

2000-2001  
FACULTY SENATE  
California State University, Sacramento

AGENDA

Thursday, November 16, 2000  
Foothill Suite, University Union  
3:00 -5:00 p.m.

**OPEN FORUM**

**CONSENT CALENDAR**

FS 00-80/Ex. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS—University

Council On Information Technology (COIT)--

--Policy Study Group: MERLE MARTIN, Accountancy, CBA, 2003

--Standards Study Group: DICK SMITH, Computer Science, E&CS, 2003

Director of Institutional <sup>RESEARCH</sup> ~~Studies~~, Advisory Selection Committee for the Selection of the:

CAROL BARNES, *Sociology*  
FRANCIS YUEN, *Social Work*

Academic Council on International Programs:

CATHERINE TURRILL, At-large, July 1, 2001-June 30, 2004

FS 00-81/CPC, Ex. CURRICULUM REVIEW—DEPARTMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY

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

FS 00-82/CPC, Ex. CURRICULUM REVIEW—GRADUATE PROGRAM IN PUBLIC POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION

The Faculty Senate receives the commendations and recommendations (Attachment B) of the Curriculum Policies Committee on the program review of the Graduate Program in Public Policy and Administration and recommends that the program be approved for six years or until the next program review.

**REGULAR AGENDA**FS 00-78/Flr. MINUTES

Approval of the Minutes of October 19 (#4), 2000.

FS 00-79/Flr. MINUTES

Approval of the Minutes of October 26 (#5), 2000.

**SECOND READING**

FS00-85 CRIS - JAN MCPHERSON [Action may be taken.]

FS 00-77/Ex. COUNCIL ON INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (COIT) }—FACULTY  
SENATE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

[Art Jensen]

*[Background: In the fall of 1999 the Provost engaged the services of David Tomcheck (Assistant Vice Chancellor at University of California, Irvine) to review the institution-wide support for academic computing technology, to assess the appropriate roles and responsibilities for centralized and distributed academic information technology staff, and to recommend a model for providing academic computing support. In March 2000, the consultant's report was submitted to the Provost.*

*In the report's executive summary, the consultant observed that "a prelude to IT deployment is a well-understood and well-accepted, campus wide technology support plan that addresses the evolving distinction between the roles and responsibilities of College support staff and those of Computing, Communications and Media Services (CCMS)." To facilitate the development and acceptance of such a plan the Executive Committee recommends the creation of an ad hoc committee.]*

The Faculty Senate creates an ad hoc Faculty Senate Information Technology Advisory Committee (FSITAC) to serve as the interface between the Faculty Senate and COIT and its Study Groups. Membership on this committee will consist of the Faculty Senate representative on COIT and the appointed faculty representatives to each of the study groups established by COIT. This Committee will inform and advise the Executive Committee and the Faculty Senate of developments and changes occurring in information technology that affect the academic community.

FS 00-83A/Ex. WAIVER OF FIRST READING OF FS 00-83

The Faculty Senate waives the first reading of FS 00-83, Resolution for Writers and Thinkers Symposium on Unity and Diversity.

*Carried* FS 00-83/Ex. UNITY AND DIVERSITY, RESOLUTION\* FOR WRITERS AND THINKERS SYMPOSIUM ON [Joan Bauerly]

- Whereas: The CSU Sacramento campus and the City of Sacramento has<sup>ve</sup> faced a recent set of challenges involving intolerance to diversity; and
- Whereas: The Administration of this campus has declared the 2000/2001 academic year the YEAR OF UNITY, a time to reflect on both our appreciation of diversity and our need for unity, harmony, and commonality; and
- Whereas: We need to continue an on-going dialogue, a set of serious conversations about the elements/interest/concerns that hold us together rather than divide us as a viable academic community; and
- Whereas: At the meeting of October 19, 2000, the Faculty Senate adopted the pledge entitled "Our Campus Community Commitment To Unity," written and presented by Professor Cecil E. Canton (FS 00-74/Ex); and
- Whereas: A public forum like the proposed Writers and Thinkers Symposium (which will take place in May 3 and 4, 2001) has as its central theme the concept of RE-VISITING/ RE-DEFINING UNITY—emphasizing commonalities while building a space of understanding and tolerance for differences; therefore, be it
- Resolved: That the week of May 2 through 6, 2001, be declared THE WEEK OF WRITERS AND THINKERS REVISITING/REDEFINING UNITY; and, be it further
- Resolved: That the Faculty Senate encourages scholars, teachers, staff, administrators, and students to participate in the events of the week and set aside time, where appropriate, to discuss in various classroom and campus settings, the issues that arise in preparation for the Symposium and during and after its occurrence; and, be it further
- Resolved: That individual faculty members and departments be encouraged to further in their classrooms and among their students an on-going dialogue that will support both an appreciation of diversity and a recognition of commonality by incorporating, wherever pedagogically appropriate, relevant issues into course syllabi, reading selections and writing assignments and class discussion .

\*Prepared by the Planning Committee for 2001 Writers and Thinkers Symposium on Unity and Diversity: Olivia Castellano, Otis Scott, Bob Arellanes, Stephanie Tucker, Sheree Meyer, Doug Rice, Joan Bauerly, Tom Pyne, Ric Brown, Roberto Pomo, Rita Cameron Wedding and Juanita Barrena.

FS 00-84A WAIVE *carried*

## FIRST READING

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

FS 00-84/CPC, Ex. INTERDISCIPLINARY PROGRAMS, PROCESS FOR APPROVAL OF  
NEW [Mary Ann Reihman]

The Faculty Senate recommends adoption of the “Process for Submission for Approval of New Interdisciplinary Programs” (Attachment C-1; see Attachment C-2 for “Comparison of Substantive Program Change Proposal Process with Proposed Process for Submission of New Interdisciplinary Programs”).

## INFORMATION

1. 2000-2001 Budget [Initial report in response to FS 00-39] (Bob Buckley)
2. Tentative F’2001 Senate Meetings—Thursdays, 3:00-5:00 p.m., in the Foothill Suite, University Union, unless otherwise noted:



November 23:

HAPPY THANKSGIVING!!



November 30: **No Meeting**

4:00 p.m., President’s Award Lecture and Reception

December 7: **Meeting**

December 14: *tentative* (Fina’s Week)

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

Summary of Commendations and Recommendations  
Contained in the Academic Program Review Report  
for the Department of Anthropology

Commendations

1. An outstanding faculty composed of dedicated teacher-scholars
2. A proactive approach to instructional delivery innovations, including distance education and the use of technology in the classroom
3. A resounding commitment to the University's general education program
4. An impressive list of outside funds generated by the faculty
5. A museum and exhibit program that survives (and is poised to thrive) in spite of the hardships imposed by negligible institutional support
6. Continual review of programs, curricula, and facilities

Recommendations

1. That the Department develop an academic plan consistent with its recent placement in the College of Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies. (p. 5)
2. That the Department consider using alternative scheduling of courses. (p. 7)
3. That the Department consider instituting mandatory undergraduate student advising. (p. 7)
4. That the Department consider augmenting its career advising activities. (p. 8)
5. That the Department develop plans for adjusting to anticipated faculty retirements. (p. 8)
6. That the Department review its curriculum and staffing to minimize instances in which only one person is able to teach a course. (p. 8)
7. That the Department consider ways to integrate part time faculty more fully into the life of the Department. (p. 9)
8. That the Department examine its post-tenure review practices to ensure that they are judiciously followed. (p. 9)

9. That the Department pursue a thematic approach to curriculum, project, and program development consistent with the University's commitment to regional (Sacramento Valley) and global (Pacific Rim) interests. (p. 10)
10. That the Department review its admission criteria for Master of Arts students to insure that those standards are clearly communicated to prospective students. (p. 11)
11. That the Department clarify its requirement for quantitative skills at the graduate level. (p. 12)
12. That the Department revisit its decision to require Master of Arts students to submit their thesis for Department-based review in the semester prior to graduation. (p. 13)
13. That the Department develop and publish a graduate course rotation list. (p. 13)
14. That the Department consider offering Graduate Assistant and/or Teaching Associate opportunities to its master's students. (p. 14)
15. That the Department foster the development of its Master of Arts offerings in Cultural and Physical Anthropology. (p. 14)
16. That the Department implement existing plans and continue consideration of future plans for assessing student learning. (p. 15)
17. That the Department confer with the Dean to secure long term staffing and funding for the Anthropology Museum. (p. 16)
18. That the Department clarify its resource allocations to its various Centers. (p. 16)
19. That the Department consider allowing part time faculty to have voting privileges in its governance processes. (p. 17)
20. That the Bachelor of Arts degree program in Anthropology be approved for another six years, or until the next program review. (p. 17)
21. That the Master of Arts degree program in Anthropology be approved for another six years, or until the next program review. (p. 17)
22. That the minor in Anthropology be approved for another six years, or until the next program review. (p. 17)

**Summary of Commendations and Recommendations  
Contained in the Academic Program Review Report for the  
Department of Public Policy and Administration**

**Summary of Commendations to the Department**

1. The Department is commended for development of a Self-Study document that included a comprehensive examination of current functioning and future issues for the department.
2. The review team is very appreciative to Bob Waste (PPA Department Chair), and Suzy Byrd (departmental Administrative Assistant) for providing additional information requested by the team; and also to the faculty members for their open conversations with the team regarding the program.
3. The Department provided a thorough and thoughtful analysis of the prior program review recommendations and has documented efforts to respond to these recommendations.
4. The review team commends PPA faculty members for their scholarly contributions and university and community service.
5. The review team applauds the interdisciplinary activities of the PPA program.
6. The review team commends the PPA faculty for a strong teaching record as well as taking an active role in evaluating effectiveness of the teaching-learning process.
7. The review team notes the commitment of faculty members to provide student support to facilitate successful completion of the degree.
8. The review team commends the PPA program for ongoing efforts to evaluate and improve student outcomes.

**Summary of Recommendations to the Department**

1. The review team recommends that PPA faculty members continue efforts to revitalize the community advisory group. (p. 3)
2. The review team recommends that PPA program faculty members continue to explore strategies to facilitate recruitment and retention of a diverse group of students. (p. 6)



3. The review team encourages PPA faculty members to continue to examine and improve advising efforts. (p. 8)
4. The review team encourages PPA faculty members to continue to explore strategies for increasing students' participation in professional activities. (p. 9)
5. The review team encourages the PPA department to reflect on strategies that can provide a balance between opportunities for faculty involvement in activities resulting in local, state, national, and international contributions to the field and other programmatic needs. (p. 12)
6. The review team encourages PPA faculty members to continue discussions regarding the proposed undergraduate major/minor including consideration of suggestions from the team and the external consultant. (p. 15)
7. The review team encourages PPA faculty members to continue efforts both in development of assessment measures and in utilizing results of student learning outcomes for program improvement. (p. 16)

#### **Recommendations to the College**

1. The review team specifically recommends that the College support at least one additional faculty position to enable the PPA department to strengthen the administration focus in the program. (p. 14)
2. The review team recommends that the College provide physical and fiscal resources necessary for program expansion including recruitment of additional students and the addition of faculty members. (p. 17)

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

1. Based on the review process the team recommends to the Faculty Senate that the PPA program be approved for six years or until the next program review. (p. 18)



**PROCESS FOR SUBMISSION FOR APPROVAL OF  
NEW INTERDISCIPLINARY PROGRAMS**

**Approval recommended by CPC**

**October 17, 2000**

**Ex. Com. amended October 31, 2000 (underscore = addition; strikeover = deletion)**

While the process for submission of substantive changes/modifications of existing programs is clearly outlined in the University Bluebook, difficulty has been encountered with the submission of interdisciplinary programs. This is the case since curricular coherence and funding must be clarified among the departments and/or colleges involved. Additionally, the process that should be followed in obtaining approval at the University level has not been defined. The following represents a proposal for a sequence of steps to be taken in obtaining approval for interdisciplinary programs that represent a change or modification of an existing program:

1. A faculty member or committee must develop the interdisciplinary program proposal. The initiating faculty member or committee will be responsible for coordinating the steps necessary in seeking approval and will be listed as "contact person(s)" on required forms for program and course changes/modification.
2. Resources to support program changes normally come from the College(s)/Department(s) requesting the change. Each request for a change in program should be accompanied by a statement from the Dean(s) indicating that the College(s) will accommodate changes in the program within its existing resource allocations or a statement indicating the additional resources needed. The latter statement should include a description of the level and nature of additional funding the College(s) will seek for the program changes.
3. Consultation with departments and/or colleges that will be involved in the interdisciplinary program must result in approval by the department(s) and college(s) of the proposed program as well as approval of whatever curriculum development and/or modification that is required.
4. With the assistance of the departments/colleges, course and program proposals (Forms A and B) must be drafted, and department and college level approval obtained in all departments and colleges participating.
5. If the program and course changes/modifications do not require an increase in funding to the budget allocation of the departments/colleges participating in the program, program and course change proposals shall be sent to the Subcommittee for Curriculum for approval via the Office of Academic Affairs.
6. If the program and course changes/modifications require a partial or full funding budget allocation by the University, information on the fiscal/budgetary impact of the new interdisciplinary program shall be provided to the Subcommittee for

Curriculum by the Office of Academic Affairs prior to its deliberation on program and course approval.

7. If the program proposal involves decisions regarding General Education policy, the program proposal shall be submitted to the General Education Policy/Graduation Requirements Committee (GEP/GRC) for approval. The decision of the Committee shall then be transmitted to the Subcommittee for Curriculum.

If General Education course proposals are submitted, such proposals shall be sent to the General Education Course Review Subcommittee (GECRSC) for approval. If approved, the decision of the Committee shall then be transmitted to the Subcommittee for Curriculum.

If both the program proposal and course proposal(s) involve decisions regarding General Education Policy, 1) the program proposal shall be submitted to the General Education Policy/Graduation Requirements Committee (GEP/GRC) for approval, and 2) course proposal(s) shall be sent to the General Education Course Review Subcommittee (GECRSC) for approval. GEP/GRC and GECRSC deliberations can be concurrent. The decision of the GEP/GRC shall be transmitted to the Subcommittee for Curriculum.

8. When the Senate recommends approval of a program change and the change requires a new budget allocation for partial or full funding, the Senate will ~~recommend to~~ note this requirement in its transmittal to the President. ~~that CUP review this proposal along with all similar instructional program funding requests. CUP will prioritize each of these requests and make a recommendation to the President.~~
9. As with other program changes, final decision on whether to implement an approved program changes rests with the College Deans based on their judgement of the impact the change will have on other existing College programs given the resources available to support the change.

\*The proposed process closely follows that outlined in the University Bluebook, section III, Modification in or Deletion of Existing Programs.

## COMPARISON OF SUBSTANTIVE PROGRAM CHANGE PROPOSAL PROCESS WITH PROPOSED PROCESS FOR SUBMISSION OF NEW INTERDISCIPLINARY PROGRAMS

| "normal" Substantive Program Change proposal   | Submission of Interdisciplinary Program  |
|--|--|
| Changes are initiated at Department level  | Faculty member or committee initiates change; designated as "contact person(s)"  |
| Resources normally come from College/Dept. requesting change. Each request should be accompanied by statement from Dean indicating funding sources including level and nature of any additional funding the College seeks.                                 | Resources normally come from College(s)/Dept.(s) requesting change. Each request should be accompanied by statement from Dean(s) indicating funding sources including level and nature of any additional funding the College(s) seeks. |
|  | Consultation with department/colleges ; departmental/college approvals of curriculum development/change and identification of funding/support and degree of both   |
| Form B is completed and indicates programmatic or fiscal impact on other academic units' programs and description of consultation including documentation of consultation  | Forms A and B completed and indicate programmatic or fiscal impact on other academic units' programs and description of consultation including documentation of consultation   |
| Fiscal analysis of proposed changes included on form. This includes 1) how changes will be accommodated within the dept/College, 2) nature and level of additional funding College seeks, 3) additional space, equipment, O.E., clerical/technical support |  |
| Faculty review at department and college levels  | Faculty review at department and college levels  |
| Proposal sent to Senate Subcommittee on Curriculum   | If no additional resources to Senate Subcommittee on Curriculum (SC)   |
| Information on fiscal/budgetary impact provided to Subcommittee by Office of Associate VP for Academic Affairs   | If additional funding is required, fiscal/budgetary impact of new program is provided to Subcommittee on Curriculum (SC)   |
|  | If program proposal involves decisions regarding GE policy, the proposal is submitted to GEP/GRC; the decision is transmitted to SC  |
|  | If GE course proposals are submitted, proposals are sent to GE Course Review Subcommittee; the decision is transmitted to SC   |
|  | If both GE policy and GE course decisions are required, proposals are sent to two committees simultaneously; decisions transmitted to SC   |
| Subcommittee on Curriculum recommends approval or disapproval  | Subcommittee on Curriculum recommends approval or disapproval  |
| President may consult CUP concerning significance and feasibility considering other University priorities  | If program requires new resources, the Senate will note this requirement in its transmittal to the President   |
| Final decision on implementation rests on Dean of College  | Final decision on implementation rests on Dean(s) of College(s) involved   |