2000-2001
FACULTY SENATE
California State University, Sacramento

AGENDA
Thursday, March 15, 2001
Foothill Suite, University Union
3:00 -5:00 p.m.

OPEN FORUM

CONSENT CALENDAR

FS 01-12/CPC, Ex.   JOINT DOCTORAL PROGRAM IN HIGHER EDUCATION POLICY --
REQUEST TO NEGOTIATE

The Faculty Senate recommends approval to negotiate a Joint Doctoral program in
Higher Education Policy between CSUS and the School of Policy, Planning and
Development of the University of Southern California. (Attachment A)

FS 01-13/CPC, Ex.   CURRICULUM REVIEW -- DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

The Faculty Senate receives the commendations and recommendations (Attachment B) of
the Curriculum Policies Committee on the program review of the Department of
Psychology and recommends that the Bachelor of Arts degree and the Master of Arts
degree in Psychology be approved for six years or until the next program review.

FS 01-14/CPC, Ex.   COURSE PROPOSALS -- NEW COURSE PROPOSAL POLICY
(Amends "Policies and Procedures for Initiation, Modification, Review
and Approval of Courses and Academic Programs" [*Blue Book*])

The Faculty Senate recommends approval of amendments to the *Blue Book*, Section II,
subsections A and D, as shown in Attachment C.

FS 01-15/CPC, Ex.   CERTIFICATE PROGRAMS -- APPROVAL PROCESS FOR
CERTIFICATE OF PARTICIPATION
(Amends *Blue Book*)

The Faculty Senate recommends approval of amendments to the *Blue Book*, Section VII,
Subsection E, as shown in Attachment C.

FS 01-16/CPC, Ex.   CERTIFICATE PROGRAMS – PROCEDURES FOR SUBMITTING
PROPOSALS FOR CERTIFICATE PROGRAMS (Amends *Blue Book*)

The Faculty Senate recommends approval of amendments to the *Blue Book*, Section VII,
Subsection I, as shown in Attachment C.

REGULAR AGENDA

FS 01-11/Flr. MINUTES

Approval of the Minutes of February 15 (#8), 2001.

FIRST READING
[Discussion only—unless extended by majority vote; no action.]

FS 01-17/CPC, Ex.   ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEWS – SELF STUDY GUIDELINES   *2nd reading 4-5-01*
(Amends *Blue Book*)

The Faculty Senate recommends approval of amendments to the *Blue Book*, Section X,
Subsection F.II, as shown in Attachment D.

FS 01-18/Flr. CESAR CHAVEZ HOLIDAY RESOLUTION

The Executive Committee has placed this item on the agenda at the request of Don Hall
and does so without recommendation.   *Govt Code Section 6700-6717*

PROPOSED RESOLUTION for CSUS Faculty Senate: Cesar Chavez Holiday

6701- if on sun-mon holiday on Sat- Fri Holiday

WHEREAS, the CSUS Board of Trustees decided at its January 24
meeting that all campuses should be closed on March 30 in honor of Cesar
Chavez, and this decision was only communicated to the faculty in mid-
February; and

WHEREAS, most teaching faculty had already prepared their calendar of
lectures and assignments before the semester began, and distributed their
syllabi to students on the first day of class, and it is very disruptive of
these assignment schedules to have one class day suddenly removed on
such short notice; and

WHEREAS, the Trustees made little or no consultation with the Faculty
about whether this precipitous action was wise or practical, and many
individual faculty have been angered by both the substance and manner of
this action; and

WHEREAS, the observance of Presidents' Day has always been moved to the last week of December in order not to interfere with class schedules, and it would be difficult to defend the proposal that Cesar Chavez was more important to the history of this country than George Washington and Abraham Lincoln combined; and

WHEREAS, Chavez, like Washington and Lincoln, might actually be better honored by holding classes and striving toward academic achievements rather than merely having a "skip day"; be it therefore

RESOLVED: that the CSUS Faculty Senate expresses to the Trustees its disappointment at their hasty and disruptive action; and be it further

RESOLVED: that all such actions that impact the academic calendar should be taken only in consultation and in agreement with the Faculty; and be it further

RESOLVED: that all future observance of the Cesar Chavez holiday should be moved to the last week of December in exactly the same way as Presidents' Day.

INFORMATION

Distance Ed
Grade Appeals

1. Faculty Merit Pay System Workgroup – J. Bauerly

2. Report on Accountability Goals – B. Buckley (Attachment E)

3. YRO Update – B. Buckley

4. Tentative S'2001 Senate Meetings—Thursdays, 3:00-5:00 p.m., in the Foothill Suite, University Union, unless otherwise noted:

Spring 2001		April 19	No Meeting
		April 26 3:00-3:30 3:30-5:00	2001-02 Senate Nominations 2000-01 Senate **Meets**
March 22	~~Tentative~~ No Meeting	May 3	*tentative*
March 29	*Tentative*	May 10 3:00-3:30 3:30-5:00	2001-02 Senate Elections 2000-01 Senate **Meets**
April 5	*Tentative*	May 17	*tentative*
April 12	**Spring Recess**	May 24	*Tentative (*Finals Week)

5. Senate Home Page: http:/www.csus.edu/acse/ or CSUS Home Page *then* Administration and Policy *then* Administration *then* Faculty Senate

Academic Affairs

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO

IX: Joint Doctoral Programs

A. **Criteria for Evaluating Requests to Negotiate Joint Doctoral Programs**[*]

Permission to negotiate formally the establishment of a joint doctoral program with another institution in no way implies approval of the program which eventually emerges. For that reason, such requests need not be elaborate documents, and the criteria for evaluating them are relatively simple.

1. NEED: There should exist an evident population to be served. There should exist an evident social need and career opportunities for the graduates of such a program. There should exist a need for the program in the region and/or state. Mere duplication is not a deciding factor; the deciding factor is needed.

2. CSUS CAPABILITY: The CSUS department should possess prima facia a faculty with extensive experience with master's programming and master's theses, highly articulated, cohesive, and relevant research experience and interests, and demonstrated potential for obtaining needed funding for research. The department should append degree programs offered and of theses completed and number of degrees awarded.

3. COLLABORATING INSTITUTION CAPABILITY: If the collaborating institution already has a doctoral program in the field, information on degree programs offered and number of doctoral degrees awarded must be provided. If the institution does not have such a program, evidence of the general capability of the faculty along the lines indicated in #2 will need to be provided. In both cases, a rationale for the selection of the collaborating institution shall be provided.

   In all cases it is presumed that these criteria will be applied in a spirit of collegiality. Permission to negotiate formally the establishment of a joint doctoral program is the first formal step of a process to develop a program. It is not approval of a program; consideration of approval comes as a later and final campus step, with the results of the negotiation at hand.

B. **Review Criteria and Guidelines for Joint Doctoral Programs**[*]

1. Rationale for Doctoral Program

   a. The proposal should specify how the program grows out of the intellectual life of the department and what its purpose is.

February 28, 2001

To: Robert Buckley, Chair
         Faculty Senate

From: Robert Waste, Director *R.W.*
         Graduate Program in Public Policy and Administration

Re: Request to Negotiate Joint Doctoral Program

Informal discussions between the faculty of the CSUS Graduate Program in Public Policy and Administration (PPA) and with the faculty and Dean of the School of Policy, Planning, and Development (SPPD) of the University of Southern California (USC) suggest strongly the need and potential for a joint doctoral program in higher education policy. The SSIS Curriculum Committee has granted PPA permission to enter into more formal negotiations with USC regarding such a venture. By means of this memorandum, and in line with CSUS policy regarding the development of joint doctoral programs, I am now seeking permission from the Faculty Senate to enter into such negotiations. I recognize that permission to negotiate is but a step in the process toward a joint degree program and in no way signals approval of such a program.

The CSUS component of the potential degree would be housed in the College of Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies and administered and staffed in the main by PPA faculty. It would, however, draw upon the substantive expertise and teaching and research contributions of faculty in other SSIS programs and in other colleges such as the College of Education. Faculty from both USC and CSUS would be expected to collaborate on all aspects of instruction, supervision, curriculum development, and program oversight.

In preliminary discussions, USC and CSUS deans and faculty have characterized the aim of the potential joint doctoral program as the preparation of educational leaders and top managers in California and nationally in the important areas of the design, implementation, and assessment of educational policy generally and higher education policy in particular. Our focus is on an alternative to the traditional Ed.D. in the sense that the Ed.D. normally attends more to basic administrative issues and less to issues of policy formulation and implications at a state or even more global level. The jointly administered degree would reverse these emphases. As well, we envision the joint degree as targeted to a professional audience rather than to the more traditional, academically oriented pursuers of the conventional Ph.D. of either the education or public policy variety, though the joint degree would draw upon components of both.

Both parties to the preliminary discussions believe that the focus of the proposed program should be upon the relatively unique (in size and complexity) higher education situation in California. Particularly important (and the attractive feature of the CSUS connection) is the program's potential to exploit the exceptional higher education policy construction and administrative context of the state capital. The PPA program and the Center for California Studies have long-standing ties to all branches of state government in Sacramento. Thus, we would expect students in the program to take advantage of the location in the capital. We envision, for example, internships and related observation situations in which students are placed in legislative offices or committee sessions and other government agencies (e.g., the Department of Education, CPEC, the California Board of Education, the Sacramento Chancellor's Office of the CSU and its Community College System counterpart) to observe firsthand the processes and outcomes on which their coursework would focus.

Three issues are to be addressed in requests to negotiate joint doctoral programs: need, CSUS capability, and collaborating institution capability.

Need

We believe that demand for a program like that described above is very strong, primarily because of rapid growth and persistent turnover in the ranks of community college administrators and education policy analysts generally. Secondarily, we believe that there is a strong market for such a degree among those holding policy-related jobs in the state legislature and government agencies.

It has become reasonably clear that education as an institution in California is seriously in transition. A robust economy and demographic trends have combined to put pressure on nearly all levels of schooling. Community colleges, for example, are at once being overwhelmed with expanding enrollment and being urged better to dovetail their curricula with state and regional needs. State universities also are being asked to build bridges with communities, to adapt to increasingly larger enrollments, and to develop the capacity better and more speedily to meet changing demands in professional and occupational sectors. The pressure to produce teachers for our public schools, for example, is intense and felt by both community college and state university systems. At the same time, legislators and boards of trustees are seeking greater levels of accountability from institutions of higher education and, at least in the community college and CSU systems, attempts at accountability are occurring in a collective bargaining environment. As well, we are experiencing large numbers of retirements in the ranks of faculty in our colleges and universities, complicating, for instance, system responses to policy initiatives that rest on expansion of program delivery.

Similarly, we are encountering increasing numbers of retirements of administrators and policy analysts at all levels of education and seem barely able to keep pace in filling these vacancies. Whether or not the retirees were prepared to handle contemporary policy challenges is moot. We need not only to replace outgoing administrators and policy analysts but also to expand the ranks of such professionals generally. Those who fill those ranks must possess a knowledge and skill set somewhat different from that of their predecessors, the ability to work directly with those formulating state higher education policy and to assist systems and individual campuses to anticipate and respond to policy initiatives proactively, rather than reactively.

CSUS Capability

The PPA program focuses, via scholarly inclination and stated program mission, upon issues of policy formulation, implementation, and evaluation. Particular attention is afforded these issues in a California context. The program is devoted entirely to graduate-level instruction. The faculty is accomplished in graduate programming and the direction of master's theses, possesses highly articulated, cohesive, and relevant research experience and interests, and has a demonstrable record of obtaining funding to support research and program development. A review of the vitae of PPA faculty members finds those members, to a person, possessing scholarly profiles similar to members of doctoral programs in other universities. Beyond the membership of the PPA faculty, SSIS and other colleges in this University house numerous scholars with the experience and credentials necessary to a contribution to the proposed degree program.

Collaborating Institution Capability

USC is a renowned doctoral-level university. The faculty of the School of Policy, Planning, and Development (including State Historian, Kevin Starr) are interdisciplinary in scholarly orientation and exceptionally experienced in the study of the challenges of governing, managing, and leading in our complex urban and regional milieu. SPPD has strong ties with USC's Rossier School of Education. Additionally, SPPD oversees USC's Sacramento Center, which offers master's programs in public administration, planning and development studies, and health administration. USC thus has a history of providing educational programs in the capital.

In sum, with your permission and in the hope that negotiations proceed well, we hope soon to combine the public policy interests and the state capital experience of PPA and SPPD to form one of the more innovative and timely doctoral programs in the West if not nationally.

Thank you for your attention.

Year 2000 Report of the CSUS Program Review Team
for the
Department of Psychology
in the College of Natural Sciences & Mathematics

Program Review Team Members
>   Leah Vande Berg (Communication Studies), Review Team Chair
>   Roselee Carter (Biological Sciences)
>   Virginia Dixon (Educational Administration)
>   Peter Sharp (International Business)

Persons Spoken With and/or Interviewed by Members of the Review Team

Dr. Cecilia Gray, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs
Dr. Marion O'Leary, Dean of the College of Natural Sciences & Mathematics
Dr. Tammy Bourg, Psychology Department Chair
The Faculty of the Department of Psychology in general session
Approximately 40 Psychology students: classroom meetings with about 25
>   undergraduate students and approximately 15 graduate students (and
>   follow-up e-mails from students to program review committee)
Mr. Stan Frost, Library
Dr. Joan Sieber, External Consultant

Documents Consulted

Spring 1993 Psychology Department Program Review
1998-1999 Psychology Department Self-Study
Dr. Joan Sieber's External Consultant Report
CSUS Catalog
Advising Brochure for [Undergraduate] Psychology Majors (dated June 1998)
Brochure for Prospective Psychology Graduate Students (dated May 1998)
26 May 1999 Addemdum to the Psychology Self-Study
7 July 1999 Memorandum from Dean O'Leary to Dr. Tammy Bourg concerning
>   the Psychology Department "Self-Study Document"
6 January 2000 letter from Psychology Department Chair, Dr. Tammy Bourg, to
>   Dean O'Leary concerning "Assessment Update"
25 February 2000 letter from Psychology Department Chair, Dr. Tammy Bourg to
>   Dean O'Leary concerning "New Faculty Positions"
American Psychological Association "Policy Principles for Quality Undergraduate
>   Psychology Programs"

American Psychological Association "Guidelines and Principles for Accreditation for
    Programs in Psychology": Section IIID, Graduate Programs
CSUS Bluebook Section X "Program Reviews"
CSUS "Program Review Protocol"
CSUS Strategic Plan
Academic Program Review Report for the Department of Humanities and Religious Studies
Academic Program Review Report for the Department of Geography
Academic Program Review Report

I. COMMENDATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Commendations to the Department of Psychology

The Program Review Team commends the Department of Psychology for the following:

1. the creation of a positive climate of student support, as indicated in their undergraduate students' positive comments about friendly interactions with accessible faculty.

2. its faculty's commitment to its disciplinary/departmental community as demonstrated in the active involvement of faculty in departmental governance and committee work.

3. its leadership's dedicated and effective work on behalf of faculty, students, and staff in the department.

4. the collegiality displayed by members of the Department toward one another.

5. the substantial number of full-time faculty (50%) actively involved in publishing their research in peer reviewed venues during the past five years.

6. its greatly improved, revised undergraduate program.

7. its earnest, substantive efforts to respond to the recommendations of the previous (1993) review team.

8. its cooperation with the program review team.

9. its comprehensive self-study.

B. **Joint Recommendations to the Dean of Natural Sciences and Mathematics and the Deparment of Psychology**

1. The Dean and the Department of Psychology should confer about the need to regularize the graduate course offerings required for students to complete the MA program in a timely manner.

2. The Dean and the Department of Psychology should confer about scheduling psychology classes in Amador building classrooms that are appropriate for the class size and the pedagogy most conducive to student learning.

3. The Dean and the Department of Psychology should confer about ways to meet the Department's needs for web support/expertise and greater instructional support in terms of providing knowledgeable student computer laboratory assistance/assistants.

4. The Dean and the Department of Psychology should confer about the Department's felt need for additional space for research facilities and the problematic physical conditions in the animal laboratory facilities and the cosmetic improvements needed in the counseling clinical spaces.

5. The Dean and the Department of Psychology should work together to develop ways to provide reasonable workload credit for the 194 and 195 classes, clinical supervision, and thesis.

6. The Dean and the Department of Psychology should work together to arrive at reasonable, mutually agreed-upon FTE targets for the department.

C. **Recommendations to the Department of Psychology**

1. The Department should revisit and revise its mission statement. The current mission statement is too narrowly focused on undergraduate professional training and fails to reflect the myriad ways in which the Department's current activities (especially its clinical and counseling activities at the graduate level) fulfill the University Strategic Plan goals (see p. 10 of the Strategic Plan).

2. The Department should begin to develop and then to utilize (a) an alumni organization, and (b) a community advisory group to provide community input to the Department. The Department should use these organizations to provide the Department with input about local and regional occupational opportunities for student interns and department graduates and developing career challenges that the Department may find useful in evaluating the Department curriculum.
   As part of its development of an alumni group and a community psychology advisory board, for example, the Department might explore the possibility of utilizing the already-existing University Homecoming week and/or River City Days. Guest lectures by Psychology

Department alumni (publicized to the Department's undergraduate and graduate students several weeks in advance via the Department web site, the Hornet, Amador bulletin boards, and in classes) during the university-wide activities of Homecoming and River City Days should be encouraged. So, too, should faculty incorporation into their course activities of alumni and community guest lectures, round-table discussions, and/or day-long seminars on careers and occupations in psychology and the future of the discipline during these weeks (Homecoming and River City Days) because such interactions offer one convenient vehicle through which the department can provide opportunities for current undergraduate and graduate students to interact and develop contacts with Department alumni in the community and region while simultaneously providing the department with broad-based community interactions and visibility.

3. The Review Team recommends that the Department revisit its assessment plan and submit a revised and considerably refined plan (which includes more specific descriptions of the learning outcomes and a specification of which outcomes are being met in which--presumably multiple--courses) to the Dean and the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs within three years.

      Specifically, the Department should continue its efforts to develop its undergraduate assessment plan, and should begin working on its graduate assessment plan. In particular, the Department must (a) develop more specific learning, ethics, and skill outcomes, and (b) indicate which of these outcomes are being addressed by which specific courses in the Department. The Department Assessment plan also must address in more detail what the primary goals of its assessment plan are: Does the Department see its goals as primarily formative rather than summative? For students or for program evaluation?

4. The Department should revisit its graduate curriculum in light of the adequacy of the current required core in meeting students' needs for a solid foundation for (a) post-MA graduate studies, and (b) teaching psychology at the junior college. This re-examination should include consideration of adding qualitative research methods instruction to the department's existing instruction in quantitative research methods.

5. The Department should undertake medium-range planning (i.e., 3-5 year) for graduate course offerings. Specifically, the Department should develop and implement a multi-year course rotation for graduate classes that is as sensitive to student scheduling needs as faculty teaching and time preferences. Such scheduling should include sufficient evening (after 5:30 p.m.) offerings of required courses in each sequence that graduate students can complete their M.A. degrees in the time frame the Department graduate degree brochure promises is possible. In doing this, the Department should meet with their Dean to address the serious problems that cancellation of graduate classes wreaks with timely matriculation and cost to students (see Recommendation I.B.1. above).

6. The Review Team concurs with External Consultant Sieber's recommendation that the Department revisit the amost-exclusive focus on statistical research in its foundational

undergraduate courses, PSYC 1, 5, and 8, and consider the following changes: (a) combining 1 and 5, (b) offering ways to test out/challenge the redundant statistics information covered in these classes, and (c) adding a qualitative research methods course that would prepare students to do the kinds of focus group, case study, and ethnographic research and report writing required in many work settings and used by scholars doing research in many areas in the field of psychology.

7. The Review Team recommends that the Department gather and utilize information about the work done in its clinical programs and research practicums to better publicize the vital, extensive community outreach and regional service provided by the Department through its clinical psychology program.

8. The Department should improve its internal communication with its undergraduate and graduate students. This could be accomplished, for example, by posting timely information on its bulletin boards. Alternatively, as External Consultant Sieber suggests, the Department could develop and maintain a department web page that provides online versions of both undergraduate and graduate handbooks, calendars of important dates (e.g., deadlines for graduation, for filing plans of study), important forms (e.g., advancement to candidacy, etc.), and hotlinks to lists of available internships and 194s. Such a web page could provide students with an overview or introduction to the field of psychology and links to advising tracks (as noted earlier) of recommended courses (in psychology and related departments) that would prepare students for various career options (e.g., Applied Behavior Analysis could be combined with liberal studies classes to prepare students for a teacher credential program, or, as External Consultant Sieber suggests, Applied Behavior Analysis classes could be combined with other classes and reorganized into an M.S. or M.A. in Applied Behavior Analysis that could prepare IO students to pursue high-tech industry positions). These advising tracks should be available both in print form (on color-coded sheets of paper) in the main department office and on the department web page.

9. The Department must work with its Dean to improve the room scheduling of classes to make sure that the rooms are large enough for the size of the classes placed in them and the instructional techniques appropriate to the class (see also Recommendation I.B.2. above).

10. The Department should improve the integration of computer and lab schedules with curricular needs of classes, and should make certain that the student staff assigned to supervise computer laboratories for psychology classes are knowledgeable in the applications being used by students in the labs.

11. The Department should consider implementing the use of paid teaching assistants to (a) provide help to students in computer labs from individuals knowledgeable both in subject metter, statistics, and computer analysis programs (e.g., SPSS), and (b) to develop, maintain, and update department and course web pages.

12. The Department should consider utilizing the University Visiting Scholars program to address areas of the curriculum not represented by the current faculty but which the department feels are important in ensuring the department has the depth and breadth required of quality undergraduate and master's degree programs (and in areas that the Department does not anticipate immanent hires will be made).

13. The Department should consider developing searchable databases (accessible from the Department web page) on (a) the fieldwork and internship assignments available to students and (b) research opportunities available to students in the department (see Consultant's Report, Recommendations III and IV). In the meantime, the Department should post these opportunities on its web page so that all students in the department have easy, current, and timely access to these opportunities (see Consultant's Report, Recommendations II and IV; see also Recommendation I.C.8. above).

14. The Department <u>must</u> redesign its internship program and its handling of the 194 Research Practicums. As Dr. Sieber, the External Consultant, noted, "students' current practice of persuading individual advisors to organize and supervise their internships is inefficient and ineffective in many respects" (Consultant's Report, "An Internship Program").

15. The Department should explore the possibility of providing at least two additional graduate tracks--an M.A. in Teaching Psychology [in the Community College] and an M.S. in Applied Behavior Analysis (which, the External Consultant suggests, might enhance students' career possibilities in the "Sierra Silicon Valley" and might be combined with credential programs to prepare psychology graduate students to assume teaching and administrative positions in the now-burgeoning field of education (see Consultant's Report, "Developing New Graduate Programs").

16. The Review Team encourages the Psychology Department to revisit the 1993 Program Review's recommendation of incorporating classroom visits in its post-tenure and RTP processes. We do not believe that the Department Self-Study's response to Recommendation 17 from the 1993 Program Review (pp. 45-47 of the Self Study) adequately explains why the Department has not adopted the Program Review's recommendation of a classroom visit as part of the once-every-five-years post-tenure review process and part of the yearly evaluation and mentorship of faculty still in the RTP cycle. Thus, we encourage the Psychology Department to revisit this issue and to reconsider adopting this or an alternative collegial, cooperative, and peer-supportive mentoring policy.

D. Recommendations to the Faculty Senate

1. The Bachelor of Arts degree in Psychology should be approved for six years or until the next program review.

2. The Master of Arts degree in Psychology should be approved for six years or until the next program review.

**TRANSMITTAL FORM
RECOMMENDATION FROM SENATE COMMITTEE
TO EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

TO: Executive Committee

FROM: Tom Kando, Chair
    Curriculum Policies Committee

DATE: February 7, 2001

ISSUE: RCE Course approval policy

BACKGROUND: On Jan. 30, 2001, the Executive Committee approved the following new course approval policy for RCE, to replace the existing language in section AS 82-47 of the University Manual:

> ANew RCE credit courses must be submitted through the regular curriculum review approval process.≅

> ANew RCE courses offered for CEUs will require the approval of the department and the College Dean.≅

> ANew RCE non-credit courses will be subject only to internal RCE review.≅

In order to bring consistency between different sections of the Blue Book (Policies and Procedures for Approval of Courses and Programs) and the University Manual, the CPC revised and approved unanimously language in sections II and VII of the Blue Book, as follows:

1. Blue Book Section II (see attachment A):
    Subsection A (New Course Proposal Policy) revised as follows (*Italics* added):

> A1:~~All~~ *N*new course proposals require departmental and college approval. [Note: Original course proposal forms with appropriate signatures must be submitted to the Office for Academic Affairs.] *(See section IID for policy governing RCE course approval)*

Subsection D (newly added):

> D. <u>RCE New Course and Course Change Proposal</u>

>> 1. New RCE credit courses and substantive changes in courses for credit must be submitted through the regular curriculum review approval process.

>> 2. New RCE courses offered for CEUs and substantive changes in courses offered for CEUs will require the approval of the department and the College Dean.

3. New RCE non-credit courses will be subject only to internal RCE review.

2. Blue Book Section VII (see attachment B):
Subsection E (Approval Process for Certificate of Participation) revised as follows (*Italics* added):

E1: All proposals to award a Certificate of Participation shall be directed to the College Dean of the relevant College for review and recommendation by ~~appropriate College bodies~~ *the appropriate department chair*. The review shall include the determination of relevance, extent of conflict (if any) with existing academic programs, resource needs, and any other pertinent factors.

2. Upon approval by the College, the completed Form B and ~~fifteen copies of~~ the proposal shall be ~~referred by the College Dean and~~ returned to the Dean of Regional and Continuing Education ~~to the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs for~~ ~~review by the Senate=s appropriate curriculum committee~~ for his/her review and concurrence.

3. Delete

4. Delete

Subsection I (Procedures for Submitting Proposals for Certificate Programs) revised as follows (*Italics* added):

I. *For certificates of academic achievement programs*, submit 15 copies of the following information to the Office of the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs.
For certificates of participation programs, submit 1 copy of the following information to the appropriate department chair and college dean of the relevant College for review and recommendation.

RECOMMENDATION: unanimous approval. The people consulted include RCE Dean Alice Tom, who wrote the revisions for Section VII, above. Other people and documents consulted are the same as those mentioned in the CPC=s Dec. 12, 2000 transmittal.

ARGUMENTS FOR: This is essentially a housekeeping measure mean to bring consistency between two different sections of the Blue Book, and the University Manual. The substantive policy change has already been approved by the Executive Committee.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST: none

**TRANSMITTAL FORM
RECOMMENDATION FROM SENATE COMMITTEE
TO EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

TO: Executive Committee

FROM: Tom Kando, Chair
        Curriculum Policies Committee

DATE: February 13, 2001

ISSUE: Insert language in Program Review Policy to require programs to justify extending the baccalaureate unit requirement beyond 120 units.

BACKGROUND: On June 1, 2000, the board of trustees initiated the process of changing Title 5, section 40508 , to reduce the minimum CSU baccalaureate degree unit requirement from 124 to 120 semester units.
On 11/2-3/00 the statewide academic senate passed the following resolution:
> AThat the Acad. Senate of the CSU recommend that each campus academic senate develop the required Amonitoring system to ensure that justification is provided for all program requirements that extend the baccalaureate unit requirement beyond 120 units≅ (Title 5, 40508)≅

The CPC was charged with developing language to be included in the Program Review Self Study Guidelines to reflect this new requirement.

The CPC has now approved the following language for insertion into the Blue Book -- Chapter X (Program Reviews), Section FII (Self Study Guidelines, Academic Programs (italics added):

> **B. How is your curriculum structured (including core requirements, prerequisites and electives) to achieve your learning expectations?** *If your curriculum requires that majors take more than 120 units for their degree, provide a justification for the extra units.*
>
> **Include a matrix that displays learning expectations and how courses contribute to achieving the expectations.**

Note: only the text in italics is new. All else is existing program review policy.

ARGUMENTS FOR: The addition of one sentence requiring programs to justify extending the baccalaureate unit requirement beyond 120 units is all that is necessary at this time to comply with Title 5 and with the 11/2/3/00 statewide academic senate mandate. Further ramifications of the lowered minimum CSU baccalaureate degree unit requirement may emerge in the future. For example, it may become necessary to specify grounds upon which programs may and may not extend requirements beyond 120 units. The CPC spent time discussing some of the academic issues raised by the lowering of the minimum unit requirement. However, no further instructions have been given so far.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST: none

AS-2511-00/AA
November 2-3, 2000

The Role of Campus Senates in the Accountability Process

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University urge the Chancellor to ensure that campus senates are involved actively in the process of forming and setting goals and preparing and submitting reports as part of the CSU accountability process; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge the Chancellor to ensure that the accountability report for each campus be signed by the academic senate chair on behalf of the campus's senate or to accept a separate report from the campus; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge the Chancellor and Board of Trustees to ensure, in keeping with Cornerstones Principle 10, that the accountability process not be used to compare individual campuses or to compare similar programs among CSU campuses.

RATIONALE: In a report titled "CSU Accountability Process; Report to the Board of Trustees: September 2000," the CSU Chancellor's Office submitted the first of what are anticipated to be annual reports to the Board of Trustees under Principle 9 of the Cornerstones report adopted by the Board of Trustees in 1998 and following procedures adopted by the Board of Trustees in November 1999. This first report consists of a series of measures of performance by the system as a whole and, for each campus, a "Digest of 1998/1999 Campus Accountability Data: Extracted from campus reports and system data." Since submission of this first report, the Accountability Process has been extended to include goal setting by individual campuses. The request for goals, including those related to the quality of a campus's academic program, was communicated to campus presidents by the Chancellor with a due date of January 19, 2001. Few campus senates were involved in the preparation of their campus's initial report, and the short timeline for the setting of goals makes full participation by campus senates difficult if not impossible. The presentation of individual campus measures as a part of the accountability report may encourage comparisons between campuses that are likely to be counterproductive for frank reporting by campuses and that may violate Cornerstones Principle 10.

APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY – November 2-3, 2000

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

DAVID S. SPENCE
EXECUTIVE VICE CHANCELLOR
CHIEF ACADEMIC OFFICER

November 7, 2000

To: Presidents

From: David S. Spence *Dave Spence*

Subject: Campus Accountability Goals

At the October 24-25 Executive Council we discussed the process for establishing and reviewing campus accountability goals. Each campus has been asked to submit achievement goals for key performance areas and indicators for the academic years 2002-03 and 2004-05. These initial goals are due on **Monday, March 5, 2001**, which is an extension of the due date mentioned at Executive Council.

To assist you in this process, we have enclosed instructions for setting campus goals and a set of submission forms that include your campus's data on these key indicators for the academic year 1998-99. These data will establish baseline performance from which improvements will be measured. Please note that the data for indicator 6.1 on outreach efforts is missing. We are still disaggregating the system data for this indicator and will provide updated forms by the end of the month.

The enclosed baseline data may differ slightly from what you were provided for the 2000 Accountability Reports last summer. We have taken this opportunity to clean up a few data errors and correct programming problems. We have also included a data dictionary that defines indicators and describes how each was determined.

If you have questions about the accountability goals submission process, please contact Dr. Gary Hammerstrom, Assistant Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs. Questions about data should be referred to Dr. Marsha Hirano-Nakanishi, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Analytic Studies.

DSS gah

c: Gary Hammerstrom
    Marsha Hirano-Nakanishi
    Jackie Kegley, w o campus attachment
    Charles W. Lindahl, w o campus attachment
    Douglas Patiño
    Charles B. Reed, w o campus attachment
    Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs Provosts

		Measure	2 Years Prior	1 Year Prior	Base Year	Base Year +1	Base Year +2	CSU ave base year	CSUS Rank in comparison group of 5 **	Goal: 2002-03	Goal: 2004-05
3		**Progression to Degree**									
3.1		Continuation Rates			Fall 98 to Fall 99						
	(a)	First-time Freshmen *	78%	77%	77%	78%		80%	4th	79%	80%
	(b)	CCC Transfers *	81%	83%	84%	82%		82%	2nd	83%	84%
3.2		Upper-division units			Graduated 98/99						
	(a)	Junior CCC transfers *	76	79	79			73	5th	78	76
	(b)	Native First-time Freshmen *	73	75	76			77	2nd	76	76
4		**Persistence and graduation**									
4.1		JCAR graduation rates									
4.1.1		First-time Freshmen *			Entered Fall '93						
	(a)	full-time									
		graduated w/i 4 years			21%			28%		21%	22%
		graduated w/i 6 years			61%			64%	3rd	61%	62%
		estimated eventually grad.			68%			68%	1st	68%	69%
	(b)	persistent part-time									
		graduated w/i 4 years			2%			2%		2%	2%
		graduated w/i 6 years			39%			39%	3rd	41%	43%
		estimated eventually grad.			55%			50%	2nd	55%	57%
	(c)	partial load/stop out									
		graduated w/i 4 years			0%			0%		0%	0%
		graduated w/i 6 years			2%			5%	tied for 3rd	3%	3%
		estimated eventually grad.			20%			24%	4th	20%	20%
	(d)	total									
		graduated w/i 4 years			5%			8%		5%	6%
		graduated w/i 6 years			40%			42%		42%	43%
		estimated eventually grad.			54%			53%		55%	57%
4.1.2		CCC Junior Transfers *									
	(a)	full-time									
		graduated w/i 2 years			36%			37%		36%	37%
		graduated w/i 3 years			71%			68%	1st	72%	73%
		estimated eventually grad.			80%			81%	1st	81%	82%
	(b)	persistent part-time									
		graduated w/i 2 years			9%			11%		9%	10%
		graduated w/i 3 years			43%			46%	tied for 4th	45%	47%
		estimated eventually grad.			71%			71%	tied for 3rd	71%	73%
	(c)	partial load/stop out									
		graduated w/i 2 years			0%			0%		0%	0%
		graduated w/i 3 years			6%			8%	tied for 2nd	7%	8%
		estimated eventually grad.			47%			47%	3rd	48%	49%
	(d)	total									
		graduated w/i 2 years			14%			18%		14%	15%
		graduated w/i 3 years			43%			48%		45%	47%
		estimated eventually grad.			69%			71%		70%	72%

Accountability Goal-Setting Worksheet

Measure	2 Years Prior	1 Year Prior	Base Year	Base Year +1	Base Year +2	CSU ave base year	in comparison group of 5 **	Goal: 2002-03	Goal: 2004-05
5 Areas of Special State Need									
5.1 First-time, new-type credentials			1998-99			CSU total			
(a) multiple subject	283	354	441	451	405	6,493		461	527
(b) single subject	114	159	169	165	136			157	180
(c) special education	85	70	122	127	131			152	173
(d) total	482	583	732	743	672		2nd	770	880
(e) 2-yr % increase			52%				1st	15%	14%
6 Relations with K-12						CSU total			
6.1 Outreach efforts			1999-2000						
(a) CSU faculty involved			63			1,176		85	105
(b) CSU students involved			156			6,274		475	560
(c) K-12 schools involved			201					240	250
(d) K-12 students involved			14,933			562,306		16,800	18,500
6.2 Fully prepared new freshmen *			Entered Fall '98						
(a) Mathematics		45%	44%	48% a	51%	46%	3rd	52%	54%
(b) English		58%	58%	52% a	49%	53%	1st	50%	51%
7 Remediation			Fall 98 to Fall 99						
7.1 Remediated within 1 year			97%	99%		94%	tied for 2nd	96%	97%
8 Facility Utilization			1998-99						
8.1									
(a) evenings (after 4pm)			20.2%			26%	5th	23.5%	27.0%
(b) Fridays			6.3%			8%	5th	7.2%	8.5%
(c) weekends			0.7%			1%	tied for 1st	1.1%	1.2%
(d) summers (YRO)			N/A			N/A		2.7%	4.4%
(e) distance learning			N/A			N/A			
(f) off-campus centers			6.2%			3%		6.0%	6.0%
9 University Advancement			1998-99			CSU average	5 campus ave.		
9.1 Voluntary Support	$ 4,877,597	$ 5,542,321	$ 7,979,601	$ 7,898,402		$ 10,109,043	$ 10,198,076	$ 14,600,000	$ 16,700,000
9.2 Special revenues			$ 46,791,474			$ 27,308,683	$ 27,308,683		
9.3 Alumni participation:									
(a) formal membership			4,452			5.6%	4,078	5,989	7,247
(b) total addressable alumni	102,555	108,585	115,267	114,615	130,143	80%	120,558	134,000	139,000
(c) total addressable grads/credentials	107,249	107,249	110,738	109,546	124,529			128,000	132,000
9.4 Ten percent private fund goal	7.0%	7.1%	10.1%	9.1%		10.0%	10.8%	10.0%	10.0%

* Regularly admitted.

** Fullerton, Northridge, Sacramento, San Francisco, San Jose (four closest in FTES to CSU)

a. Chancellor's Office data incorrectly shows 47% for English and 45% for Math. Campus ERSS files have been corrected.

MEMO

Date: February 28, 2001

To: David S. Spence
Executive Vice Chancellor
California State University

From: Bob Buckley, Chair
Faculty Senate
CSU, Sacramento
916-278-6593; FAX 916-278-5358

Subject: Comments on the Campus Accountability Report

On February 16, 2001 members of the Council for University Planning (CUP) took the action of recommending to President Gerth a set of campus accountability goals, as requested by the Chancellor's Office. This action was the culmination of two months of diligent work by the members of the Council of University Planning and a number of supporting staff.

The faculty members of the Council, who are also members of the Faculty Senate's Executive Committee, all abstained from the vote to recommend the set of accountability goals. These abstentions were not cast in opposition to our administration or the manner in which they have responded to the Chancellor's Office. In fact, the faculty members are unanimous in commending our administration for their efforts in establishing a process for the work and supporting that process. The fault lies neither in the effort expended nor faculty aversion to change and the idea of goal setting, assessment and action. In fact, the work of CUP does just that. This Council involves representatives from faculty, student, staff, alumni, community and administration in our annual strategic planning process.

The abstentions were prompted by our concern about 1) the purpose of the accountability goals, 2) the inappropriate time-line for the response and 3) the inability to engage the campus in the appropriate consultation for the development of the accountability goals.

With the publication of campus "report cards", the apparent intent of the accountability process is to rank the campuses and to foster inter-campus competition. Such competition will have the likely result of committing significant campus resources in an effort to meet if not exceed the goals that were set. This system wide process and its apparent intent is in stark contrast to the planning process established on this campus and many of the other campuses in the system.

6000 J Street, Sacramento, California 95819-6036 • (916) 278-6593 • (916) 278-5358 FAX

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY • Bakersfield • Chico • Dominguez Hills • Fresno • Fullerton • Hayward • Humboldt • Long Beach • Los Angeles • Maritime Academy
Monterey Bay • Northridge • Pomona • Sacramento • San Bernardino • San Diego • San Francisco • San Jose • San Luis Obispo • San Marcos • Sonoma • Stanislaus

If all campuses in the system were identical in their student body, their programs and their community environment, a system wide specified strategic plan with standardized accountability goals might be appropriate for comparing, evaluating and ranking a campus. But the CSU has always been a collection of individual campuses, each with their unique place in the fulfillment of the System's mission.

The time-line mandated for the campus made it impossible to engage faculty and administration in an effective consultative and shared decision making process. As has been the case with other "requests", the directions and information provided by the Chancellor's Office resulted in the need to establish a process and to do the work in a period from mid December to mid February. This is a period that coincides with the end of our fall semester and our intercession period. This is also a time when the availability of representatives of the campus community is problematic. By necessity, much of the crafting of the work products was left to staff. Time was not sufficient to provide for an informed discussion about the process, the results and the possible consequences of this effort. Furthermore, the time-line did not allow our Executive Committee to engage the Senate in an informed discussion of the nature and consequences of this system-wide accountability process.

The CSUS planning process, including the establishment of priorities, has evolved over a considerable period of time as a collaborative effort with the Council for University Planning serving as the forum for engaging representatives from all constituent groups in our campus community. Each of these campus constituencies is represented on the Council, resulting in an opportunity for the Council's recommendations to reflect shared understanding and decision making. In the rush to provide target numbers for the system-wide accountability process, our own existing strategic planning processes were interrupted, side-tracked and appear to be threatened by a process that has little bearing on the improvement of this campus and certainly did not allow for campus-wide consultation.

The faculty members serving on the Council for University Planning abstained from recommending the proposed set of accountability goals to President Gerth in order to express our concerns about the issues as identified above.

cc: Dr. Jacquelyn Ann K. Kegley, Chair
        Academic Senate, California State University
      CSUS Faculty Senate Executive Committee Members