

1
2
3 **California State University, Sacramento**
4 **2013-2014 FACULTY SENATE**
5

6 **Meeting Agenda**
7 **Thursday, October 31, 2013**
8 **3:00 – 5:00 pm, Foothill Suite**
9 **Updated: October 29, 2013**
10

11
12 The Agenda (below) contains hyperlinks to the proposed legislation which now feature a line number system to
13 enable us to assist with discussion and editing. Simply click on the FS item to see the document. This will provide a
14 more accurate record for the Senate, the President, and for inclusion in the University Policy Manual. We make
15 other adjustments to the agenda format during the fall experience and will arrive at a workable system for the
16 spring.
17
18

19 **Open Forum**

20 *Consistent with FS 08-43/EX (October 2008) the open forum is a time when any member of the campus community*
21 *can address the Senate on any issue not included in the Senate agenda for that meeting. Persons wishing to utilize*
22 *the open forum are encouraged to notify the senate chair of such intent at least 24 hours prior to the senate*
23 *meeting, indicating the topic to be addressed. Presentations at the open forum shall be limited to no more than 3*
24 *minutes. Issues raised during the open forum may be placed on the agenda as first reading items at the time the*
25 *agenda is approved.*
26

27 **Information**

- 28 ▪ [John C. Livingston Annual Faculty Lecture](#): Presented by Chair Hecsh
 - 29 ▪ [ASI Annual Priorities 2013 – 2014](#): Presented by Senator Banus, ASI Vice President, Academic Affairs
 - 30 ▪ **Faculty Endowment for Student Scholarships Update**: Presented by Vince A. Sales, Vice President for
31 University Advancement and Kevin Gonzalez, Director of Major & Planned Gifts
- 32
33

34 **Approval of the Agenda**
35
36

37 **Regular Agenda**

38
39 [FS 13/14-40/FL](#) **Minutes – October 17, 2013**
40
41

1 **Second Reading**

2
3
4 [FS 13/14-26/CPC/EX](#) **Academic Program Reviews, Amendment of Policies: FS 02-03/CPC, EX;**
5 **FS 02-04/CPC, EX; FS03-57/CPC, EX; FS 04-13/CPC, EX: (FSA00010.htm)**
6

7 The Faculty Senate recommends the following revisions to the Academic Program Review policy:

8 *The following changes were made based on the established policy, the current pilot academic program*
9 *review procedures, and the goal to separate the policy from the procedures:*

<i>Proposed</i>	<i>Current</i>
<i>I. Intro and Rationale</i>	<i>A. Self Study Procedures</i>
<i>II Review Team Composition and Responsibilities</i>	<i>B. Review Team Composition Guidelines</i>
<i>III Program Review Oversight Committee Composition and Responsibilities</i>	<i>C. External Consultants Procedures</i>
<i>IV External Consultant Identification</i>	<i>D. Consultant's Visit</i>
<i>V Program Review Procedures</i>	<i>E. Program Review Team Procedures</i>
<i>VI External Accreditation Review Process</i>	<i>F. Program Review Oversight Committee</i>
	<i>G. Self Study Guidelines</i>
	<i>H. Assessment Plan Guidelines</i>

- 10
11 **Academic Program Review Transmittal Information:** [FS 13/14-26a](#)
12 **Academic Program Review Policy** (*UPM: FSA00010.htm*)
13 **Program Review Process and Self-Study Pilot Program:** [FS 13/14-26b](#)
14 **CPC Program Review PowerPoint Presentation**

15
16 *At the time of adjournment the following motion was pending having been introduced by Senator*
17 *Buchanan, English.*

18
19 Whereas: The proposed Academic Program Reviews Policy documents should
20 be considered in relation to other existing campus policy documents
21 that may duplicate or overlap with them; and

22
23 Whereas: The proposed IPP policy document overlaps with the Academic Program Reviews Policy documents,
24 since it specifies that departments and programs would need to gather data that could be obtained
25 through a Self-Study process; and

26
27 Whereas: Compared with the predictable timetable of Program Reviews, the
28 unpredictable timing of the IPP process is problematic and unfair,
29 representing an unreasonably sudden increase in faculty workload; and

30
31 Whereas: The most recent proposed draft of the IPP guidelines suggests
32 removing all comparative ranking of programs and thus would make it
33 unnecessary for the data collected for IPP purposes be submitted by all
34 programs at the same time; and

1
2 Whereas: Any budgetary decisions based on IPP data should also be informed by a fuller view of a given
3 department and/or program, including the Self-Study report and the report of an external reviewer
4 required by the Academic Program Reviews process; and

5
6 Whereas: If the data to be collected through an IPP process are sufficiently important to inform campus budgetary
7 decisions, they ought to be collected regularly by the relevant departments; therefore be it

8
9 Resolved: The Faculty Senate recommends postponing Senate debate and/or a decision on both the Academic
10 Program Reviews Policy documents and the IPP policy document pending the formation of a Senate
11 task force to consider these documents and their potential relationship to each other; be it further

12
13 Resolved: Such a consideration might include (though by no means be limited to)
14 the possible merits of combining the most important features of these
15 documents into a single overarching document; be it further

16
17 Resolved: The task force will include a group of Faculty Senators (or at-large
18 faculty if an insufficient number of Faculty Senators are available) to
19 be selected by the Senate as a whole; be it further

20
21 Resolved: The task force will provide its recommendations to the Faculty Senate
22 Executive Committee.

23
24 **FS 13/14-32/EX Academic Program Review Manual, Adoption Of**

25
26 The Faculty Senate adopts the Academic Program Review Manual as prepared by PROC for use in the
27 academic program review.

28
29 **FS 13/14-42/EX Policy on Instructional Program Priorities (IPP): Academic Planning, Resource**
30 **Allocation and Enrollment Management, Amendment Of ACA-144**

31
32 The Faculty Senate recommends revision of the Policy on Instructional Program Priorities (IPP) in
33 accordance with the recommendations of the 2013 IPP Workgroup.

34
35 **Transmittal Document**

- 36
 - 2013 IPP Workgroup Recommendations: [FS 13/14-42a](#)

37
38 **FS 13/14-43/EC APR / IPP Task Force Establishment Of**

39 *The following resolution was unanimously endorsed by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee at its*
40 *meeting of October 29, 2013 at the request of the Senate at its meeting of October 17, 2013.*

41
42 The Faculty Senate recommends the establishment of a Task Force to examine the relationship between the
43 IPP process and Academic-Program Review at Sacramento State to be constituted after current business
44 pertaining to Academic Program Review Policy (*FS 13/14-26/CPC/EX*), the Academic Program Review
45 (APR) Manual (*FS 13/14-31/EX*) and the Policy on Instructional Program Priority (IPP) (*FS 13/14-42/EX*)
46 is concluded.

47
48 The Task Force will include a group of 5-7 Faculty Senators (or at-large faculty if an insufficient number of
49 Faculty Senators are available), with no more than one member from any given department, to be selected
50 by the Senate as a whole. The Task Force is charged with examining both the APR policy and the IPP
51 policy to determine the extent (if any) of overlap or duplication. The Task Force will provide its
52 recommendations to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee by Fall 2014.

1
2 **FS 13/14-18/EX Program Impaction Policy, Revision of FS 12/13-27/EX (November 1, 2012) General**
3 **Policies For:**
4

5 The Faculty Senate recommends revision of the Program Impaction Policy in accordance with the
6 recommendations of the 2012-2013 Impaction Taskforce.
7

- 8 ■ 2012-13 Impaction Task Force Recommendations Memo (*Aug 9, 2013*): [FS 13/14-18a](#)
- 9 ■ Policy on Program Impaction:
10 [http://www.csus.edu/acaf/academic%20resources/policies%20and%20procedures/Program%20Impaction.p](http://www.csus.edu/acaf/academic%20resources/policies%20and%20procedures/Program%20Impaction.pdf)
11 [df](#)
12

13 **FIRST READING**

14
15 **FS 13/14-38/EX Timely Declaration of Major (FS 12/13-127) and Undergraduate Academic Advising**
16 **Policy (FS 12/13-126), President’s Gonzalez’s Proposed Amendments To:**
17

18 The Faculty Senate endorses the amendments to the Timely Declaration and Student Advising policies as
19 recommended by President Gonzalez, in his memo of August 15, 2013 reflected in the amended polices
20 below:

- 21 • **Timely Declaration of Major** Attachment: [FS 13/14-38b](#)
- 22 • **Undergraduate Academic Advising Policy** Attachment: [FS 13/14-38c](#)
23

24 **Transmittal Documents:**

- 25 ■ Memo from President Gonzalez, August 15, 2013 Attachment: [FS 13/14-38a](#)
- 26 ■ Senate Approved Policies:
 - 27 ■ Timely Declaration of Major (FS 12/13-127) Attachment: [FS 13/14-38g](#)
 - 28 • Undergraduate Academic Advising Policy (FS 12/13-126) Attachment: [FS 13/14-38h](#)
- 29 ■ Opinion from CPC Attachment: [FS 13/14-38f](#)
- 30 ■ Opinion from APC Attachments [FS 13/14-38d](#) and [FS 13/14-38e](#)
31
32

33 **FS 13/14-41/CPC/EX Program For Bachelor Of Arts/Bachelor Of Science: Special Major,**
34 **Amendment Of: (FSP00020.htm)**
35

36 The Faculty Senate recommends the following revisions to the Program For Bachelor of Arts/Bachelor of
37 Science: Special Major policy effective be January 2014:
38

- 39 1) Update the policy to use current, correct, and specific terms (e.g. Associate Dean for Undergraduate
40 Studies, academic unit);
- 41 2) Require coursework from at least three academic units;
- 42 3) Raise the entering minimum GPA to 3.0;
- 43 4) Revise the policy to reflect recent policy changes to the Degree Programs Policy, specifically the minimum
44 major units requirements;
45

46 **Transmittal Document:** Attachment: [FS 13/14-41a](#)
47

48 **REMINDERS:**

49 **Livingston Lecturer:** Thursday, November 7, 3 pm. Redwood Room

50 **November Faculty Senate Meetings:** Thursdays, November 14 and 21, 3-5 pm, Library 11