledge, skills, and expectations which are at the heart of our efforts as educators. These expectations of undergraduate learning place our common values at the center of our efforts to evaluate and improve the quality of student learning at CSUS. The implementation of these expectations across the curriculum will allow us to work together in consistent and coherent ways to embody our goal of offering "academic programs characterized by high quality, . . . a commitment to life-long learning, the preparation of an educated citizenry, and a responsiveness to regional needs."

#### **A STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES:**

A baccalaureate education is focused on the premise that all students should explore how the great body of human knowledge is organized and become familiar with the methods for gaining, evaluating and extending that knowledge. Baccalaureate students should possess a range of knowledge, values, and skills that will enrich and shape their lives long after their formal education has ended.

Most of the learning expectations that follow emphasize ways of knowing and contexts for knowledge rather than specific content. More than any specific list of courses, these baccalaureate learning goals emphasize the development of knowledge, values and skills that will serve students throughout their lives, providing them with

- the resourcefulness and flexibility to adapt successfully to rapid social, economic and technological change,
- the understandings and tolerance necessary for informed citizenship and social action, and
- the interest and curiosity that is essential to the pursuit of learning throughout a lifetime

## EXPECTATIONS OF UNDERGRADUATE LEARNING

(revised 5/2000)

### ◆ Competence in the disciplines

DEFINITION: The ability to demonstrate the competencies and values listed below in at least one major field of study. Additionally, this learning goal requires students to demonstrate informed understandings of other fields, drawing on the knowledge and skills of disciplines outside the major.

SPECIFIC EXPECTATIONS: This expectation is demonstrated by a student's ability to

- a) examine, organize, and reveal significant understanding of at least one disciplinary way of knowing
- b) apply at least one discipline's knowledge and methods to specific problems and issues
- c) examine, organize and integrate a variety of disciplinary perspectives and ways of knowing to reveal a broad understanding of the relationships between disciplines and the ways they strengthen and enliven each other.

### ◆ Analysis and Problem-Solving

DEFINITION: The ability of students to identify and diagnose problems; organize and critically evaluate relevant information of a qualitative and quantitative nature; develop reasonable arguments and effective solutions.

SPECIFIC EXPECTATIONS: This set of expectations is demonstrated by a student's ability, as an individual and in collaboration with others, to

- a) analyze complex issues and make informed decisions
- b) recognize and synthesize valid and relevant information from various sources in order to arrive at reasoned conclusions
- c) diagnose and solve problems, including those which are quantitative in nature
- d) evaluate the effectiveness of proposed solutions

### ◆ Communication

DEFINITION: The ability to read, write, speak and listen effectively. The ability to respond, with understanding and appreciation to a wide variety of communicative acts.

SPECIFIC EXPECTATIONS: This set of expectations is demonstrated by a student's ability to

- a) express ideas and facts in a variety of written and quantitative formats and to a variety of audiences in discipline-specific, work-place, and civic contexts

- b) comprehend, interpret, and analyze written and oral presentations
- c) communicate orally in one-on-one and group settings
- d) communicate in a language other than English
- e) interpret, analyze, and evaluate ideas presented in a variety of creative formats, including written, verbal and visual.

◆ Information Competence

DEFINITION: The ability to make effective and ethical use of information resources and technology for personal and professional needs.

SPECIFIC EXPECTATIONS: This set of expectations is demonstrated by a student's ability to

- a) locate needed information using a variety of resources, including journals, books, and other media
- b) use basic computer applications such as word processing software, e-mail, the internet, and electronic databases
- c) learn, understand, evaluate and apply appropriate technologies to information processes, communication needs, and problem-solving in productive and sustained ways in both professional and personal settings
- d) distinguish and make judgements among available information resources

◆ Cultural Legacies

DEFINITION: Acquisition of knowledge of human accomplishments in the creative and performing arts and the achievements of human thought.

SPECIFIC EXPECTATIONS: This set of expectations is demonstrated by a student's

- a) application of a broadly historical consciousness to the human condition, the social world, and human achievements in the arts and sciences
- b) experience of and appreciation for the fine and performing arts
- c) understanding of the development of world civilizations and the values of different cultural traditions
- d) ability to apply aesthetic principles to various cultural expressions

◆ Values and Pluralism

DEFINITION: The ability to apply ethical standards in order to make moral judgements with respect to individual conduct and citizenship, and to recognize the diversity of human experiences and cultures, both within the United States and internationally. The development of positive social attitudes, values and behaviors.

SPECIFIC EXPECTATIONS: This set of expectations is demonstrated by a student's

- a) recognition of the moral dimensions of decisions and actions
- b) understanding of and respect for those who are different from oneself



- c) willingness to accept individual responsibility
- d) ability to work collaboratively with those who come from diverse cultural backgrounds
- e) ability to recognize and understand the implications of various social structures and the ways people are grouped by such characteristics as status, race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation
- f) valuation of service as a component of active citizenship

5-9-00