

2012-2013 FACULTY SENATE California State University, Sacramento

Thursday, April 4, 2013

Foothill Suite, Union

3:00 – 5:00 pm

AGENDA

Updated 4/2/13

MOMENT OF SILENCE

JUANITA KIRKENDOLL

Student

Department of Social Work

OPEN FORUM

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

INFORMATION

- **Spring 2013 Enrollment Update:** Ed Mills, AVP for Student Affairs, Enrollment and Student Support
- **Unit Reductions in Baccalaureate Programs Request** – [EVC Smith letter, February 26, 2013](#)

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

CONSENT INFORMATION

The item below is action taken by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee on behalf of the Faculty Senate at the Executive Committee meeting of March 12, 2013. The item is a recommendation to the President. Although all consent information items constitute approved Senate actions, a Representative may move to add any item to the regular agenda as a “motion to rescind” or a “motion to amend” the item. Such a motion would be handled like any other motion to amend the agenda.

FS 12/13-98/APC/EX PRE-MAJOR AND EXPRESSED INTEREST DEFINITION POLICY, ESTABLISHMENT OF

On behalf of the Faculty Senate, The Executive Committee, at its meeting on March 12, 2013, recommends the establishment of the Pre-Major and Expressed Interest Definition Policy.

The Faculty Senate recommends the establishment of a policy for the definition of a Pre-major and Expressed Interest to clearly identify each group of “pre-major” that will occur within three semesters of the passage of this bill.

- A. Pre-Major – A designation for undergraduate students pursuing a non-impacted major. These students may declare or be assigned major status upon admission to the university or by the department/program of their intended major after completing specified pre-requisites as defined by their academic department/program.
- B. Expressed Interest – A designation for undergraduate students interested in pursuing an impacted major but who may not declare or be assigned by the department/program of their intended major upon admission to the university. These students must successfully complete any specified pre-requisites and a supplemental admissions process in order to be formally admitted to the major/program.

Rationale: *(For the entirety of the information given below, the terms “expressed interest” and “pre-major” will be used to more clearly articulate the points. It should be noted that simply the difficulty with explaining the position using the present terminology denotes the importance of this suggested policy.)*

CPC had been previously charged with establishing criteria for declaration of major. Since there was no explicit definition for what is a pre-major, and since that designation is used to represent several different categories of students depending on the major, CPC was unable to accurately design a policy that would address pre-majors without a clear definition. This policy explicitly establishes terms and definitions that will permit CPC to propose the declaration of major policy and allow for the further creation of policies to apply to categories of students.

Background Information: [Attachment: FS 12/13-98a](#)

REGULAR AGENDA

FS 12/13-101/FL [MINUTES – MARCH 7, 2013](#)

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES NOMINATIONS

- **Election of Committee Members:** Faculty Senate Meeting - Thursday, April 18
- **Committee Meetings:** Tuesday, April 23 and April 30, 3:00 – 3:20 pm, 275 Sac Hall

Taken from the Faculty Senate Bylaws, Article IV. B, 1-4: <http://www.csus.edu/acse/Docs-and-pdfs/Bylaws-7-25-12.pdf>.

B. Committee on Committees

1. **Membership:** The Committee on Committees shall be composed of the Chair and Vice Chair of the Faculty Senate, the other nine (9) members of the Executive Committee, the senior representative to the Faculty Senate from the Library electing unit, the senior representative to the Faculty Senate from the Student Services electing unit, and one representative from an electing unit within each college elected by the incumbent Faculty Senate.
2. **Nomination and Election of College Representatives:** At the beginning of the spring semester, the Faculty Senate shall nominate and elect by secret ballot the representative of each of the seven (7) colleges to the Committee on Committees. Nominations shall be

made from the floor; nomination of oneself shall be permitted. No one who is not then a representative of an electing unit from within one of the colleges shall be eligible to be nominated to be the representative of that college. Every representative may vote for one nominee from every college. If none of the candidates from a college receives a majority of the votes cast, the Faculty Senate shall immediately decide by secret ballot which of the two candidates who have received the most votes shall become the college's representative. As between the two candidates, the candidate who receives the most votes shall be elected.

3. **Meetings:** Each spring, the Chair of the Faculty Senate shall convene an initial meeting of the Committee on Committees to review vacancies and volunteers for these positions. At a subsequent meeting, the Committee on Committees shall nominate to the Senate, candidates to be appointed members of the standing Policy Committees of the Senate to serve during the following academic year.
4. **Charge:** Having considered the results of an annual survey of the faculty members' interest in serving on any one or more of appointed standing Policy Committees, the Committee on Committees shall make a recommendation to the Faculty Senate specifying who the members of the Faculty Senate's standing Policy Committees shall be during the following academic year. Between the annual deliberations of the Committee on Committees, the Executive Committee shall nominate candidates to fill the vacancies that occur in the membership of the standing Policy Committees.

SECOND READING (OLD BUSINESS)

FS 12/13-67/
APC/EX

STUDENT GRADE APPEAL PROCESS - SUMMER GRADE APPEAL, AMENDMENT OF

The Faculty Senate recommends the following changes to the Grade Appeal Process, Section VII.C.1:

1. by adding the following subsection "a" and re lettering sequentially the other subsections
2. To amend Section VII.C by adding a new subsection "g" as follows:
3. To amend Section VII.C.4 by adding a new subsection "e" as follows:
 - a. Normally, students wishing to initiate a formal grade appeal shall do so during the Fall and Spring semesters in the manner specified elsewhere herein. Students may, however, apply to the Provost's designee to file a grade appeal during a summer recess in the following three rare and compelling cases but in no others:
 - (1) cases where the disputed course grade assigned at the end of the immediately preceding Spring term will result in a course grade or cumulative grade point average low enough to disqualify the student from entering at the beginning of the ensuing Fall term an educational program to which the student has been previously admitted or beginning at once an employment already offered and accepted contingent upon the student's completing a degree.
 - (2) cases where the disputed grade assigned at the end of the immediately preceding Spring term would prevent the student from graduating in that Spring term or the subsequent Fall term.

The Provost's designee shall grant the student's application provided that (1) the application is made within two weeks of the date on which the student knew or could have known of the posted disputed course grade but no later, (2) the student has made a good faith effort to settle the grade dispute informally as provided elsewhere herein, (3) the student has stated a case for a summer grade appeal as described above in items (1) – (3) of this subsection, (4) the instructor is willing and able either in person or by a designated representative to exercise the instructor's right or to decline to exercise the instructor's right to defend the disputed grade if called upon to do so by a panel during the summer recess and (5) a panel of qualified members can be assembled from among faculty and students willing to serve voluntarily or for a stipend to be agreed before service begins.

~~b. c. . . .~~
~~e. d. . . .~~

1. To amend Section VII.C by adding a new subsection “g” as follows:

g. Concerning Summer Grade Appeal Panels

The Provost's designee may convene an existing panel to consider and decide a summer grade appeal or form a panel under this Process from among the faculty members and students who have served on a panel during the previous academic year or who have been recommended previously by the Faculty Senate in case of the faculty members and the A.S.I. in the case of student members. Before rejecting an application for a summer grade appeal and as a last resort, the Provost's designee shall apply to the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate and the A.S.I. for the names of faculty members and students to recommend to Academic Affairs for appointment to a summer panel.

3. To amend Section VII.C.4 by adding a new subsection “e” as follows:

e

The written decision of the panel shall conform to the requirements set forth in Section VII.C.6.e (1)-(3) of this document.

Procedural appeals against a panel's decision of a summer grade appeal shall be subject to summary review as provided in Section VIII.B.15 of this document.

- **Proposed amendment from APC: Section VII. C.1.a, #4 and 5:** [Attachment: FS 12/13-67b](#)
- **Background Information:** [FS 12/13-67a](#)
- **Grade Appeal Policy (ACA0-110) – Student Grade Appeal Process (2010):**
http://www.csus.edu/acaf/Policies&Procedures/GAP%202010%20_2_.pdf

The Faculty Senate recommends an amendment to Article IV, Section A-4a of the [Bylaws](#) to include the following statement on Executive Committee action on behalf of the Faculty Senate.

The Executive Committee shall have the power to:

- a. ~~Take action on behalf of the Faculty Senate when time does not permit the Faculty Senate to act. Such actions shall be reported to the Faculty Senate on the Faculty Senate agenda at the first meeting of the Faculty Senate after the Executive Committee has acted.~~ Act on behalf of the Faculty Senate at times when the Faculty Senate is not meeting regularly or when an action is necessary prior to the next meeting of the Faculty Senate.

Such an action would typically occur during a open meeting of the Executive Committee after the Executive Committee determines the action is appropriate and sufficiently urgent.

In extraordinary circumstances, when the Executive Committee cannot convene in an open meeting to consider such action, the Faculty Senate Chair may ask the Executive Committee to consider taking action via electronic, email, or other virtual means.

Any actions taken by the Executive Committee on behalf of the Faculty Senate are reported as Consent Information items at the next regular meeting of the Faculty Senate.

FIRST READING (NEW BUSINESS)

The Faculty Senate recommends amending Section 5.05.E.1.C(1) by adding the following paragraphs immediately following the first paragraph. (March 6, 2013)

. . .

Exceptions to the rule requiring all classes taught to be evaluated.

On this campus, it is assumed that the provision of M.O.U. 15.15 quoted above has been agreed by the bargaining agents in order to provide every student an opportunity to record an opinion of the instruction and support for the student’s work received from the instructor in every class taken by the student. It is assumed as well that the provision has been agreed in order to give the best and greatest opportunity to demonstrate teaching ability to every member of the teaching faculty for purposes of periodic evaluation and performance review as provided elsewhere in this document, as well as to improve teaching performance generally.

On the basis of these assumed reasons, the campus has concluded that, consistent with M.O.U. 15.15 quoted above, student evaluations shall be conducted in all classes (every section of every course) taught each Fall and Spring term unless a primary unit is able to offer compelling reasons for excepting a class from being evaluated by the students in it.

Primary units desiring to except a class from being evaluated by the student or students in it shall seek to persuade the University ARTP Committee and the Provost, acting for the President, that

its reasons for excepting that class are sufficiently compelling to outweigh the reasons assumed by the campus to support the requirement that every class taught shall be evaluated by the students in it.

Primary units seeking approval of a proposed exception shall submit to the University ARTP Committee the text of the amendment of its RTP document proposing the exception. With that text, the unit shall submit a supporting argument written to persuade the reader that the unit's reasons for the exception sought are sufficiently compelling to override the reasons assumed by the campus to justify the requirement that all classes taught be subject to student evaluations.

Procedures to govern student evaluations submitted online.

. . .

Background Information:

- [President Gonzalez's response to the Resolution \(FS 12/13-60\), January 8, 2013](#)
- UARTP Memo: [Dillon to Faculty Senate, March 6, 2013](#)
- University UARTP Policy: <http://www.csus.edu/umannual/hr/UARTP%2007-2012.pdf>

FS 12/13-78/GSPC/EX

COURSE REPEAT POLICY, POST-BACCALAUREATE STUDENTS, ESTABLISHMENT OF

The Faculty Senate recommends the establishment of a new Course Repeat Policy for Post-Baccalaureate students to provide rules for Post-Baccalaureate students (Graduate, Credential, and Second Bachelors) effective Fall 2013. The Faculty Senate further recommends that all academic units with Post-Baccalaureate programs adopt a repeat policy in accordance with this policy no later than May 17, 2013.

***Rationale:** In May 2010 (FS 10-57/EX), the University Repeat Policy was changed to reflect Executive Order No. 1037 (<http://www.calstate.edu/eo/EO-1037.html>). The new policy language only refers to undergraduate students. Currently, therefore there is no existing policy regarding course repeat for Post-Baccalaureate students. This policy provides that language.*

POST-BACCALAUREATE STUDENTS COURSE REPEAT POLICY

1. Post-Baccalaureate students may petition to repeat courses only if they earned grades lower than a B (B-, C+, C, C-, D+, D, D-, F, WU, NC). A petition to repeat a course must be completed, submitted and approved prior to enrolling in that course.
2. Course Repeats with "Grade Forgiveness" (Grade Forgiveness is the circumstance in which the new grade replaces the former grade in terms of the calculation of GPA, etc.):
 - 2.a. Post-Baccalaureate students may petition to repeat any course with grade forgiveness in accordance with section 3.
 - 2.b. Post-Baccalaureate students may petition to repeat an individual course for grade forgiveness no more than one time.
 - 2.c. Grade forgiveness shall not be applicable to a course for which the original grade was the result of a finding of academic dishonesty.

3. Course Repeats with "Grades Averaged":

Post-Baccalaureate students may petition to repeat a particular course once for which grade forgiveness (i.e. replacement) is permitted. If a student is granted permission to repeat a course for the second time (i.e. 3rd total attempt), all grades received for the course will be averaged when calculating the student's overall grade-point average.*

(Note: This policy does not count attempted coursework forgiven under the academic renewal process.)

4. Departments and Colleges may not have a repeat policy that is less stringent than the campus policy. (Note: restrictions on repeats for enrolled and classified graduate and certificate students within specific programs, represent substantive program changes and not exceptions to the repeat policy.)

* The default sequence for applying forgiven and averaged grades is to forgive grades for repeated courses that are eligible (that have not already been repeated once). Grades for a course that has already been forgiven once will be averaged.

Note: Post-Baccalaureate students may not take courses to replace or improve the grade point average at the undergraduate level.

Background: [FS 12/13-78a](#)

FS 12/13-77/EX PROGRAM PROPOSAL

The Faculty Senate recommends approval of the following program proposal.

College of Health and Human Services

Criminal Justice Minor [Attachment FS 12/13-77](#)

FS 12/13-86/GSPC/EX GRADUATE POLICY FOR GRADUATION WITH DISTINCTION, ESTABLISHMENT OF

The Faculty Senate endorses the establishment of a Graduate Policy for Graduation with Distinction, effective Fall 2013.

Graduation with Distinction: Graduate Level

A. Policy

For the purposes of awarding degrees with distinction at the graduate level, the overall performance of degree candidates in each department or equivalent academic program will be judged in relationship to the performance of degree-seeking students in that unit, not in relation to other university graduate students. Two criteria will be used in evaluating students to determine if they merit a notation of distinction: grade point average and the quality of the work produced by the student for the culminating experience.

To graduate "with distinction," a graduate student must

1. have a cumulative grade point average of 3.8 or higher at the time the student's degree is posted,
2. have completed at least 18 units in residency, and
3. be nominated for distinction by a unanimous vote of his or her dissertation/thesis/project/examination committee or equivalent academic program committee.

Each department or equivalent academic program may establish a graduation with distinction policy, but is not required to establish such a policy. The University recognizes that each discipline has its own mechanisms and standards for evaluating student work. Departments or equivalent academic programs desiring to nominate students to graduate with distinction must specify the standards and procedures that will be used to judge or measure distinction in the culminating experience, including but not limited to originality of the work, mastery of knowledge of the discipline, and/or broader significance as a contribution to learning.

Although there can be no rigorous quota on the number of graduate students awarded distinction, the standard of merit should be such that no more than ten percent of graduating students in each department or equivalent academic program will be selected to receive the designation of distinction. Departments or equivalent academic programs may elect not to nominate any candidates for this designation in a given semester.

B. Reporting Mechanism: Three years after the adoption and implementation of this policy, the Dean of Graduate Studies will issue a report to the Faculty Senate detailing:

1. how many and which departments or equivalent academic programs opted out of the distinction policy;
2. how many degrees were awarded “with distinction” in the previous three years per department or equivalent academic program, and
3. what percentage that number constitutes of total graduate degrees awarded per department or equivalent academic program.

The Faculty Senate can use this data to determine if the policy is being implemented fairly and equitably and to make any changes to the policy, if needed.

C. Procedures: In determining whether a student should be awarded a degree “with distinction,” the following guidelines should be followed.

1. In accordance with department or equivalent academic program-level policies and procedures, and upon completing the culminating requirement, a student may be nominated for distinction by a unanimous vote of his or her dissertation/thesis/project/examination committee or academic program.
2. If so nominated, the committee chair or academic program designee shall draft a letter outlining the qualities of the student’s dissertation/thesis/project/examination that merit the award of distinction, including but not limited to originality of the work, mastery of knowledge of the discipline, and/or broader significance as a contribution to learning.
3. The letter of nomination shall be forwarded to the Graduate or Program Coordinator, who in consultation with the designated Department, Program, or Graduate Committee Chair shall make the determination as to whether the student’s record meets the department or equivalent academic program standards for distinction
4. If in agreement with the nominating committee, the designated Coordinator or Chair shall send formal written notification and documentation to the Dean of Graduate Studies of the nomination.
5. Prior to the posting of the degree, the Graduate Dean will review the nomination and ascertain whether the student’s final GPA meets the 3.8 threshold and, if so, register the notation. The student’s permanent transcript will state whether the student completed a

dissertation, thesis, project, or examination and note the completion of the culminating experience was “with distinction.”

Rationale

- ***Recognizing excellence:*** This policy would allow graduate students who achieve high academic performance as evidenced by their grade point average and by excellence in research, scholarly work, or creative activity to be acknowledged for their superior work with the notation of distinction on their transcript. In an environment which values and encourages graduate student success, this policy seeks to acknowledge the effort made by deserving students to achieve academic excellence.
- ***Achieving equity:*** The University recognizes excellence in undergraduate education by awarding degrees with various categories of distinction. This policy would create a comparable policy for graduate students.
- ***Making our students competitive:*** Other California State University campuses—including Chico, Northridge, San Francisco, Long Beach, Fresno, and Cal Poly—have adopted comparable graduation with distinction policies, and San Diego State University is in the process of adopting such a policy. California State University-Sacramento students will be competing with these students for jobs and for acceptance into advanced degree programs. This policy will help to give our best students a competitive edge.

Consultation: This policy has been reviewed by the GSPC (Graduate Studies Policies Committee), the Graduate Advisory Committee and the Graduate Coordinators. Each group approved the policy unanimously.

FS 12/13-88/EX

STANDING RULES: STANDING POLICY COMMITTEES WITH EX-OFFICIO MEMBERSHIP ON THE FACULTY SENATE, EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AND THE FACULTY SENATE

This item is carried over from the May 17, 2012 meeting of the Faculty Senate, and replaces Agenda item.

FS 11/12-162/Flr by the same title (see #1), which was postponed at that meeting along with a proposed amendment to add (see #2). In addition, the Executive Committee, at its meeting of February 19, 2013, recommended that a substitute motion (see #3) be adopted. When this item comes to Second Reading, the Executive Committee substitute motion will be introduced, initiating debate under the rules governing substitute motions (i.e., opportunity will be provided to perfect either the proposed substitute (#3) and the original motion (#1).

#1. Original main motion added to the agenda from the floor on May 17, 2012

FS 11/12-162/Flr

STANDING RULES: STANDING POLICY COMMITTEES WITH EX-OFFICIO MEMBERSHIP ON THE FACULTY SENATE, EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AND THE FACULTY SENATE

Beginning in Fall 2013, the Academic Policies Committee, the Faculty Policies Committee, and the Curriculum Policies Committee shall be the only selected standing Policy Committees whose Chairs are designated as ex-officio voting members of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and as ex-officio non-voting members of the faculty Senate, unless concurrently serving as the elected representative of his or her department/unit. If any of the charges of these committees do not currently reflect this, they shall be amended accordingly. If the charge of any other committee currently specifies that the Committee Chair serves as an ex-officio member of the

Faculty Senate or its Executive Committee, the charge shall be amended accordingly. The Chairs of the selected standing Policy Committees identified herein whose Chairs shall serve as ex-officio members of the Executive Committee and the Faculty Senate shall be nominated and elected in accordance with procedures set forth in the By-Laws of the Faculty Senate. In addition, although the General Education/Graduation Requirements Committee shall not be among the standing Policy Committees whose Chairs hold ex-officio members of the Faculty Senate and the Executive Committee, the Chairs of these Committees shall be nominated and elected by the same procedures as the Chairs of the selected committees.

Rationale:

In FS 11/12-85/SEL, the Senate amended the By-Laws to deleted the names of Senate Policy committees as the standing Policy committees whose chairs would be ex-officio members of the Executive Committee and the Senate, and instead provided that the Chairs of certain standing Policy committees as specified in the standing Policy Committee's charge would be the ones with membership. In addition, the Senate, in FS 11/12-87/SEL: approved the following:

The Faculty Senate approves that, for the 2012-13 Academic Year, the Chairs of the following Policy Committees shall be specified as ex-officio voting members of Faculty Senate Executive Committee: Academic Policies Committee, Curriculum Policies Committee, Faculty Policies Committee, General Education and Graduation Requirements Policy Committee, and Graduate Studies Policy Committee.

Therefore, the Senate must affirmatively select the Committees and declare in standing Policy Committee's charge, whether the committee chair shall be a member of the Senate and the Executive Committee.

One of the major objectives of the recommendations of the Wankett Select Committee (2010-11) was to reduce the number of Committee Chairs on the Executive Committee and increase the number of at-large members. This motion would accomplish this.

The motion proposes that the number of Committee Chairs be reduced from 5 to 3, which would allow for increasing of at-large members from 4 to 6. Given the large and broad scope of the charges of the Academic Policies, Faculty Policies and Curriculum Policies Committee, the motion proposes that these be the three selected committees. In contrast, the charges of GSPC and GE/GR are more limited in scope.

#2. Proposed amendment to the original motion made, but not decided, at the May 17, 2012 meeting.

Beginning in Fall 2013, the Academic Policies Committee, the Faculty Policies Committee, and the Curriculum Policies Committee and the Graduate Studies Policies Committee shall be the only selected standing Policy Committees whose Chairs are designated as ex-officio voting members of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and as ex-officio non-voting members of the faculty Senate, unless concurrently serving as the elected representative of his or her department/unit. If any of the charges of these committees do not currently reflect this, they shall be amended accordingly. If the charge of any other committee currently specifies that the Committee Chair serves as an ex-officio member of the Faculty Senate or its Executive Committee, the charge shall be amended accordingly. The Chairs of the selected standing Policy Committees identified herein whose Chairs shall serve as ex-officio members of the Executive Committee and the Faculty Senate shall be nominated and elected in accordance with procedures set forth in the By-Laws of the Faculty Senate. In addition, although the General Education/Graduation Requirements Committee and ~~The Graduate Studies Policy Committee~~ shall not be among the standing Policy Committees whose Chairs hold ex-officio members of the

Faculty Senate and the Executive Committee, the Chairs of these Committees shall be nominated and elected by the same procedures as the Chairs of the selected committees.

#3. Substitute Motion recommended by the Executive Committee at its meeting on February 19, 2013

Beginning in Fall 2013, the Chairs of the following standing Policy committees: Academic Policies Committee, the Curriculum Policies Committee, the Faculty Policies Committee, the General Education/Graduation Requirements Policies and Graduate Studies Policies Committee are designated as ex-officio voting members of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and as ex-officio non-voting members of the Faculty Senate, unless concurrently serving as the elected representative of his or her department/unit.

If any of the charges of these committees do not currently reflect this, they shall be amended accordingly. If the charge of any other committee currently specifies that the Committee Chair serves as an ex-officio member of the Faculty Senate or its Executive Committee, the charge shall be amended accordingly.

The Chairs of the selected standing Policy Committees identified herein whose Chairs shall serve as ex-officio members of the Executive Committee and the Faculty Senate shall be nominated and elected in accordance with procedures set forth in the By-Laws of the Faculty Senate.

Rationale: The Executive Committee proposes this substitute motion because it feels that there is a reasonable balance of At-Large membership and standing Policy Committee chairs on the committee. The Executive Committee felt that the workings of its committee over the past several years demonstrated the efficacy of the current constitution of the committee and recommends that the current membership be retained and the charges of the committees be amended accordingly along with the amendment to the standing rules.

FS 12/13-87/AITC/EX

SAFECONNECT IMPLEMENTATION, FACULTY ACCESS TO THE CAMPUS WIRELESS NETWORK, REQUEST FOR DELAY

The Faculty Senate requests that SafeConnect implementation for the Faculty be delayed until the completion of the spring 2013 semester.

Rationale: While implementation of SafeConnect has been completed for both students and staff, there is some concern that disruption in faculty delivery of instruction may occur. Furthermore, with faculty time significantly limited, the efficacy of training and/or troubleshooting is problematic.

Background Information:

- [SafeConnect FAQ](#) March 2013
- SafeConnect FAQ: <http://www.csus.edu/irt/FAQ/internet-network-and-communications/safe-connect/index.html#safe-connect>
- Trouble shooting: <http://www.csus.edu/irt/ServiceDesk/Support/Safe-Connect/troubleshooting.html>
- Staff SafeConnect Help: <http://www.csus.edu/irt/ServiceDesk/Support/Safe-Connect/staffhelp.html>

FS 12/13-92/EX

PROGRAM PROPOSAL

The Faculty Senate recommends approval of the following program proposal.

FS 12/13-100/GSPC/EX

**MODIFICATION IN OR DELETION OF EXISTING
PROGRAMS, AMENDMENT OF**

The Faculty Senate recommends that the Modification In or Deletion of Existing Programs Policy <http://www.csus.edu/umanual/AcadAff/FSM00010.htm> be amended to further refine the criteria and process for modification in or deletion of existing programs, effective Fall 2013.

A. General Policies

1. Additions of minors, concentrations, options, specializations, or emphases subsumed under existing degree programs and certificate programs, when largely composed of existing course offerings, will be treated for review purposes as modifications in existing programs. *
2. Changes in programs normally are initiated at the Department level.
3. Modifications or deletions in programs follow the established university approval process, which includes faculty review at the department and College levels, ~~Academic Faculty~~ Senate review as well as administrative review and approval. Managing enrollments to a level at which the program would not be viable would be considered de facto program elimination.
4. The programmatic and resource review responsibilities of departments and colleges in regard to their program modifications or deletions are essentially the same as those associated with course proposals.
5. Resources to support program changes normally come from the College/Department requesting the change. Each request for a change in program should be accompanied by a statement from the Dean indicating that the College will accommodate changes in the program within its existing resource allocations or a statement indicating that additional resources will be needed. The latter statement should include a description of the level and nature of additional funding the College will seek for the program changes.

(Sections B-F not altered)

G. Discontinuation of Existing Programs

1. The discontinuation of an existing program is normally initiated at the Department level. In this circumstance, faculty will recommend to the President discontinuation of existing programs only after appropriate action by the ~~Academic-Faculty~~ Senate and its duly constituted committees charged with reviewing and evaluating program. Such action includes, but is not limited to, consultation with faculty of the academic unit offering the program, with appropriate administrators, and with others directly involved in the offering of the program. In case of a decision by the University to discontinue a program, reasonable provisions are to be made to ensure enrolled students the opportunity to complete the program. Discontinuation of degree programs, majors, minors, options, concentrations, and special emphasis do not require the Chancellor's consent; however, the Office of the Chancellor must be informed in writing about the action taken by the university (AAP-91-14).

4.2. The de-funding of a program, or a reduction in resources to a level at which the program would not be viable, is considered to be a *de facto* program discontinuation. Similarly, elimination of admissions for a program with managed admissions (e.g., a graduate program, or an impacted undergraduate program), or a reduction in allocated admissions for such a program to a level at which the program becomes unsustainable, also constitutes a *de facto* program discontinuation. In instances such as this, see section H.2. for procedures to follow.

H. Procedures for Requesting Discontinuation of Existing Programs

1. Procedures for Discontinuation when Initiated by Faculty (as described in section G.1.)

Requests for discontinuation of existing programs are to follow the format below. Submit fifteen copies of the request to the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs.

- a) Complete Form B.
- b) Reasons for the Program Discontinuation.
- c) Indicate any programmatic or fiscal impact discontinuation of the program will have on other academic units' programs. Describe the consultation that has occurred with affected units.
- d) Provisions to ensure currently enrolled students have a reasonable opportunity to complete the program.
- e) Indicate what resources will be freed up or shifted to other programs as the result of the program discontinuation.

2. Procedures for *de Facto* Discontinuation Appeals

If, in the determination of the program faculty, the defunding or elimination of admissions occurs as described in section G.2. above, then the faculty in the affected academic unit may pursue the following appeal procedure.

- a) The program coordinator and/or Chair of the affected academic unit requests a written explanation from the party responsible for taking the action that the program faculty feel initiates a *de facto* discontinuation. If this explanation satisfies the program faculty, the process ends.
- b) If the explanation in (a) is not considered satisfactory by the program faculty, they may send their complaint (including the response received in (a)) to the Provost, with a copy sent to the Faculty Senate, requesting a further explanation or decision by the Provost. If this decision or explanation satisfies the program faculty, the process ends.
- c) If the decision of the Provost provided in (b) is not considered satisfactory by the program faculty, they may request action from the Faculty Senate. This request should take the form of a recommendation requesting a specific resolution to the problem which might, for example, include that the formal program discontinuation process be followed (as described in H.1.), or that funding or admissions be returned to the affected program. If the Faculty Senate chooses to act, such a recommendation would be sent to the President. If the Faculty Senate chooses not to act, the process ends.
- d) A final decision is made by the President.

Background Information: [Attachment FS 12/13-100a](#)

APRIL AND MAY SENATE MEETINGS

- **April 11:** Special Meeting – General Education/Graduation Requirements
- **April 18:**
 - 3:00 – 3:30 pm: 2013-2014 Senate 1st Organizational Meeting – Nomination of Officers
 - 3:30 – 5:00 pm: 2012-2013 Regular Senate meeting
- **April 25:** Special Meeting – General Education/Graduation Requirements
- **May 2:**
 - 3:00 – 3:30 pm: 2013-2014 Senate 2nd Organizational Meeting – Election of Officers
 - 3:30 – 5:00 pm: 2012-2013 Regular Senate Meeting
- **May 9:** Special Meeting or Regular Senate Meeting (if needed).
- **May 16:** Special Meeting or Regular Senate Meeting (if needed)