

2000-2001
FACULTY SENATE
California State University, Sacramento

AGENDA

Thursday, April 26, 2001
Foothill Suite, University Union
3:30 -5:00 p.m.

OPEN FORUM

CONSENT CALENDAR

FS01-27/ConC COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS--Senate

General Education Policies/Graduation Requirements Committee
JENNIFER WARE, At-large 2004

*Debra Matzger, Library
Const*

FS 01-28/CPC, Ex. CURRICULUM REVIEW – DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

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

REGULAR AGENDA

FS 01-29/Flr. MINUTES

Approval of the Minutes of April 5 (#10), 2001.

SECOND READING

[Action may be taken.]

FS 01-22/APC, Ex. ACADEMIC CALENDARS 2002-03 AND 2003-04

m/s/c

[Tom Krabacher]

The Faculty Senate recommends adoption of the proposed 2002-03 and 2003-04 academic calendars (college and academic years) (Faculty Senate April 5, 2001 Attachment B).

yes be referred back

FS 01-23/Ex. DISTANCE EDUCATION POLICY

1.5 stays

m/s/c

The Faculty Senate recommends adoption of the proposed Distance Education Policy . (Arguments for and against Section 1.5, see Attachment B)

FS 01-24/Ex. OUTSTANDING SERVICE AWARD *m/s/c*

Ted Lascher
[Tom Kando]

College level

The Faculty Senate recommends establishing an Outstanding Service Award (Faculty Senate April 5, 2001 Attachment D).

FS 01-25/Ex. FACULTY MERIT SCHOLARSHIP AWARD PROGRAM POLICY *m/s/c*
 (Amends AS 96-07)

[Suzanne Lindgren]

The Faculty Senate recommends that the current campus policy (AS 96-07) establishing the Faculty Endowment Fund Program and the procedures for its implementation be amended as shown in Attachment C.

FIRST READING *- carry over*

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

FS 01-29/Ex. MATH PROFICIENCY AS A GRADUATION REQUIREMENT

[Ted Lascher]

The Faculty Senate recommends the development of policy options and resource needs aimed at establishing a campus mathematics proficiency requirement for graduation (Attachment D).

INFORMATION

1. Moment of Silence:

THOMAS CARTER

Professor of Public Policy and Administration Emeritus
 1971-1994

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

SPRING 2001			
May 3	<i>tentative</i>	May 17	<i>tentative</i>
May 10 3:00-3:30	2001-02 Senate Elections	May 24	<i>Tentative (Finals Week)</i>
3:30-5:00	2000-01 Senate Meets		

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

MEMORANDUM

To: Tom Kando
Curriculum Policies Committee

FROM: Dennis Huff
Curriculum Review Subcommittee

SUBJECT: Department of Sociology Curriculum Review

DATE: April 4, 2001



The revised draft of the Academic Program Review Report of the Department of Sociology, received in the Spring of 2001, and the recommendations contained in that draft are ready for action by the Faculty Senate.

Cc. ✓ Cecilia Gray
Judson Landis
Joseph Sheley
Julie Yen

COMMENDATIONS

The Program Review Team commends the Sociology Department for

1. its successful efforts to maximize enrollments at the undergraduate and graduate levels (both at their highest in 25 years);
2. its introduction of a new course at the graduate level (Sociology 200 A/B) designed to more clearly articulate thesis development to the students;
3. its 1998 revision of its governance structure designed to integrate new colleagues more fully into the decision-making practices and leadership roles in the department;
4. its close working relationship with the Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Studies, Cecilia Gray, in pioneering assessment strategies on the campus;
5. the openness and accessibility of the faculty to their students;
6. its support of the diversity efforts of the university in the recruitment of minority faculty;
7. its development and support of the Institute for Social Research;
8. the faculty's quality of teaching which consistently receives enthusiastic praise from students;
9. the distinguished scholarship and various professional accomplishments of the faculty;
10. the faculty's participation in community activities;
11. the exemplary work of the department staff, a sole secretary for the entire department;
12. its recent efforts in sending students to prestigious Ph.D. programs;
13. the comprehensiveness and thoroughness of the assessment data on the Department web page; and
14. the cooperation of the entire department with the program review team; and in particular the Chair, Jud Landis, for his generous help and professional courtesy throughout the entire review process.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

The Review Team recommends that the Department:

1. Reconsider the mission of the Department and make a frank and realistic assessment about the courses that should be offered in its curriculum to maintain the integrity and coherence of the program;
2. Review each semester's class schedule to ensure that key courses designed to help students fulfill the program's goals and learning expectations are offered regularly;
3. Schedule a variety of course offerings more frequently to ensure real choices for students in all four areas of study offered by the program;
4. Encourage new faculty members to regularly offer courses that have recently been neglected in the Department curriculum;
5. Provide more flexibility in the scheduling of classes by offering more evening classes and multiple sections of classes for the undergraduate program;
6. Explore the possibility of cross-listing courses with other programs and departments to provide more course options that the program is currently not able to offer, such as courses in gender, race, and ethnicity;
7. Develop the option of an exam or a project for the culminating experience in the graduate program;
8. Offer some courses at a senior/graduate student level so that more electives would be available for graduate students;
9. Hold an advising workshop for faculty members to familiarize everyone with advising information and initiate steps towards fostering stronger advising and mentoring ties between faculty and students;
10. Establish a link with the campus career center to provide students with updated information about internships, career paths, and possible career fairs in Sociology;
11. Consider holding a career fair or colloquium in which alumni could be invited to speak to students about their careers and professional experiences;
12. Strengthen the existing internship program and develop more internship opportunities for students;

13. Appoint a committee of faculty and students to revise and update the Department student handbook;
14. Schedule meetings as necessary between junior faculty and the chair and the personnel committee of the Department to review personnel policies, procedures, and general expectations for tenure and promotion;
15. Establish a Part-time Faculty Liaison Committee which meets regularly to improve communication between part-time faculty members and the Department;
16. Encourage all faculty members to become involved in governance issues and general decision-making processes in the Department;
17. Establish an ISR (Institute for Social Research) Coordinating Committee consisting of the director of the Institute and other Sociology faculty, which would work on pursuing grants and research opportunities through the Institute as well as work with the College to promote the Institute and make it more visible to the University and the general Sacramento community;
18. Establish a quantitative research task force to ensure that necessary computer software for research is consistently upgraded and supported by the University;
19. Explore the possibility of hiring additional clerical staff for the Department office;
20. Continue to work with the library to build up reference materials for Sociology, especially in the area of online journals, periodicals, and social science databases;

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE DEAN

The Review Team recommends that the Dean:

1. Provide support and guidance to help the Department make a frank and realistic assessment of its curriculum to ensure real choices for students in all four areas of study offered by the program;
2. Provide support and guidance to help the Department initiate a complete and thorough review of the program's class schedules and offer more flexibility in the scheduling of classes, by offering more evening classes and multiple sections of classes;
- 3.. Provide support and guidance to the Department for developing the option of an exam or a project for the culminating experience in the graduate program;

4. Encourage the Department to review its student advising policy and develop stronger guidelines which address the academic responsibility of all faculty members to provide advising to students;
5. Strongly encourage the Department to improve student relations by strengthening advising measures and mentoring relationships with students;
6. Provide support and guidance to help the Department coordinate a career colloquium in which alumni could be invited to speak to students about their careers experiences;
7. Clarify personnel policies, procedures, and general expectations for tenure and promotion for the junior faculty;
8. Encourage all faculty members to become involved in governance issues and the general decision-making process of the Department;
9. Work with the Department to promote the Institute for Social Research and make it more visible to the University and the Sacramento community;
10. Provide funding and support to ensure that enough technical staff are available in the new computer labs to help faculty and students during class hours and open lab hours;
11. Explore the possibility of hiring additional clerical staff for the Department office.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE PROVOST AND VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

The Review Team recommends that the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs:

1. Encourage the Sociology Department to review its student advising policy and develop stronger guidelines which address the academic responsibility of all faculty members to provide advising to students;
2. Continue to support the Institute for Social Research and work with the Dean of the College of Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies to promote the Institute and make it more visible to the University and the general Sacramento community.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE FACULTY SENATE

1. The Review Team recommends that the Bachelor of Arts degree in Sociology be approved for six years or until the next program review.
2. The Review Team recommends that the Master of Arts degree in Sociology be approved for six years or until the next program review.

Spring 2001

FS 01-23 Proposed DISTANCE EDUCATION POLICY**SECTION TO BE “DEBATED”**

1.5 For programs in which required courses have been traditionally provided in a non-distance education mode of delivery, a change in any of these required courses to a distance education mode of delivery shall also provide students in the program a pathway to completing the major through non-distance education courses.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF SECTION 1.5:

The issue addressed by general guideline 1.5 is ultimately one of access. Distributed or mediated course delivery (i.e., those in which student and instructor are not in the same room at the same time) requires that students have access to the necessary technology, frequently computer hardware and web access, to participate. At this point in time, it is not safe to assume that these resources are available on a regular basis to all CSUS students. Section 1.5 guarantees that all students that may lack the necessary technology or opportunity to participate in distance-mediated courses nonetheless have access to the major of their choice. It also increases the flexibility of the major in that it also allows students in general to choose a non-distributed pathway to complete their major, should they feel distance education courses are not appropriate for them.

Note that the provisions of section 1.5 place only a modest demand on departmental programs. It does not, for example, necessarily require that programs schedule two sections (i.e. one in the distance-mediated mode and another in the traditional classroom format) of any required course offered in a distance-mediated format. It simply requires that options to taking courses in this mode be made available. Such options might include: scheduling distance-mediated and traditional offerings of the course in alternate semesters, the provision for a range of course options from which students may choose to meet a requirement, and so on.

Also, please note that this guideline applies only to programs that have traditionally been offered in a non-distance mode of delivery; it does not affect new programs specifically designed to include distance-mediated course offerings.

ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION TO SECTION 1.5:

The Faculty Senate’s newly revised Distance Education Policy reflects significant effort and is commendable. Of particular importance is that the majority of the Policy reflects the wisdom of charging faculty and departments with determining the quality and appropriateness of using distance and distributed methods of delivering courses and programs. An exception to this is described in section 1.5 under General Guidelines. The Policy will not allow a department/program to change any required non-distance education course in the major to a distance education course unless the department/program provides students a pathway to completing the major through non-distance education courses. In many cases on our campus, faculty expertise and resources are limited and would not permit additional offerings and would, therefore, prevent distance offerings. Departments in which courses/programs are initially

designed in a traditional format should not be prevented from changing to distance offerings if students would benefit from alternative methods of delivery and if learning outcomes can be met. Departments know their students and should be able to propose how courses are offered in their specific disciplines. The Policy would prevent that for some departments.

Section 1.5 also implies that changing to distance education offerings could interfere with a student's ability to complete his/her major. On the contrary, distance education provides course/program access to many more students than it prevents. It is important to point out that none of the courses offered via distance and distributed formats impede student progress to graduation. If a department must offer non-distance sections in a major, it could interfere with students' progress to graduation. Personal schedules may not permit enrollment in on-campus sections at specific required times. Students in distance education courses are provided alternative learning experiences that allow for flexibility in personal schedules that includes employment and child-care. The implied argument that students may not have access to a televised course or a Web-based course and that a traditional non-distance course will somehow speed up graduation is also inappropriate. Students have the option of attending televised courses in studio classrooms on campus. They also have the ability to complete course requirements in Web courses by either accessing campus computer labs or using their own personal computers. Students enroll in distance education courses because of their situations and needs. The ability of a student to access information based on a personal schedule only increases, and certainly does not impede, his/her chances of graduating.

In summary, as is reflected in the rest of the Policy, departments have the faculty expertise and experience with their students' needs and are, therefore, in the best position to make decisions about course offerings and achieving student outcomes. Access to distance education courses/sections is not an issue and students have options for completing course requirements in these courses. Therefore, we recommend removal of Section 1.5 from the General Guidelines in the Distance Education Policy.

FS 01-25/Ex. FACULTY MERIT SCHOLARSHIP AWARD PROGRAM POLICY (Amends AS 96-07).

The amended version that was presented at the April 5, 2001 Senate meeting by Susanne Lindgren, Chair of the Faculty Endowment Fund Committee

Procedures, guidelines and criteria for allocation of funds:

1. Interest accrued in the prior year (Jan. 1-Dec. 31) shall be used to fund the Merit Scholarship (MS) Awards and the Undergraduate Scholarly and Creative Activity (USCA) Awards in the following academic year.
2. Up to a maximum of 60% of the contributions accumulated in the prior year (Jan. 1- Dec. 31) may be set aside for use in funding the Merit Scholarship Awards and the Scholarly and Creative Activity Awards in the following academic year. The 40% (or more) of the accumulated contributions from the fiscal year Jan. 1-Dec. 31 will be deposited directly into the principal of the endowment fund.
3. The Faculty Endowment Expenditure Fund (FEEF) will contain the total accrued interest and up to 60% of the accumulated contributions from the prior year.
4. During the spring semester, based upon the amount contained in the FEEF, the Faculty Endowment Committee will recommend the number of MS and USCA awards to be given the following academic year.

If the funds are insufficient to make the minimum number of awards, the Committee's recommendation will be brought to the Executive Committee for approval.

If the funds are sufficient to make awards in excess of the minimum number of awards, the Committee may recommend that the remaining funds be deposited in the Faculty Endowment Fund or be used to grant additional awards. In either case, the Committee's recommendation will be brought to the Executive Committee for approval.

5. At the second meeting of the Faculty Senate in the fall semester, the Faculty Endowment Fund Committee will make a report to the Senate. The report should include Faculty Endowment Fund activity from the prior year; including contributions, interest earned on the endowment fund, audit information on the management and performance of the endowment fund, and disbursements in support of the awards made. In addition, the report should include information on the awards to be granted in the current year. The Committee should also report on the current year's plan for fundraising.

**TOPIC FOR FACULTY SENATE DISCUSSION:
CAMPUS MATHEMATICS PROFICIENCY REQUIREMENT**

OVERVIEW

The issue before us is whether CSUS should establish a math proficiency requirement for students, to be enforced through some appropriate mechanism (e.g., a math proficiency examination similar to the current writing proficiency examination).

BACKGROUND

Both nationally and locally, extensive concern about entering students' basic skills has prompted efforts to require all students demonstrate competency in particular areas. Worries about widespread writing problems led to establishment of the writing proficiency examination, which students must pass before they are allowed to graduate. More recently, the CSU's Academic Senate asked campuses to consider ways of better assuring that graduating students are competent using basic mathematical skills.

At CSUS, the Mathematics Department advocated against establishing a campus mathematics standard, emphasizing that necessary skills vary significantly depending on students' majors and occupational choices. The Senate's General Education/Graduation Requirements Committee recommended that the Mathematics Department position be accepted. However, the Senate Executive Committee believed that the full Senate needed to consider this question, because its implications were not confined to a single department or school.

OPTIONS

A campus mathematics requirement could be designed in a number of different ways. For instance, standards could be established for *all graduating students* or standards could be established for graduates of *each particular college*. Similarly, different mechanisms might be used to enforce the requirement. One obvious choice would be development of a math proficiency exam similar to the writing proficiency exam. However, other approaches (e.g., changes to the general education curriculum) might also be used.

WHAT'S NEXT

The Executive Committee wants to get a "sense of the Senate" about what's desirable. If there's support for a mathematics requirement, Senate committees could be instructed to develop a more specific plan for full Senate consideration. If there isn't support, the issue could be abandoned.

THE MOTION BEFORE THE SENATE AT THIS TIME IS:

The development of policy options and resource needs aimed at establishing a campus mathematics proficiency requirement for graduation.



ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

Senate Received

401 Golden Shore, Suite 139 Long Beach, California 90802-4210
562-951-4010/4015 FAX 562-951-4911

Jacquelyn Ann K. Kegley, Chair
Academic Senate CSU

MEMORANDUM

TO: Chairs, Campus Academic Senates **DATE:** June 30, 2000
FROM: Jacquelyn Ann K. Kegley, Chair *Jackie*
Academic Senate CSU
SUBJECT: Exploration of the Math Competencies for CSU Graduates

Attached please find a copy of a memorandum sent by Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer David Spence and me to the Math Council. It is a request for a broad discussion among faculty members in mathematics about math competencies for CSU graduates. A series of questions is posed for reflection. This is a first step in a consultative process concerning the math competencies of our CSU graduates. The Academic Senate CSU will forward the recommendations of the Math Council to each campus senate for discussion and recommendations. The Academic Senate CSU will then use the advice of the campus senates to inform its reflections and recommendations.

c: David Spence, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer
Executive Committee, ASCSU
Dorothy Keane
Elmo Moore
CSU Math Council



Jacquelyn Ann K. Kegley, Chair

ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

401 Golden Shore, Suite 139 Long Beach, California 90802-4210
562-951-4010/4015 email: dhennessy@calstate.edu FAX 562-951-4911

MEMORANDUM

To: The Math Council

Date: June 19, 2000

From: Jacquelyn Ann K. Kegley, Chair
Academic Senate CSU

David Spence, Executive Vice Chancellor and
Chief Academic Officer

Subject: Exploration of the Math Competencies for CSU Graduates

On behalf of the California State University we request that you explore among yourselves and particularly with your mathematics colleagues at your own campuses the following issues or questions.

What do we want all graduates of the California State University system to know and be able to do in mathematics?

Can we agree on some basic math competencies that we should expect from our graduates?

How are they related to the competencies we expect at entrance to the CSU?

How are they related to the competencies that are tested through ELM?

If we do expect a set of math competencies from our graduates, how can we ensure that these competencies will be gained during the CSU experience?

Do we want to have a required General Education course that teaches these competencies?

Do we want more flexibility in course work, but require a mathematics exit examination?

We hope that you will be creative in your exploration of these questions. We also hope that you will discuss these issues widely among your mathematics colleagues in the CSU. Once you have gathered a set of reflections, please communicate those to us along with any recommendations you wish to make on the issues. These will then be shared with the Academic Senate CSU for discussion and action.

It is our hope that you will send your reflections and recommendations by October 1, 2000.

Thank you very much for your assistance on these important matters.

JAKK:mp
c: Executive Committee
Dorothy Keane
Elmo Moore



RECEIVED

Memorandum

SEP 21 2000

Date: September 13, 2000

Academic Senate CSU
Chancellor's Office

To: Math Council Members

cc: Jacquelyn Kegley, Chair
Academic Senate CSU
David Spence,
Executive Vice ChancellorFrom: Claudia Pinter-Lucke, Chair *C Pinter-Lucke*
Mathematics Department
Calif. State Polytechnic University, Pomona

Subject: Exploration of Math Competencies for CSU Graduates

This is a response to the memorandum dated June 19, 2000 from Jacquelyn Kegley, Chair of the CSU Academic Senate and David Spence, Executive Vice Chancellor. It is a **draft** document developed after one meeting on September 9, 2000 of a sub-committee of the Math Council. The topic of math competency for CSU graduates will be an agenda item for the Math Council at their fall meeting on October 20, 2000.

The mathematicians who attended this meeting participated in a four hour spirited conversation. Many ideas and views were exchanged. Since there is an effort at this time to revise the ELM, discussion of the relationship between entrance competencies, the ELM and graduation competencies was deferred until a later time. (Progress on this effort also will be presented to the Math Council on October 20.) Inspiration (and suggested wording) was provided by the above-mentioned memo, a memo from Silvia Heubach, a member of the CSULA Mathematics Department to an on-campus GE Working Group, and the Draft Statement of Learning Outcomes for Mathematics reasoning for the Baccalaureate Degree written in 1998 by faculty from the Chico, Sacramento, and San Francisco campuses of the CSU.

The sub-committee formulated four general competencies that should be expected from all CSU graduates. These competencies build on the entry-level knowledge of CSU students.

Baccalaureate graduates of the CSU will be able to:

- *appreciate the connections between mathematics and other disciplines*
- *regard mathematics not simply as a set of techniques, but as a way to think, reason and conceptualize*
- *use mathematical-based reasoning to interpret, evaluate alternatives, make appropriate judgments, and draw reasonable conclusions based on numerical, graphical, and symbolic information*
- *understand and perform requisite mathematical calculations and symbolic manipulations*

Satisfaction of these competencies cannot be demonstrated by performance on an exit examination. All lower division general education mathematics classes offered by the CSU should teach these competencies. Some courses may need to be modified to meet this goal; some may need to be removed from general education if it is not possible to modify them in an acceptable manner. In any case, it appears that one course is not sufficient to fully develop these abilities. Options for a second course are another lower division mathematics course or an upper division general education mathematics course that could incorporate concepts learned in the students' own disciplines. Another idea is to require the other disciplines to develop an upper division course that would include a quantitative reasoning component. Mathematics Department faculty members could work with their colleagues in other disciplines to develop such courses. (Note that this two course concept is currently satisfied by students in technical majors and would not require an additional course.)

A new mathematics course presents several challenges. There is currently discussion in the CSU system to decrease the number of requirements to graduate. An additional course would appear to run counter to this goal. Mathematics Departments have been chronically under-staffed and the increase in the number of sections of pre-college math courses has exacerbated this problem. Without more faculty positions, Mathematics Departments would not be able to meet the demand for another general education course. If courses are developed in other disciplines, there will need to be funds for release time and workshops to assist faculty members, particularly in non-quantitative fields, to acquire the knowledge as well as the materials to teach such courses.

We should be pleased that the importance of mathematical knowledge is recognized by the Trustees of the CSU System, the Chancellor's Office and the CSU Academic Senate. However, making lists of topics or creating new tests will not ensure that students obtain this knowledge. The solution requires moral and financial support by all levels of the CSU system.