CONSENT CALENDAR

FS 00-68/Ex. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS—Senate

Academic Policies Committee:
ANN MOTEKAITIS, At-large, 2003 (repl. D. Taylor)
ROBERTA CHING, At-large, 2002 (repl. D. Wunder)

FS 00-69/Ex. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS—University

Administrative [Performance] Review Committee:
HENRY CHAMBERS, At-large, 2002 (repl. R. Wassmer)

AIDS Advisory Committee:
GENI COWAN, At-large, 2002

Alcohol and Drug Steering Committee:
MARY BRAHAM, At-large, 2002

Alumni Board, CSUS:
ROGER LEEZER, Faculty Alumnus, 2001

Anthony J. Leones Scholarship Committee:
JUANITA BARRENA, At-large, 2003

ASI Appellate Council:
WILLIAM DILLON, At-large, 2001

ASI Board, Faculty Representative:
ROBYN NELSON, At-large, 2001

ASI Elections Complaint Committee:
MIKE FITZGERALD, At-large, 2001

Campus Educational Equity Committee:
SATSUKI INA, EDUC, 2003
XIN REN, At-large, 2003

Campus Cooperative Education Advisory Committee:
ANNE-LOUISE RADIMSKY, At-large, 2001

Council for University Planning:
JIAN-ZHOUG "Joe" ZHOU, Non-Instructional Faculty, 2001

Diversity Awards Committee:
RHONDA RIOS KRAVITZ, At-large, 2002
PAM KING, SSP At-large, 2002

Energy Management Committee:
ANDREW BANTA, At-large, 2002

Financial Aid Satisfactory Progress Appeals Board:
SIMON SLAK, At-large, 2002

General Education Program Review Team:
JOHN CORLESS, CBA (repl. D. Carper)
ANNE-LOUISE RADIMSKY, E&CS (repl. S. Holl)

Grade Appeal Procedural Appeals Board:
KEN DEBOW, At-large, 2001
WILLIAM DILLON, At-large, 2001
ANN MOTEKAITIS, At-large, 2001

Honorary Degrees Committee:
TURAN GONEN, At-large, 2002

Instruction Related Activities Committee:
MICHAEL FITZGERALD, At-large, 2001
ANNE-LOUISE RADIMSKY, At-large, 2001

Persons with Disabilities, Committee for:
BRUCE OSTERTAG, EDUC, 2002

Student Academic Development Committee:
MARIE HELT, At-large, 2002

Student Complaint Hearing Panel:
SATSUKI INA, At-large, 2003
VINCE PANTALONE, At-large, 2003

Student Health Advisory Committee:
LOIS BOULGARIDES, At-large, 2001

University Copyright and Patent Committee:
SUZANNE SUTHERLAND, At-large, 2003

2000-2001
FACULTY SENATE
California State University, Sacramento

AGENDA
Thursday, September 28, 2000
Foothill Suite, University Union
3:00 -5:00 p.m.

OPEN FORUM

CONSENT CALENDAR

FS 00-61/Ex. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS—Senate

Academic Policies Committee:
    JUDE ANTONYAPPAN, Senator, 2001 (repl. T. Krabacher)

Curriculum Policies Committee:
    HENRY CHAMBERS, Senator, 2001

Visiting Scholars Subcommittee (FPC):
    KATHLEEN JARVIS, H&HS, 2003
    AYAD AL-QAZZAZ, SS&IS 2003

General Education Policies/Graduation Requirements Committee:
    SUSANNE LINDGREN, At-large, 2003 (repl. M. Reihman)

Livingston Annual Faculty Lecture Committee:
    TED LASCHER, At-large, 2001 (repl. R. Wassmer)

FS 00-62/Ex. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS—University

Alcohol and Drug Steering Committee:
    MERLE MARTIN, At-large, 2002

Athletic Advisory Board:
    KEN DEBOW, At-large, 2001
    SCOTT MODELL, At-large, 2001

Council for University Planning:
    BOB BUCKLEY, Executive Committee Member, 2001

Student Academic Development Committee:
RUTH WANG, At-large, 2002

Student Fee Advisory Committee:
CAROLYN GIBBS, At-large, 2001
MERLE MARTIN, At-large, 2001

FS 00-63/CPC, Ex. CURRICULUM REVIEW – DIVISION OF NURSING

The Faculty Senate receives the commendations and recommendations (Attachment A) of the Curriculum Policies Committee on the program review of the Division of Nursing and recommends that the Baccalaureate and Master's programs in Nursing Education be approved for six years or until the next program review.

FS 00-64/GEP/GRC, Ex. G.E. ASSESSMENT

The Faculty Senate recommends adoption of the "Proposal for GE Assessment Process: Description of Process and Principles to be Used to Establish Learning Outcomes and Assessment Methods for General Education" (Attachment B).

FS 00-65/Ex. SENATE FLOOR PROCEDURES (FS 99-68; FS 99-107)

The Faculty Senate approves the continuation through Fall 2000 of the "Senate Floor Procedures" adopted for the Fall 1999 (FS 99-68) and Spring 2000 (FS 99-107) Semesters (Attachment C).

CONSENT—INFORMATION

FS 00-60/Ex. GRADE APPEAL PROCEDURES (contains editorial revisions to and supercedes FS 00-38; amends FS 00-13;)

The Executive Committee, on behalf of the Faculty Senate, recommends the following amendments (shown in Attachment D) to the proposed Grade Appeal Procedures (contains editorial amendments to and supercedes FS 00-38; amends FS 00-13).

REGULAR AGENDA

Carried

FS 00-58/Flr. MINUTES

Approval of the Minutes of May 18 (#18), 2000.

Carried

FS 00-59/Flr. MINUTES

Approval of the Minutes of April 13 (#1) and May 4 (#2), 2000.

FIRST READING

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

The following actions will be offered from the floor; if seconded, they will be considered first reading items:

FS 00-66/Flr.   CFA FEE, PROCEDURES FOR HANDLING REQUESTS FOR
                RELIGIOUS EXEMPTION FROM

WHEREAS,   the language of SB645, the authorizing legislation for the mandatory fee
            now being collected from non-members by the California Faculty
            Association, says simply that a person with a valid conscientious objection
            "shall not be required to join or financially support" the organization; and

WHEREAS,   the usual standards of collegiality suggest that the norm or default position
            should be that each request for religious exemption will be presumed valid
            and sincere unless and until definite reasons are presented to challenge it;
            and

WHEREAS,   though SB 645 does not specifically authorize the bargaining agent to pass
            judgment upon such requests, CFA took upon itself the task of questioning
            and judging the sincerity or validity of the religious exemption claims
            submitted by individual faculty members; and

WHEREAS,   CFA's ~~wholesale~~ denial of ^many of^ those claims during Spring 2000 was a source of
            anguish and contention for many people, necessitating appeals and threats of
            court action before some ~~few~~ claims were finally approved; and

WHEREAS,   it is at the very core of religious beliefs that they are highly personal,
            individual, and private, and cannot adequately be pigeonholed according to
            whether one's name is on a particular membership list, yet neither CFA's
            procedures nor the language in SB645 take adequate account of this; and

WHEREAS,   CFA has a vested interest in denying all applications for religious
            exemption, in order to maximize their revenue; and

WHEREAS,   any challenge and denial should logically be decided by a neutral third party
            with no financial interest in the outcome; and

WHEREAS,   it is contrary to the most basic standards of justice that one party to any
            dispute would also have the power to be the judge in that matter; therefore,
            be it

RESOLVED: that the CSUS Faculty Senate recognizes the existence in the Spring 2000
            actions of a significant problem for individual faculty rights; and, be it
            further

RESOLVED: that the Faculty Senate calls the attention of the CSU Administration, the
            California Faculty Association and the Public Employment Relations Board

to this problem, and urges that they should cooperate in developing procedures which will overcome these objections.

2nd Reading FS 00-67/Flr. FACULTY MERIT INCREASE (FMI) PROCEDURES, AMEND

Motion to be offered from the floor. Item will include a review of procedures adopted by the Senate [FS 00-43B, C] (see Attachments E-1 and E-2).

INFORMATION

1. Moment of Silence:

PAUL R. "BEN" MURRAY
Professor of Government Emeritus
CSUS 1951-1982

ELMO SLIDER, JR.
Student Services Professional–Academic
Related, University Outreach Services Emeritus
1976 – 2000

LETHA MARIE POLENSKE
Professor of Music Emeritus
CSUS 1957-1975

SEIKO BURT
Custodian
CSUS 1983 - 2000

ISABEL HERNANDEZ SERNA
Associate Professor of Ethnic Studies
Assistant Vice President for Academic
    Affairs, Educational Equity and
    Student Retention
CSUS 1980 – 2000

ELIZABETH B. AUSTIN
Professor of Biological Sciences Emeritus
CSUS 1955 - 1975

[Note: A campus Memorial/Celebration for Isabel will be held on Monday, October 2, 3:00-5:00 p.m., University Ballroom]

2. WPE Policy implementation and status (Greg Wheeler, GE Coordinator)

3. CSUS Foundation Functions (Greg Wheeler, Chair of Foundation Board)

4. Campus Safety: An Update, David Braverman, Associate VP, Student Affairs (Attachment F)

5. 2000-2001 Budget [Initial report in response to FS 00-39] (Bob Buckley)

6. Report on special Executive Committee meeting with President Gerth concerning 1) accountability "report cards" (Attachment G) and 2) YRO [year round operations] (Bob Buckley)

5. Tentative F'2001 Senate Meetings—Thursdays, 3:00-5:00 p.m., in the Foothill Suite, University Union, unless otherwise noted:
    October 5: **No Meeting**
    October 12: *tentative*
    October 19: **Meeting**

October 26:   *tentative*
November 2:   The John C. Livingston Annual Faculty Lecture entitled "Applied Behavior Analysis and the Treatment of Autism Spectrum Disorder" presented by Professor Joseph Morrow
November 9:   *tentative in Mendocino Hall 1003*
November 16: **Meeting**
November 23: HAPPY THANKSGIVING!
November 30: *tentative*
                      4:00 p.m., President's Award Lecture and Reception
December 7:   **Meeting**
December 14: *tentative* (Finals Week)

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

Commendations and Recommendation of the Program Review Team for tne
Division of Nursing

The Evaluation Team Report on the Accreditation Review of the Baccalaureate and Master's
Program in Nursing Education compiled by the Commission on Collegiate Nursing On Site
evaluation team (November 1999) stated the following strengths for the Division of Nursing.

Strengths and/or Commendations for the Division of Nursing

1. There was evidence of the Division of Nursing's congruency, commitment, and participation in the
    university's mission of teaching and community service.

2. The community advisory committee has both internal and external representation and
    provides input in advancing, improving, and promoting the Division of Nursing's
    programs.

3. The parent institution provides teaching and related technological support for the faculty.

4. The Division of Nursing chair's leadership and long time tenure with the Division contributes to the
    strength of the nursing division.

5. Most of the full time faculty are prepared at the doctorate level. Faculty have clinical expertise
    appropriate to their teaching assignments.

6. The curriculum, teacher-learning practices and teaching enviornment fosters professional nursing
    behaviors.

7. The Division of Nursing provides clinical learning opportunities in a variety of settings appropriate to
    expected course outcomes.

8. The needs of the community of interest are clearly considered when making changes in the curriculum.

9. The undergraduate and graduate nursing program curricula are logically organized and provide
    learning activities supportive of professional nursing.

10. The Division of Nursing evaluation plan provides for systematic, comprehensive, and timely
    assessment of all the major elements of the nursing programs. The results of program evaluation are
    used in curriculum revision and provision and program planning.

11. Students and other members of the community of interest recognize faculty's commitment to teaching
    and student learning.

12. Evaluation of faculty performance is timely and comprehensive.

The Program Review Team also agrees with the strengths and/or commendations that were reported by the
Commission of Collegiate Nursing Education On-Site Evaluation Team. The Program Review Committee
also commends the Division of Nursing for the extensive preparation required for the completion of The
Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education Self-Study. The Self-Study reflects a quality program with
teaching excellence as the primary focus for the nursing faculty.

The Evaluation Team Report on the Accreditation Review of the Baccalaureate and Master's Program in Nursing Education compiled by the Commission on Collegiate Nursing On Site evaluation team (November 1999) stated the following areas for Improvement /Compliance Concerns for the Division of Nursing.

Areas for Improvement/Compliance Concerns for the Division of Nursing

1. The program has not identified strategies to include clients (defined as members of the community of interest) as members and participants on the community advisory committee.

2. The program has not developed strategies to provide additional opportunities for students to participate in the governance of the Division of Nursing.

3. There is limited space for faculty offices, classrooms, laboratories, and student interaction.

4. There is high reliance on part-time faculty.

5. The program is in the process of determining if the AACN Essentials documents for baccalaureate and graduate nursing programs would provide additional direction for curriculum development and evaluation.

6. It has not been determined if there is a more time and resource efficient approach to providing and utilizing program evaluation data.

7. The program has not identified and implemented strategies to provide opportunities and support for faculty scholarship and practice.

8. Assessment of the adequacy and currency of the library holdings.

9. Institutional support for faculty scholarship and for faculty practice.

The Program Review Team also agrees with the areas of improvement/compliance concerns that were reported by the Commission of Collegiate Nursing Education On-Site Evaluation Team and recommends that the Division of Nursing investigates ways to improve upon or remedy these concerns.

Recommendation to the Faculty Senate

The program review team has completed its evaluation of the Division of Nursing. It is the recommendation of this review team that the Division of Nursing has not just met all the standards set by the university, but has exceeded in their presentation and implementation, and should be approved for six years or until the next program review.

It is also the recommendation of this Program Review Subcommittee that the University supports the motion passed by the College of Health and Human Services Academic Council that states:

> That academic units which participate in a national accreditation process be allowed to submit a current self-study document and reviewer's report to the Curriculum Policies Committee of the Faculty Senate and request a waiver of all or part of the University review process.

And, the Program Review Subcommittee also recommends that the Division of Nursing be granted a waiver to submit the Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education Self-Study to the Curriculum Policies Committee in lieu of the University review process.

**PROPOSAL FOR GE ASSESSMENT PROCESS:
DESCRIPTION OF PROCESS AND PRINCIPLES TO BE USED TO ESTABLISH
LEARNING OUTCOMES AND ASSESSMENT METHODS FOR GENERAL
EDUCATION**

Introduction

In March 2000, CSUS received a memorandum documenting timelines and expectations for campus accountability reports. Beginning in August 2000, CSUS is to submit a report that describes the processes and principles by which the campus is establishing learning outcomes and assessment methods for both degree programs and general education. The report is to include a description of the methods that will be used to assure that students are achieving the core competencies or foundational skills of general education.

Also in March 2000, CSUS faculty attended the CSU Conference on Assessing General Education Learning Outcomes. The recurring themes presented at the Conference help frame this proposal for the process and principles to be used in assessing learning outcomes for General Education at CSUS.

Additionally, the proposal for an assessment seminar focused on General Education that was developed by Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Programs and the GE Area Review Proposal approved by the Faculty Senate in Fall 1999 have been incorporated in this current proposal.

Rationale for proposal

In his summary of the CSU Conference on Assessing General Education Learning Outcomes, Professor William Dorman outlined several principles the participants learned. Two of these principles are: 1) assessment must be faculty owned and consultation must be as broad as possible and 2) avoid the ready-aim-fire syndrome (successful assessment involves a series of steps and a sequence in which they must be taken). One of the Principles of Good Practice for Assessing Student Learning that were developed under the auspices of the AAHE Assessment Forum is that "assessment works best when it is ongoing, not episodic …[and] is a process whose power is cumulative." In his address to the participants of the conference, Dr. Dan Barwick (Provost Fellow, SUNY) stressed at assessment done properly is a major initiative that requires time, money, and energy.

While recognizing the need for a concentrated effort to develop GE student learning outcomes and assessment methods, GE assessment should be an ongoing process that the University supports with adequate resources. This proposal calls for a year-long process to develop GE area learning outcomes and assessment plans. Area coordinators with assigned time will convene area faculty to develop consensus on area goals, learning outcomes and possible assessment methods. The proposal also describes a second year process that has the potential to be developed into an ongoing means for coordinating GE

assessment. The processes described involve broad faculty consultation, follow a logical sequence, can evolve into an ongoing process, and require University resources.

Process for establishing GE learning outcomes and methods of assessment

GE Area Coordinators Fall 2000-Fall 2001

As proposed by the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, area coordinators will be appointed for each of the five GE Areas. The GE Area Coordinators will be selected in Fall 2000. During the Fall semester, the Coordinators will be expected to participate in meetings convened by the Interim University Assessment Coordinator. The goal of this activity will be to familiarize the area coordinators with such aspects of GE assessment as methods for developing learning outcomes and types of assessment instruments in current use. The GE Area Coordinators may also initiate conversations with area faculty.

In Spring 2001, each area coordinator will convene faculty from all departments that teach courses in their respective GE area (in those areas with sub-areas, several such groups could be convened) for conversations about "…what constitutes outcomes that can and should be assessed within that area" (as describe by Professor Dorman in his conference summary). The goal of this activity is to develop explicit, agreed upon student learning outcomes in each GE area. These will be reported by the end of Spring 2001 and Fall 2001 semester to the GE Policy/Graduation Requirements Committee (GEP/GRC).

With the assistance of the Interim University Assessment Coordinator, the GE area coordinators will be responsible for examining the assessment literature for "best assessment practices", possible outcome models, and available testing instruments that could potentially be used in their area. These materials will be brought to the area faculty for discussion. (Dorman conference summary). The goal of this activity is to define assessment plans for each GE area. These plans will be reported to GEP/GRC by the end of Spring 2001 and Fall 2001.

The GE area coordinators will also be expected to meet periodically as a group to discuss progress in the development of learning goals and assessment plans. The Interim University Assessment Coordinator could serve as the convener of the area coordinators.

Each GE area coordinator will receive 3 units of assigned time for Spring 2001 and Fall 2001.

Principles to be used in the development of learning outcomes (as summarized by Professor Dorman)

1. GE assessment must only be used to improve teaching and learning.
2. Assessment must be faculty owned and consultation must be as broad as possible.

3.   Patience is absolutely essential.
4.   There is no need to reinvent assessment methods. (There is a robust literature.)
5.   GE program assessment must not be based on too many goals and objectives.
6.   There is a series to steps that should be followed in developing learning outcomes and assessment methods.

GE Assessment Coordinator (beginning in Spring 2002)

The GE Assessment Coordinator will be responsible for overseeing and coordinating the assessment plans developed in the Spring 2001 and Fall 2001. The duties of this position will be to meet or communicate with faculty in each area to clarify the assessment activities that will occur in the area and to serve as a resource person to facilitate the process. At the conclusion of each semester, the assessment coordinator will compile a report on the types of assessment activities that occurred and how area faculty will use the results obtained. The report will be presented to GEP/GRC. The GE Assessment Coordinator will also convene area faculty to obtain their input on the assessment plan and help faculty evaluate the plan.

The GE Assessment Coordinator will receive six units of assigned time per semester.

This position will be evaluated at the end of Spring 2002 to determine whether the level of funding is appropriate.

GEP/GRC role

Early in Fall 2000, the GE Policy/Graduation Requirements Committee will develop a glossary of assessment vocabulary for use by area faculty in the development of student learning outcomes and assessment plans. (Suggested in Professor Dorman's conference summary.)

After receiving the reports of the Area Coordinators in Spring 2001 and Fall 2001, GEP/GRC will be responsible for drafting a report describing the process and principles used to develop GE learning outcomes and methods of assessment. The report will include a summary of the learning outcomes and assessment plans developed by the five GE areas. This report will be forwarded to the Faculty Senate and the Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Education.

Upon receipt of the report of the GE Assessment Coordinator, GEP/GRC will forward the reports to the Senate and the Associate Vice President.

During Spring 2002, GEP/GRC will evaluate the GE Assessment Coordinator position and will provide a recommendation to the Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Programs on level of funding and role of the position.

General Education Course Review Subcommittee (GECRSC) role

While the role of GEP/GRC in the GE Review process approved by the Faculty Senate in Fall 1999 will be replaced by the process described above, the GECRSC will continue the area by area syllabus review process approved by the Senate. Syllabi for one GE area will be collected and reviewed during each academic year, as described in the Senate document. The committee workload would be too great if all GE courses were reviewed during a single academic year.

January 27, 1999

Memo To: Faculty Senators

From: ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Governance

Re: Senate Floor Procedures for the Spring 1999 Semester

OVERVIEW

This memo sets forth and explains recommended changes to Senate floor procedures. All modifications are aimed at improving the efficiency and effectiveness of the Senate. We recommend that the Senate adopt these changes on an experimental basis for the spring 1999 semester.

BACKGROUND

Last spring, the CSUS Faculty Senate passed a resolution to create an ad Hoc Faculty Governance Committee (FS 98-12). The Committee was charged with examining the way faculty governance was working at our campus and recommending possible improvements. The Committee met over the summer and issued its report last October.

The ad Hoc Committee offered recommendations requiring a) amendments to the **Senate Constitution**, b) changes to the **Senate By-Laws**, and c) changes to the **Senate Standing Rules**. All such recommendations were discussed in the Committee's report. However, because the constitutional changes were subject to the strictest time deadlines, the fall 1998 governance debate in the Senate focused on those items. Most of the constitutional amendments originally proposed by the Committee were included in a referendum that went to the faculty in the late fall. The package of changes was overwhelmingly approved.

Nevertheless, we wish to emphasize that the recommendations most directly affecting the conduct of regular senate meetings are contained in the proposed standing rule changes summarized in this memo. These changes address widely expressed concerns

The extent of such concerns is underscored in the table below, which presents data from the summer 1998 survey of faculty senator. As shown in the table, survey respondents expressed particular concern about the Senate being dominated by a few individuals, and about poor use of Senate time.

PHRASES USED TO DESCRIBE SENATE MEETINGS
(From Summer 1998 Survey of Faculty Senators)

Phrase	% Marking Phrase
"Dominated by a few"	89
"Poor use of time"	50
"Too little follow-up"	34
"Disliked by participants"	32
"Loosely organized"	21
"Valued by participants"	18
"Tightly organized"	9
"Disorganized"	7
"Good use of time"	5
"Little discussion"	2

We have attempted to craft the rule changes carefully. Yet it is an *empirical* question whether these modifications would lead to greater satisfaction on the part of senators. Accordingly, we recommend that the changes be in effect for a single semester and then reevaluated at the end of that period.

SUMMARY AND RATIONALE FOR CHANGES

The following chart summarizes the differences between the way business is currently conducted in the Senate and the way we are proposing it be conducted in the spring of 1999. The right hand side of the chart also contains the rationale for the changes.

Important Note Regarding "First and Second Readings." We propose to draw a distinction between agenda items that are on "first reading" and those that are on "second

reading." First reading items would come to the Senate floor for discussion rather than action such as amendments or up-down votes (however, first reading items could be referred to a committee for further consideration). Items that have completed first reading would appear on the "second reading" file of the *subsequent* Senate meeting, at which time any action would be appropriate.

SUMMARY OF SPECIFIC CHANGES TO SENATE RULES

CURRENT RULES	PROPOSED RULES
Whether Action Can Be Taken on Agenda Items	**Whether Action Can Be Taken on Agenda Items**
o Items are ready for action when they appear on the agenda	o Normally items initially will be placed on "first reading;" items completing first reading would go on the "second reading" at the *subsequent* meeting
	- The Executive Committee may request a waiver of the first reading requirement to place the item on the agenda for immediate action; such requests will appear on the printed agenda. the waiver would require a 2/3 vote of the entire Senate
	Rationale: This best ensures that senators are prepared to address action items

Order of the Meeting	**Order of the Meeting**
o Normal Order: 1. Open forum 2. Information items 3. Approval of the agenda(followed by approval of minutes)	o Normal Order: 1. Open forum 2. Approval of the agenda(followed by approval of minutes) 3. Second reading agenda

4. Action on agenda items

4. First reading agenda items (at a time certain or at the end of completion of the second reading file)
5. Information items

Rationale: Information items are lower priority; it's desirable to get to action items earlier

Re-Ordering the Agenda

o Re-ordering the agenda requires a motion and a majority vote

Re-Ordering the Agenda

o Re-ordering the agenda requires a motion and a 2/3 vote

Rationale: Re-ordering the agenda can be time consuming and possibly result in high priority items not being addressed

Adding a New Agenda Item from the Floor

o Adding a new agenda item requires a motion and a majority vote

Adding a New Agenda Item from the Floor

o Adding a new first reading item to the agenda requires a motion and a majority vote; any new item added would go at the end of the first reading file

Rationale: Many senators are not prepared to address items added from the floor; it's desirable to stick to the published agenda

Time Limits on Considering Agenda Items

o There are no time limits on

Time Limits on Considering an Agenda Items

o 1) the executive committee

the length of time that can be devoted to any agenda item

would set time limits on first reading items; and 2) the default time limit for each first reading item and each item added from the floor would be 10 minutes (by 2/3 vote, the Senate could allocate more than 10 minutes) *Rationale*: This will improve the efficiency of the Senate's work

Order of Items on the First Reading Calendar

o Not applicable

Order of Items on the First Reading Calendar

o The Executive Committee would set the order of items on the first reading calendar; normally, second reading items would appear on the agenda in the order in which they were moved from first to second reading, although the Executive Committee may adjust the order of items when appropriate; the Senate could re-order the items by 2/3 vote

> *Rationale*: The Executive Committee ought to be able to determine which first reading items are lesser or higher priority

Limits on Time Allocated Individual Speakers

o There are no limits on how long an individual speaker can have the floor

Limits on Time Allocated Individual Speakers

o Speakers normally would be limited to three minutes at a time; longer remarks would be allowed when a senator is making an opening presentation on an item (on either first or second

reading) or a summary
argument against an item

- A motion could be
  made to allocate a
  speaker additional
  time; the motion could
  be approved by
  unanimous consent or,
  failing that, by
  majority vote

Rationale: This
limitation addresses the
commonly heard complaint
about long-winded
remarks

FLOW OF ITEMS TO THE SENATE FLOOR

If our proposals are approved, agenda items could come to a vote
before the full Senate in the following ways:

1. (*Most common route*) Senate standing committee (e.g.,
   Academic Policies Committee) ===> Senate Executive
   Committee ===> full Senate for first reading ===>
   full Senate for second reading

2. Recommendation of individual senator (e.g., in the
   "open forum") ===> Senate Executive Committee ===>
   full Senate for first reading ===> full Senate for
   second reading

3. At a meeting of the full Senate, item added to the first
   reading file by floor motion (majority vote required) ===>
   full Senate for second reading at subsequent meeting

4. At a meeting of the full Senate, item of pressing
   importance added to the agenda (2/3 vote required);
   second reading requirement waived so action can
   be taken on the item on the same day (2/3 vote
   required for this motion as well)

SENATE ACTION

We request that the package of changes be approved for the
spring 1999 semester only i.e., that there be a "sunset clause"

on the new rules). We further recommend that the Senate evaluate the effectiveness of the changes by the end of the semester. After the evaluation a motion could be made to implement any or all of the proposed changes on a full-time basis, as appropriate.

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO Faculty   Senate Received
FACULTY SENATE

TO: Thomas Krabacher, Chair
           CSUS Faculty Senate

FROM: Mary Ann Reihman, Chair
           General Education Policy and Graduation Requirements Committee
           (GEP/GRC)

SUBJECT: Recommendation for change to GE Area review policy

DATE: May 20, 1999

The General Education Policy/Graduation Requirements Committee (GEP/GRC)
recommends that the current Senate policy governing GE Area review procedures be
changed. The committee's recommended procedures for GE Area review are attached.

One of the reasons GEP/GRC is recommending a change in Area review procedures is
that a new subcommittee has been established for GE course review. As you know, the
GE Course Review Committee (which is referenced in the Senate policies document)
disbanded in Fall 1996. The GEP/GRC request for the establishment of a GE Course
Review Subcommittee in Fall 1995 was denied by the Senate Executive Committee. For
three semesters, GE course review was done by an ad hoc committee. During this time
period, the Faculty Coordinator for General Education was reluctant to ask an ad hoc
committee to take on the additional duty of GE Area Review.

While GEP/GRC assessed some GE Areas (B1, B2, and Advanced Study), progress was
slow due to the other agenda items before the committee. Additionally, the assessment
instruments developed by GEP/GRC gauged student perceptions of whether their course
met area requirements and, in Area B, attempted some assessment of content mastery.
The Area review did not include examination of syllabi and course outlines for
compliance with Area criteria and requirements.

The new policy which I am forwarding to the Senate Executive Committee proposes a
procedure which involves both GEP/GRC and the GE Course Review Subcommittee
(GECRS) in the Area review process. The proposed process includes both critical review
of course syllabi and outlines (by GECRS) and the development and administration of
assessment instruments (by GEP/GRC)

GE AREA REVIEW PROPOSAL
Amended for 5/17/99

RATIONALE:

> Need to undertake regularized, cyclical 5-year review of GE areas (Senate policy)
> Need for area review to be done by faculty with some knowledge of area
> Desire to share workload between GEP/GRC and GE Course Review
> > Subcommittee (GECRS)

PROCESS:

Spring semester before review year:

1. GEP/GRC notifies GECRS of upcoming area review
2. GEP/GRC and GECRS organize area review working groups. The GECRS working group includes a liaison member from GEP/GRC.
3. Faculty Coordinator for General Education for GECRS notifies department chairs of need to provide course syllabi for current and upcoming fall course offerings. The call for syllabi will include sending a copy of the area criteria to chairs with a request that the criteria be distributed to all faculty who will be teaching GE courses in fall.
4. Area working groups convene to prepare for review

Fall semester of review year:

1. Syllabi collected by GE coordinator's office during first 3 weeks of fall semester
2. GECRS working group reviews syllabi for compliance
   - A. If syllabi are found which are not in compliance. this will be reported to the department chair to allow remedial action. Remedial action must be taken by the end of the fall semester and a revise syllabus for use the following spring must be submitted.
   - B. The working group will report its findings to GEP/GRC and GECRS by the end of the fall semester.
3. GEP/GRC working group develops assessment instrument(s) for area review
   - A. The working group consults with department chairs or designees in development of the assessment instrument(s).
   - B. The working group bring the assessment instrument(s) to GEP GRC for approval by the end of fall semester.

Spring semester of review year

1. GEP/GRC working group administers assessment instrument(s) to all students in all classes in area of review (or to a statistically valid sampling of the students in these classes)
2. GEP/GRC working group begins final report on results of assessment

3. GECRS working group reports on any syllabi which are not in compliance to GECRS and may recommend removal from GE of non-compliant course or section of course to GECRS

4.

Fall semester after review year

1. GEP/GRC working submits report to GEP/GRC and Executive Committee of Faculty Senate by mid-term
2. GECRS reports on any courses/sections which have been removed for non-compliance to GEP/GRC

* CALENDAR:

1999-2000	Area B
2000-2001	Area C
2001-2002	Area D
2002-2003	Area E and Foreign Language Proficiency Requirement
2003-2004	Area A and ENGL 20
Cycle repeats	

* As courses in GE Areas are reviewed, the courses that are also graduation requirements: Race and Ethnicity and Advanced Study and, if applicable, Foreign Language Requirement, will be reviewed for compliance to criteria for these graduation requirements when they are reviewed in Areas. This will prevent reviewing some courses twice.

VII. GRADE APPEAL PROCEDURES IN DETAIL
    A.   ...
    B.   Formal Procedures
        1. ...
        2. Grade Appeal Panel.

The grade appeal panel shall consist of one full time tenured or tenure-track faculty from the academic unit in which the grade was assigned, one full-time tenured or tenure-track faculty from the college in which the unit is located and one student who shall be an upper division or graduate student in good standing currently registered in an undergraduate or graduate program in the college in which the academic unit is located. An upper division student in good standing shall serve on the panel to hear the appeal of an undergraduate. A graduate student in good standing shall serve on the panel to hear the appeal of a graduate student. One faculty member shall serve as chair.

    a. Selection of Faculty Members.

        (1) The unit chair shall randomly select ~~eight~~ four prospective panel members (who shall be numbered in order of selection) from the list of full-time tenured or tenure track faculty members within the academic unit (excluding those on sabbaticals or other leaves and those involved in the appeal). Additional panel members to bring the number to four shall be selected from ~~or~~ related units as determined by the unit chair in ~~those~~ cases where there is an insufficient number of eligible faculty members from the unit. If any faculty member selected is unwilling or unable to serve, due to extenuating circumstances, random selection shall continue until the names of ~~eight~~ four faculty members willing and able to serve have been drawn.

        (2) The unit chair shall inform the student and the instructor of the ~~eight~~ four names on the list. During the 48 hours following, each of the parties shall then have the right to challenge ~~up to two~~ one names on the list for any reason or no reason at all. The first ~~two~~ unchallenged names on the list shall be the faculty panel members from the unit and the other unchallenged faculty shall be alternates from the unit.

        ~~(3) The academic unit in which the appeal is filed shall forward to the Dean of the College to whom the unit reports a copy of the grade appeal form. When received by the Dean, this copy shall constitute notice of a unit's need of a faculty member of the~~

~~College who is not a member of the unit to serve on a grade appeal panel. That faculty member shall be selected a provided below.~~

(4) (3) By the end of the third week of instruction, the Dean of each College shall forward to each of the Departments within the College, a list of full-time tenured or tenure track faculty members within the College. The unit chair shall randomly select four prospective panel members from this list excluding those holding appointments or joint appointments in the unit hearing the grade appeal, those on sabbaticals or other leaves and those involved in the appeal. If any faculty member selected is unwilling or unable to serve, due to extenuating circumstances, random selection shall continue until the names of four faculty members willing and able to serve have been drawn.

(5) (4) The unit chair shall inform the student and the instructor of the four names on the list. During the 48 hours following, each of the parties shall then have the right to challenge one name on the list for any reason or no reason at all. The first unchallenged name on the list shall be he faculy member of the panel from the College and the other unchallenged faculty members shall be alternates from the College.

FS 00-43B/FPC, Ex., Flr. 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, as well as each Dean and the President, must develop and publish the criteria and the procedures 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 recommending FMI awards at that level, just as Faculty and Staff Affairs provides a schedule for the whole process.

CHOICE OF CATEGORIES

Faculty will be evaluated on their work assignment within the categories of faculty activity set forth in the bargaining agreement, namely (1) quality and effectiveness of teaching, (2) scholarly and creative activities, and (3) service to the University and community. Each department shall use a system that will give appropriate weight, or range of weights, to these categories, consistent with their use in that department's retention, tenure and promotion (RTP) procedures.

Faculty unit employees whose performance does not include assignments in all of the areas shall nonetheless be eligible for a Faculty Merit Increase on the basis of their performance in the individual areas of their assignment. In cases wherein the individual's workload assignment deviates from or interferes with the performance of standard expectations, the faculty member shall be evaluated using criteria consistent with his/her assignment.

Submitted FARs must demonstrate performance in all areas of the faculty member's work assignment. For purposes of the FMI process, "demonstrated performance" shall mean performance that effectively fulfills the obligation of the work assignment. *Once performance is demonstrated the individual's choice of categories will control further review and will be the basis for recommending a FMI.* **(President disagreed. He indicated that the ... "MOU does not provide for choice of categories in the way explained in the Senate document...")** As indicated previously, faculty members eligible for FMI award consideration can choose the categories in which they will be evaluated. The four choices provided in them M.O.U. are:
a.   The quality of the unit member's teaching alone.
b.   The quality of the unit member's teaching and scholarship.
c.   The quality of the unit member's teaching and service to the University and community, or
d.   The quality of the unit member's teaching, scholarship, and service to the University and community.

Departments and programs must establish criteria for each choice option that allow for the full range of possible awards. This means, in effect, a faculty member cannot be

disadvantaged based solely upon his or her choice. Nothing in this section will prohibit a department from requiring a higher level of performance from someone who chooses not to be evaluated in all three categories (teaching, research, and service) than from someone who chooses to be evaluated in all three categories.

In the case of faculty work assignments, which do not include all three categories—teaching, scholarship, and service to the University and community, it will be possible for affected faculty members to receive full merit for performance of duties that are assigned.

Faculty who engage in activities that are not directly part of their work assignment may choose to include these activities in such a way that demonstrates an impact on their assigned duties. The Department, Dean, and President must consider those unassigned activities in their merit assessments if a faculty member has requested it. **(President agreed but did not feel a policy change was needed – merely notification to part-time faculty…")**

FS 00-43C/FPC, Ex., Flr.   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 the understanding of the faculty that the Deans and the President will follow the judgments 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 capricious or arbitrary, and 2) the FMI award clearly was not reflective of the person's demonstrated performance. Examples are the failure of a Department or Program to publish its FMI evaluation criteria and the failure of a Department or Program to recommend FMI awards consistent with its published FMI evaluation criteria.

FMI money is allocated to Departments and Programs on the basis of FTEF. In those cases when a Department or Program is able to recommend 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.

(President disapproved of the first three paragraphs… restricting presidential discretion. "Such restrictions are not in the MOU and would have to be bargained between CFA and the Office of the Chancellor." He did agree with the "categories" of reasons included in the Senate language and indicated so in the letter on FMI's sent to faculty in the summer.)

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 recommended at other levels based upon value added by a faculty member to the University through service performed.

(President disapproved. "… language is restrictive of Deans' ability to recommend FMI awards beyond the provided by a department and is similarly restrictive of the ability of the President to award an FMI.')

NOTE: Section 31.20 Dean's Review indicates just that… the recommendations of the departmental committee or designee shall be reviewed. The Dean may concur or disagree…" This section does not indicate that the Dean should do an independent assessment using separate criteria. The implication being that the departments criteria and recommendations and the individual FARs should be reviewed for consistency.

It should also be noted that the MOU does not distribute funds to the Deans. Assuming that award amounts (percentages) are determined by the total amount of FMI funds allocated to the department, net reductions by the Deans in recommended awards would create a surplus and net increases a deficit. Presumably, the deficit would be "covered" with a reduction in FMI award amounts to other faculty.

In addition, t he adoption of "College Deans' Criteria" establishes a separate criteria for FMI judgments and a de facto standard criteria for departments.

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 (percentage and dollar amounts) must be made public.

The Department or Program must disclose to the individual faculty member the basis for the recommended FMI award. In addition, when the Dean recommends an award that is lower than that recommended by the Department or Program the Dean must disclose to the individual faculty member the basis for such a lower recommendation. Likewise, when the President makes an FMI award that is less than that recommended by the Department , Program, or Dean, the President shall disclose the reasons for lowering the award. Communications with individual faculty shall be confidential. However, an individual faculty member who appeals an FMI award decision can provide the information disclosed to the FMI Appeals Committee.

COLLEGE DEANS' CRITERIA FOR FACULTY MERIT INCREASES

General Criteria

■ Consistent with the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and campus policy, the Faculty Activity Report (FAR) must provide evidence of demonstrated performance in all areas of assignment for the year under review. If all areas of assignment are not demonstrated, there will be no recommendation for a Faculty Merit Increase (FMI). Demonstrated performance is performance which effectively fulfills the obligations of the work assignment.

■ For full-time faculty, the normal assignment includes teaching, scholarship, institutional service, and community service. For most part-time faculty, the assignment is normally in the area of teaching alone. Assignments which differ from the above must be noted at the beginning of the FAR.

■ For group activities such as committee work, joint authorship of scholarship, etc., the individual's contribution to the success of the group activity beyond membership alone must be clearly explained. The nature of the group activity, its outcome, its importance, and other participants (if applicable), also should be mentioned.

Specific Criteria and Process

■ Areas of assignment in the FAR will be evaluated as:

Performance not demonstrated

Basic performance demonstrated

Effective performance demonstrated

Excellent performance demonstrated

    ■ "Performance not demonstrated" results from a lack of appropriate information in the FAR on one or more areas of assignment. If all areas of assignment are not demonstrated, no FMI will be recommended.

    ■ "Basic performance" minimally fulfills the work assignment or there is insufficient information to ascertain effective performance.

    ■ An FMI will be recommended for all faculty whose FAR has been evaluated by a dean as "effective" or above in teaching and at least "basic" in other areas of assignment. The size of the FMI will vary based on the amount of money available to the college and the number of FARs found "effective" or "excellent."

- Factors considered in whether the FAR represents "basic," "effective," or "excellent" performance in one or more areas of assignment include:

  - Demonstration of performance at or beyond the level of effective in one or more areas of assignment

  - Assessed value of other levels of recommendations

  - The quality of performance of the assignment

  - The significance, scope, or importance of accomplishments

  - The strength of the evidence presented to document performance

  - Indication of how innovative or unique were the accomplishments

  - Information on how accomplishments within their assignment significantly advance University priorities

  - Nature and breadth of assignment as reflected by rank and years of service

Listed below are the normal four (4) areas of assignment for full-time faculty. For part-time faculty the assignment is normally in the area of teaching alone. The first entry under each area of work assignment is the minimum information or data necessary to allow an evaluation of either "basic" or "effective" performance for that area. Subsequent entries under each area of work assignment provide additional information which may lead to a recommendation of "excellent." The information provided in each area will be evaluated using the criteria above to determine whether the FAR demonstrates performance which is "basic," "effective," or "excellent."

Teaching

- Effectiveness in teaching is at the core of the mission of California State University, Sacramento. It is, therefore, for most faculty, the primary (but not the only) factor in successful completion of a faculty assignment. To reach a level of "effective" in demonstrating performance in teaching, it is necessary to provide relevant information for all courses taught during the time period covered by the FAR. This information will include both numerical data from department-approved standardized student evaluations for those classes evaluated as well as student comments and other qualitative opinions, such as written student feedback. Where available it should include other measures of teaching effectiveness such as results of outcomes assessment, information on grading practices, assessment of course material prepared by the instructor, development of new courses, and/or peer recognition of teaching effectiveness.

- A more complete picture of teaching effectiveness is achieved by providing information on those instructional practices or strategies which enhance teaching effectiveness/student learning. This may include innovative classroom activities or practices, for example, use of technology, special case studies, or field work which have made teaching more effective in reaching the learning goals of our diverse student population.

- Teaching also occurs outside of the traditional classroom. Where applicable, the FAR should include information on nonclassroom interaction with students including student advising, student supervision, thesis advising, involvement with community-based learning, internships, community student projects, and student involvement in research.

Scholarship

- To reach a level of "basic" or "effective" in scholarship, the FAR must contain relevant information on the scholarly and/or creative activity product or project worked on during the appropriate time covered by the FAR. This information should explain the importance of the scholarship and note what was accomplished during the year including how this one year of activity fits into an overall program of scholarship and/or how the described activity relates to the faculty's field of instruction.

- Most scholarship involves distribution or dissemination of information. The FAR should describe how and when it was disseminated and the nature of peer review or peer recognition, if any, involved with the final dissemination or presentation of material.

- For works in progress, the FAR should describe the anticipated scope of the entire work project, including a target completion date. It is necessary to present with clarity the work accomplished during the time period covered by the FAR.

Institutional Service

- To reach a level of "basic" or "effective" performance in institutional service, the FAR must provide relevant information on service to the institution, department, college, campus, or system and explain the extent and significance of the service.

- The FAR should identify those contributions which were the most significant and/or time consuming and explain the importance of the service provided. Leadership roles or other noteworthy contributions should be described.

Community and/or Professional Service

- To reach a level of "basic" or "effective" performance in community service, it is necessary to provide relevant information on service to the community or to the profession and explain its significance and link to the University.

- Service should be relevant to the faculty member's discipline and/or teaching assignment. If not obvious, this link should be explained in the FAR.

- The FAR should identify those contributions which were the most significant and/or time consuming and explain the importance of the service provided. Leadership roles or other noteworthy contributions should be described.

University Manual
California State University, Sacramento

Policy Name: Campus Safety Advisory Committee
Ref:
Effective:
Last Revision Date: July 27, 2000

Policy Administrator: Vice President for Student Affairs
Index cross-references:
Policy File Number: UMP14475

Charge

The Campus Safety Advisory Committee is charged with the task of recommending to the president of CSUS, policy, policy changes, and other actions related to campus safety which may enhance our campus climate. The committee shall review all issues raised from campus and community members related to safety and make appropriate recommendations for action.

The committee is further charged with making recommendations to promote greater sensitivity to the needs of our diverse population with regard to safety issues.

Membership will be appointed upon receipt of recommendations from appropriate campus organizations.

Campus Safety Advisory Committee Members

- Two faculty (one who teaches primarily night classes; one who teaches primarily day classes) [Recommended by the Faculty Senate]
- Two students (one who lives in the Residence Halls; one who takes night classes) [Recommended by ASI]
- One staff member (not from Public Safety) [Recommended by USA]
- Vice President for Student Affairs or designee - Chair
- Director of Public Safety or designee
- Sacramento Community Representative [Appointed by the president]
- Director of Environmental Health and Safety or designee
- Dean of Faculty and Staff Affairs or designee

Return to University Manual Index, CSUS Home Page.

The Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Crimes Statistics Act

(formerly the Campus Security Act)

Emergencies: Dial 9-1-1 (Campus Phone)

Non-Emergency Assistance: Dial Ext. 86851 (Campus Phone)

Direct On-Line Access - Website: http://www.csus.edu/police/SRTKRPT.html

The University and the Department of Public Safety encourage the prompt reporting of any incident that compromises the safety, health or rights of University community members. The Department of Public Safety is the primary respondent for campus emergencies and reports of criminal activity on campus. Officers are fully certified by the State of California and cooperate with State and local police agencies, resulting in the University's awareness of criminal activity, perpetrated beyond the campus, by students. Reports of criminal activity will be fully investigated, and appropriate referrals made to the courts, the University, or both.

Campus Buildings: Buildings on the CSUS campus remain open only through the completion of the last scheduled event. A daily schedule is provided to Facilities Management and buildings are locked on the basis of that schedule. Only employees with offices in or maintenance responsibilities for those buildings have access after buildings are locked.

Personal Safety Training: The Department of Public Safety has full-time Police Officers who are available, on request, for presentations to students, faculty, or staff (Ext. 86851). A full-time CSUS employee is available for seminars concerning personal safety for women through the Rape Prevention Education Program (Ext. 85422). In addition, students are employed through the Department of Public Safety as Community Service Officers, with primary responsibility for additional security to the Residential Life Complex.

Violence in the Work Place Policy (PM/FSA96-04): It is the University's desire to maintain a safe environment for the campus community to conduct its business and fulfill its mission. In view of the increase of violent incidents in workplaces across the nation, the following policies and procedures of California State University, Sacramento, regarding potential threats to the campus community is clarified. For the purposes of this policy, violence and threats of violence include but are not limited to:

> Any act which is physically assaultive

> Any substantial threat to harm or to endanger the safety of others

> Behaviors or actions interpreted by a reasonable person as carrying the potential for violence and/or acts of aggression

> Any substantial threat to destroy property

> Possession on campus of any weapon or dangerous instrument (e.g. any type of firearms, certain knives, brass or metal knuckles, etc.) as defined in the California Penal Code, Title 5 of the California Administrative Code or University Policy.

A climate of fear or intimidation will not be tolerated at California State University, Sacramento. Threatening behaviors, acts of aggression and violence will result in appropriate action by the

University, up to and including dismissal.

Reporting Sexual Assault: All members of the campus community should be aware that sexual assaults are prohibited by state laws, and university protocols, and will be viewed by CSU, Sacramento as a serious matter.

As soon as convenient, the victim of a sexual assault should report the incident, including date or acquaintance rape to the Department of Public Safety/University Police, the local police (if off-campus), university faculty or staff members, or through Rape Prevention personnel. The victim should make every attempt to preserve any physical evidence of the assault. This may include a voluntary medical exam, not showering, or disposing of any damaged clothing, or other items that are present after/during the assault.

The University Police, with the victim's consent, will immediately conduct a criminal investigation of on-campus sexual assaults. Disciplinary actions may be imposed on recognized individual students, student organizations, and/or university faculty and staff found guilty of a sexual assault.

Sexual Assault/Domestic Violence Resources (916 Area Code):

278-7388: CSUS Women's Resource Center
278-5422: Rape Prevention Education Program
278-5018: CSUS Employee Assistance Program
278-6416: CSUS Psychological Counseling Service
874-5701: Victim/Witness Assistance
874-5064: Restraining Orders
920-2952: W.E.A.V.E.
1-800-VICTIMS: Victims of Crime Resource Center

University's Alcohol Policy: On-campus use of alcohol is limited to certain approved events and locations covered by the guidelines of California State University, Sacramento, and Residence Halls, official policy on alcohol and other drugs.

The unlawful manufacture, distribution, dispensation, possession, or use of a controlled substance on the campus is absolutely prohibited and subject to vigorous enforcement of all applicable statutes.

The University recognizes alcohol/drug dependency as an illness and a major health problem. Information, assessment, and referral services for alcohol or drug-related problems are available on campus. Services for students are available at the Student Counseling Center. Services for employees are available through the University's Employee Assistance Program.

Crime Statistics: The University is required to publish statistics in compliance with the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crimes Statistics Act (formerly the Campus Security Act, Public Law 101-542). These statistics and policies are available on-line at the website: **http://www.csus.edu/police/SRTKRPT.html**

Printed copies are available in the CSUS Schedule of Classes, in the Reserve Book Room of the Library, and at the Department of Public Safety (University Police), 6000 J Street, California State University, Sacramento, CA 95819-6092. For additional information, copies of the Uniform Crime Report and the Chancellor's Public Safety Activities Report are retained in the Reserve Book Room of the Library under call letters YC2913.

Residence Halls: CSUS Residence Halls policy requires that exterior doors be locked at all times. All residents are issued a key card for personal access. A resident must accompany all guests. Additional information is contained in the Guide to Residential Living available through the Office of Residential Life in Sierra all.

Publications: Brochures are available through the Department of Public Safety which provide additional

information under the following titles: Personal Safety, Auto Theft, Bicycle Safety, Resources Against Rape, Protecting Valuable Property, Operation Identification, and Emergencies on Campus. The CSUS Rape Prevention Education Program has a brochure on Rape Prevention and another on Acquaintance Rape. An Emergency Response Manual is available to the campus community through Public Safety with information concerning procedures for fire, earthquake, serious injury, bomb threat, hazardous material leaks, and crimes in progress.

Last Updated August 18, 2000

STUDENT RIGHT-TO-KNOW REPORT

ON-CAMPUS CRIMES

OFFENSE	1996	1997	1998	1999
Murder	0	0	0	1
Manslaughter	0	0	0	0
Total Forcible Sex Offenses	5	4	5	4
a. Forcible Rape	2	3	3	1
b. Forcible Sodomy	0	0	0	1
c. Sexual Assault with Object	0	0	0	0
d. Forcible Fondling	3	1	2	2
Total Non-Forcible Sex Offenses	0	0	0	0
a. Incest	0	0	0	0
b. Statutory Rape	0	0	0	0
Robbery	2	1	4	3
Arson	2	1	3	4
Aggravated Assault	2	7	4	2
Burglary	22	30	35	43
Motor Vehicle Theft	28	27	61	29
Reportable Crimes Identified as Hate Crimes	0	0	0	0

CRIMES OCCURRING IN ON-CAMPUS HOUSING (extracted from total data above)

OFFENSE	1996	1997	1998	1999
Murder	0	0	0	0
Manslaughter	0	0	0	0
Total Forcible Sex Offenses	2	1	1	0
a. Forcible Rape	2	0	1	0
b. Forcible Sodomy	0	0	0	0
c. Sexual Assault with Object	0	0	0	0
d. Forcible Fondling	0	1	0	0
Total Non-Forcible Sex Offenses	0	0	0	0
a. Incest	0	0	0	0
b. Statutory Rape	0	0	0	0
Robbery	0	0	0	2
Arson	1	1	1	1
Aggravated Assault	1	1	0	1
Burglary	8	2	2	5
Motor Vehicle Theft	6	8	4	6
Reportable Crimes Identified as Hate Crimes	0	0	0	0

ARRESTS

OFFENSE	1996	1997	1998	1999
Drug Law Violations	12	6	2	1
Liquor Law Violations	2	0	8	6
Weapon Law Violations	5	7	4	1
Reportable Arrests Associated with Hate Crimes	0	0	0	0

DISCIPLINARY REFERRALS

OFFENSE	1996	1997	1998	1999
Drug Law Violations	0	0	0	N/A
Liquor Law Violations	0	0	0	N/A
Weapon Law Violations	0	0	0	N/A

N/A = Information Not Available

Reporting Requirements:

The Department of Education in its Higher Education Amendments of 1998, published final rules and regulations providing clarification for crime reporting requirements under the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy & Campus Crimes Statistics Act. Statistics concerning the occurrence on campus of the following crimes must be reported:

A. Murder
B. Manslaughter
C. Rape (prior to August 1, 1992) or forcible or nonforcible sex offenses (on or after August 1, 1992)
D. Aggravated assault
E. Burglary
F. Arson
G. Motor-vehicle theft
H. Statistics concerning the criminal offenses of murder, forcible rape, and aggravated Assault which manifest evidence of prejudice based on race, religion, sexual orientation, or ethnicity, as prescribed by the Hate Crimes Statistics Act.

Additionally, statistics concerning the number of arrests for the following crimes on campus must be provided:

A. Liquor-law violations
B. Drug-abuse violations
C. Weapons possessions
D. Statistics concerning the above crimes which manifest evidence of prejudice based on race, religion, sexual orientation, or ethnicity, as prescribed by the Hate Crimes Statistics Act

Crime Definitions

Murder: The willful (non-negligent) killing of one human being by another.

Manslaughter: The unlawful killing of a human being without malice.

Forcible Rape: The carnal knowledge of a person, forcibly and/or against that person's will or not against the person's will where the victim is incapable of giving consent.

Forcible Sodomy: Oral or anal sexual intercourse with another person, forcibly and/or against that person's will, or not against the person's will where the victim is incapable of giving consent.

Sexual Assault with an Object: The use of an object or instrument to unlawfully penetrate the genital or anal opening of the body of another person, forcibly and/or against the person's will, or not against the person's will where the victim is incapable of giving consent.

Forcible Fondling: The touching of the private body parts of another person for the purpose of sexual gratification, forcibly and/or against that person's will; or not forcibly or against the person's will where

the person is incapable of giving consent.

Incest: Non-forcible sexual intercourse between persons who are related to each other within the degrees wherein marriage is prohibited by law.

Statutory Rape: Non-forcible sexual intercourse with a person who is under the statutory age of consent.

Robbery: The taking/attempting to take anything of value from the custody or control of a person or persons by force, threat of force or violence and/or putting the victim in fear.

Aggravated Assault: An unlawful attack by one person upon another for the purpose of inflicting severe bodily injury. Usually accompanied by use of a weapon or by means likely to produce death or great bodily harm, though it is not necessary that physical injury actually occur.

Burglary: The unlawful entry of a structure to commit a felony or a theft. Includes unlawful entry with intent to commit a larceny or felony; breaking and entering with intent to commit a larceny; housebreaking, safecracking, all attempts to commit any of the aforementioned.

Arson: The willful and malicious burning of another's property.

Motor Vehicle Theft: The theft or attempted theft of a motor vehicle.

Weapon Law Violations: Violations of laws dealing with weapons offenses, such as manufacture, sale, possession or carrying of deadly weapons.

Drug Abuse Violations: Violations of state and local laws relating to the unlawful possession, sale, use, cultivation, and manufacturing of narcotic drugs, and dangerous non-narcotic drugs.

Liquor Law Violations: The violations of laws or ordinances prohibiting: the manufacture, sale, transporting, furnishing, possession of intoxicating liquor. (Drunkenness and driving under the influence are not included in this definition).

Return to   CSUS Police Home Page

Jerry Sharpe Institutional Research relative to public safety

- Reviewed 1999 and 2000 CASPER results and the 1999 SNAPS results and basically reveal that people feel pretty safe on campus.
- Feelings of safety drop at night.
- Over time people have felt safer on campus

SNAPS are done every 5 years - report was that 64% of students feel safe on campus at any given time.

Degree of Safety	Day	Night
Always	95%	62%
Sometimes	4%	22%
Rarely	1%	15%

Comparisons with other CSU Campuses to the statement **"I feel safe on this Campus"**:

Response	All CSU Campuses Frequency	%	CSUS Frequency	%
Strongly Disagree	279	1.6	19	1.5
Disagree	957	5.3	73	5.5
Neutral	3939	22.0	294	22.3
Agree	9250	51.7	729	55.1
Strongly Agree	3483	19.4	207	15.6

CASPER comparisons

Semester	Felt Safe
Spring 1996	77%
Spring 1997	78%
Spring 1998	64%

Broken out by sex:

CASPER S'96 "I feel safe on campus"

	Female N	%	Male N	%	Total N	%
Yes	688	66	732	91	1420	77
No	352	34	73	9	425	23
Total	1040	100	805	100	1845	100

CASPER S'97 "I feel safe on campus"

	Female N	%	Male N	%	Total N	%
Yes	702	69	740	90	1442	78
No	311	31	85	10	396	22
Total	1013	100	825	100	1838	100

CASPER S'98 "I feel safe on campus"

	Female		Male		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	687	64	508	63	1195	63
No	387	36	301	37	688	37
Total	1074	100	809	100	1883	100

SNAPS 1999

"Do you feel safe on campus during the day?" (responses are only from students who are on campus during the day and the night)

	Female		Male		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Almost Always	502	79	361	90	863	83
Frequently	92	15	30	7	122	12
Sometimes	34	5	9	2	43	4
Rarely	4	1	0	0	4	0
Never	1	0	3	1	4	0
Total	633	100	403	100	1036	100

"Do you feel safe on campus at night? (responses are only from students who are on campus during the day and the night)

	Female		Male		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Almost Always	51	19	105	62	156	35
Frequently	91	33	43	25	134	30
Sometimes	83	30	17	10	100	23
Rarely	29	11	3	2	32	7
Never	21	8	1	1	22	5
Total	275	100	169	100	444	100

Conclusion:
Although the majority of crime occurs during the day, people feel safe on campus during the day, 38% feel safe on campus at night.

There is a difference in the perceptions of safety between men and women. The largest discrepancy comes at thing, where 19% of women and 3% of men rarely or never feel safe, and 30% of women and 10% of men report only sometimes feel safe at night. We need to determine what people mean by safe, and if there are any actions the University can take to increase perceptions of safety on campus.

The Office of Public Safety

Contact Information:

Office Location:	Public Services Building, First Floor
Hours of Operation:	24 hours a day, 7 days a week
Lobby Hours:	24 hours a day, 7 days a week
Administrative Staff Hours:	Monday - Friday 8:00am - 5:00pm
	(Closed Noon - 1:00PM)
Telephone:	911 (Emergency)
	(916) 278-6851 (Non-Emergency)
Fax:	(916) 278-6889
E-Mail:	police@csus.edu
Website:	(http://www.csus.edu/police/)

Programs and Services
(A sample of offerings)

- Violence in the Workplace presentations
- Speakers Bureau (i.e day care, NSO)
- Property Identification
- Disaster Preparedness
- Training and Plan Development
- Home Safety Survey
- Crime Prevention Presentations
- Late Night Escorts
- Vehicle and Office lock-outs
- Emergency Paging and Message Delivery
- Civil Stand-by
- Crime analysis
- Campus and Directed Patrols – bicycle, vehicle, and foot
- Bicycle registration
- Special Events Planning
- Dedicated 911 Emergency System

- Emergency Phone Response
- Welfare Checks
- Serve on a range of campus committees
- Campus Safety Officers
- Life Scan (finger printing and credentialing)
- TRAC System
- HASMAT/First Responder
- First Aid and CPR
- Inservice Training
- Post Certified Training
- Traffic Enforcement
- Community Policing
- Neighborhood Policing
- Public Awareness of issues and Notification of Criminal Activities
- Brochures and Publications

Sacramento
Digest of 1998/1999 Campus Accountability Data
Extracted from campus reports and system data

1. Quality of baccalaureate degree programs
Each campus will provide evidence of progress toward the identification of learning outcomes and the development of a process to assess student learning outcomes at the general education and program levels.

Most degree programs at CSU Sacramento (CSUS) have established expectations for student learning in the major. Although some programs have decided on a direct method of assessing student learning outcomes, most are using indirect methods. The newly appointed Faculty Assessment Coordinator will provide assistance to departments as they move to implement more direct methods of student learning. By this time next year, learning expectations for General Education should be defined and specific strategies for assessment selected.

2. Access to the CSU
Eligible applicants are guaranteed admission to some CSU campus.

CSUS had only two impacted programs over the past few years, Nursing and Physical Therapy. All other programs remained open, and all eligible candidates were accepted. Supplemental criteria used in impacted programs have maintained student diversity in the programs.

3. Progression to the degree
The CSU provides clear paths to the baccalaureate degree for first-time freshmen and transfer students.

These data describe regularly-admitted CSU students. For the last three years, one-year continuation rates have ranged between 77 and 78 percent for first-time freshmen and between 81 and 84 percent for CCC transfers. For the last three years, as upper-division students progressed towards the degree, junior transfer students took 76 to 79 semester units, and native freshman students took 73 to 77 units.

4. Persistence and graduation
The CSU, through clear statements of graduation requirements, effective advising, and effective access to courses, will assist students to achieve their degree objectives.

Three forms of graduation rates are used in the public arena today: 6-year, 12-year, and JCAR rates. Therefore, all three are reported here. For the past three years, 6-year graduation rates for first-time full-time freshmen ranged between 37 and 43 percent. In 1999, the persistence to graduation rates for Fall 1987 regularly admitted first-time freshmen and CCC transfer students were 65 percent and 70 percent, respectively. The following table of JCAR graduation rates takes full- and part-time attendance into account.

JCAR Student Category	First-time Freshmen		CCC Junior Transfers	
	6-year Graduation Rate	Estimated Final Graduation Rate	3-year Graduation Rate	Estimated Final Graduation Rate
1. Full-time	66	74	73	83
2. Persistent Part-time	41	57	40	69
3. Partial Load/Stop-out	2	14	7	48

5. Areas of special need
There is great need in many regions of California for credentialed teachers.

The numbers of first-time/new-type multiple, single subject, and special education credentials issued from CCTC, recommended by CSUS, were 482 in 1996-97, 583 in 1997-98, and 732 in 1998-99.

6. Relations with K-12

Although the CSU cannot assume full control of the academic preparation of entering students, our universities can influence the level of preparation.

In mathematics, the percentage of regularly-admitted, first-time freshmen fully prepared was 44 percent in Fall 1998, and 45 percent in Fall 1997 and Fall 1999. In English, the percentage of regularly-admitted, first-time freshmen fully prepared was 58 percent in Fall 1997 and Fall 1998, and 47 percent in Fall 1999.

7. Remediation
The CSU successfully remediates, within one year, students who are not fully prepared to begin college-level mathematics and English.

CSUS has put considerable effort into the implementation of Executive Order 665 which first addressed students entering in Fall 1998 not fully prepared for college level work in English and/or mathematics. Through coursework and other activities, by Fall 1999, 96 percent of the returning Fall 1998 regularly-admitted first-time freshmen were prepared in *both* English and mathematics.

8. Facilities Utilization
To meet growing enrollment pressure, the CSU will expand its capacity by using existing facilities more effectively.

When and Where Instruction Takes Place	1998-99
Mon-Thur Main Campus Lecture/Lab AY FTES until 4 PM	61.9%
Mon-Thur Main Campus Lecture/Lab AY FTES after 4 PM	20.2%
Friday Main Campus Lecture/Lab AY FTES	6.3%
Sat/Sun Main Campus Lecture/Lab AY FTES	0.7%
Other Main Campus Lecture/Lab AY FTES	0.0%
Summer Annualized FTES (Main Campus and Off-Site)	0.0%
Main Campus Other Non-Lecture Lab AY FTES	4.6%
Off Site (Including Official Off-Campus Centers) AY FTES	6.2%
Total College Year FTES	100.0%

9. University Advancement
To support educational excellence, CSU will continue to seek funding through private contributions

Achieving its 10 percent goal, CSU Sacramento increased voluntary support to $7,979,601. Special revenue also climbed, to $46,791,474. With 140,000 total alumni and 114,000 addressable alumni, 4,452 are registered as alumni association members. The new alumni center, built with $2.2 million in private funds, was opened this year.

10. Quality of Graduate and Postbaccalaureate Programs

Direct indicators of quality for graduate and postbaccalaureate programs include the development and implementation of student learning outcomes assessment plans, student rating of the quality of the major, alumni satisfaction with the quality of the major, percent of programs eligible for accreditation that are fully accredited, regional emphasis of the academic program, and student satisfaction with course availability and schedule options. Indirect indicators of quality include the number of basic teaching credentials recommended and continuing education enrollment and certificates awarded.

Sacramento
Digest of 1998/1999 Campus Accountability Data
Extracted from campus reports and system data

1. Quality of baccalaureate degree programs
Each campus will provide evidence of progress toward the identification of learning outcomes and the development of a process to assess student learning outcomes at the general education and program levels.

Most degree programs at CSU Sacramento (CSUS) have established expectations for student learning in the major. Although some programs have decided on a direct method of assessing student learning outcomes, most are using indirect methods. The newly appointed Faculty Assessment Coordinator will provide assistance to departments as they move to implement more direct methods of student learning. By this time next year, learning expectations for General Education should be defined and specific strategies for assessment selected.

2. Access to the CSU
Eligible applicants are guaranteed admission to some CSU campus.

CSUS had only two impacted programs over the past few years, Nursing and Physical Therapy. All other programs remained open, and all eligible candidates were accepted. Supplemental criteria used in impacted programs have maintained student diversity in the programs.

3. Progression to the degree
The CSU provides clear paths to the baccalaureate degree for first-time freshmen and transfer students.

These data describe regularly-admitted CSU students. For the last three years, one-year continuation rates have ranged between 77 and 78 percent for first-time freshmen and between 81 and 84 percent for CCC transfers. For the last three years, as upper-division students progressed towards the degree, junior transfer students took 76 to 79 semester units, and native freshman students took 73 to 77 units.

4. Persistence and graduation
The CSU, through clear statements of graduation requirements, effective advising, and effective access to courses, will assist students to achieve their degree objectives.

Three forms of graduation rates are used in the public arena today: 6-year, 12-year, and JCAR rates. Therefore, all three are reported here. For the past three years, 6-year graduation rates for first-time full-time freshmen ranged between 37 and 43 percent. In 1999, the persistence to graduation rates for Fall 1987 regularly admitted first-time freshmen and CCC transfer students were 65 percent and 70 percent, respectively. The following table of JCAR graduation rates takes full- and part-time attendance into account.

	First-time Freshmen		CCC Junior Transfers	
JCAR *Student Category*	*6-year* *Graduation Rate*	*Estimated Final* *Graduation Rate*	*3-year* *Graduation Rate*	*Estimated Final* *Graduation Rate*
1. Full-time	66	74	73	83
2. Persistent Part-time	41	57	40	69
3. Partial Load/Stop-out	2	14	7	48

5. Areas of special need
There is great need in many regions of California for credentialed teachers.

The numbers of first-time/new-type multiple, single subject, and special education credentials issued from CCTC, recommended by CSUS, were 482 in 1996-97, 583 in 1997-98, and 732 in 1998-99.

6. Relations with K-12