

**2012-2013 FACULTY SENATE  
California State University, Sacramento**

**Thursday, April 18, 2013**

**Foothill Suite, Union**

**3:30 – 5:00 pm**

**AGENDA**

*Updated: 4/16/13*

**MOMENT OF SILENCE**

**ANDREW LLARDI**

Student

Department of Mathematics and Statistics

**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

**APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

**CONSENT ACTION**

**FS 12/13-112/EX**

**PROGRAM PROPOSAL**

The Faculty Senate recommends approval of the following program proposal.

Arts and Letters

MA in English – Plan A / Thesis: Composition [Attachment FS 12/13-112](#)

**FS 12/13-113/EX**

**PROGRAM PROPOSAL**

The Faculty Senate recommends approval of the following program proposal.

Education

MA in Education – Multicultural Education [Attachment FS 12/13-113](#)

**FS 12/13-114/EX**

**PROGRAM PROPOSAL**

The Faculty Senate recommends approval of the following program proposal.

Education

BA in Child Development: elementary Pre-Credential [Attachment FS 12/13-114](#)

**FS 12/13-115/EX**

**PROGRAM PROPOSAL**

The Faculty Senate recommends approval of the following program proposal.

Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies

BA in Economics [Attachment FS 12/13-115](#)

**FS 12/13-116/EX**

**PROGRAM PROPOSAL**

The Faculty Senate recommends approval of the following program proposal.

College of Continuing Education

Bully Perspectives and Prevention Strategies – Certificate of Academic Achievement  
[Attachment FS 12/13-116](#)

**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 12/13-105/FPC/EX**

**OUTSTANDING FACULTY AWARDS POLICY,  
AMENDMENT OF**

The Faculty Senate endorses the amendment of the Outstanding Faculty Awards policy (FS 11-43/FPC/EX) that:

1. consolidates all existing policies, guidelines and procedures related to the Outstanding Faculty Awards into a single integrated document that addresses the issues of selection committees, award criteria, procedural matters, and manner(s) of recognition of award recipients for all four awards
2. incorporates new language dealing with the issues of ties, collaborative projects, rollover applications, and frequency of repeat winners.

*Background: On 4/9/09 the Faculty Senate passed FS 09-20 FPC/Ex, which, in addition to affirming the Faculty Senate's support of the current Faculty Awards model, tasked the Faculty Policies Committee (FPC) with the creation of an integrative Outstanding Faculty Awards policy document.*

*Additionally, the Executive Committee referred to the FPC for its consideration two items related to the Outstanding Faculty Awards: ties (not including shared winners) and the frequency of repeat wins. The FPC unanimously voted to recommend that each College shall select a maximum of a single award in each of the four awards categories, and that collaborative efforts should be considered a single application. The FPC also unanimously voted to recommend that each College should have a policy statement on Outstanding Faculty Awards that addresses issues such as frequency of repeat winners and rollovers of applications to following years.*

**Previous amendments May 5, 2011 and April 9, 2009: [FS 12/13-105a](#)**



<p>Outstanding Teaching, Scholarly and Creative Activity, University Service, and Community Service.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. All committee members shall be elected by the college faculty, in a college-wide election called for that purpose, to serve multiyear staggered terms with a maximum term length of three years per term.</li> <li>3. All probationary, tenured, or other full-time faculty in the college shall be eligible to serve on this committee.</li> <li>4. The committee shall consist of at least five faculty members.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>B. <u>Library Faculty, Student Service Professional (Academic Related)'s, Counselor Faculty, and Coaching Faculty</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. For purposes of consideration for awards for Outstanding Teaching, Scholarly and Creative Activity, University Service, and Community Service, members of the library <del>faculty</del>, <b>SSPAR's, counselor,</b> and coaching faculty shall establish a joint review committee.</li> <li>2. The committee shall consist of three members, preferably representing at least two of the units, to be elected from within the faculty membership of each unit.</li> <li>3. The Faculty Senate Chair shall facilitate this process by: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. sending the call for nominations for Outstanding Faculty Awards to each administrator and each eligible faculty member in the amalgam group of library <del>faculty</del>, <b>SSPAR's, counselor,</b> and coaching faculty;</li> <li>b. initiating the election of three faculty to serve on a selection committee, preferably representing at least two of the units;</li> <li>c. convening the selection committee; and reporting the committee's decisions.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	<p style="text-align: center;">Modified</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Modified</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Modified</p>
<p><b>V. <u>Award Criteria</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Before the application process begins, colleges shall establish criteria for Outstanding Teaching, Scholarly and Creative Activity, University Service, and Community Service awards beyond the basic eligibility requirements. These criteria shall be distributed to all faculty within the college.</li> <li>B. If a file does not reach a level of outstanding, colleges are not obligated to give out the award in each category.</li> <li>C. Individual Award Criteria: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. Teaching</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Teaching effectiveness, as established over the most recent five-year period.</li> <li>b. Impact on the lives and careers of students, as evidenced over the tenure of the nominee at Sacramento State.</li> </ol> </li> </ol> <p>The quality of the evidence, not the quantity of evidence, shall be used by the committee in reaching a decision. All forms of the teaching duties of faculty members at Sacramento State are appropriate for recognition: undergraduate and graduate level teaching, lectures, seminars, laboratories, clinical practica, fieldwork supervision, etc.</p> </li> </ol>	<p style="text-align: center;">V</p> <p style="text-align: center;">2013 Call</p>

**2. University Service**

- a. Contributions to the faculty member’s Department through their leadership and work as a member or chair of a committee and/or their leadership and work in carrying out special assignments for the Department, for example, in the area of curriculum development, and student advising.
- b. Contributions to the faculty member’s College through their leadership and work as a member or chair of a committee and/or their leadership and work in carrying out special assignments for the College, for example, in the area of curriculum development, and student advising.
- c. Contributions to the University through their leadership and work as a member or chair of a committee and/or their leadership and work in carrying out special assignments for the University, for example, in the area of curriculum development, and student advising.

The quality of the evidence, not the quantity of evidence, shall be used by the Committee in reaching a decision.

**3. Community Service**

Awards will be given for service that applies the nominee’s professional knowledge and skills to addressing community needs, and thus represents the university as a resource to the region. Only service completed while employed as a faculty member by California State University, Sacramento shall be considered. Priority will be given to nominees who provide evidence of the impact of their service work in both the university and the community.

Evidence of impact on the university may include but is not limited to:

- a. documented creation of new opportunities for students to combine learning and service, e.g., service learning courses, internships, Master’s theses, and participation in civic improvement and/or citizen action projects.
- b. documented positive student outcomes from involvement in the nominee’s community service work.
- c. relevance of service outcomes to university mission and goals
- d. acquisition of grant funds and other resources for the university
- e. documented creation of new research and consultation opportunities for faculty.

Evidence of impact on the community may include but is not limited to:

- f. documented positive outcomes of the service activity on quality of life in the Sacramento region or beyond – outcomes may be economic, social, or cultural
- g. documented positive outcomes for specific public benefit agencies, organizations, and/or vulnerable populations.

#### 4. SCHOLARLY AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY

In addition to the CV and the nomination letter, applications should highlight the nominee's most significant scholarship or creative activities, including:

- a. impact of the scholarly and creative activities on nominee's field(s) of study, including key citations or unique contributions;
- b. impact of the scholarly and creative activities on the university and students;
- c. additional criteria may be established by each college.

V

## REGULAR AGENDA

**FS 12/13-109/FL** MINUTES – [APRIL 4, 2013](#)

**FS 12/13-110/FL** MINUTES – [APRIL 11, 2013](#)

**FS 12/13-111/FL** **COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES ELECTION**

*The following Senators were nominated to represent their college at the April 4 Faculty Senate meeting. A NSM representative(s) needs to be nominated. Additional nominations will be taken at the April 18 meeting. The election of committee members will then follow. Attached is the Committee on Committees election ballot. Please print out and bring to the meeting with you. [Election Ballot](#)*

*Christine Miller (Communication Studies, A&L)  
Kace Chalmers (Economics, SSIS)  
Oliver Liu (Business Administration, CBA)  
Cid Gunston-Parks (Teacher Education, EDU)  
Karen Horobin (Child Development, EDU)  
Ben Fell (Civil Engineering, ECS)  
Heather Diaz (Kinesiology and Health Science, HHS)*

The Committee Meetings will be held on Tuesday, April 23 and Tuesday, 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.*

*The following item has been placed on the Agenda by the Faculty Senate Chair to provide a scheduled opportunity for consideration of a motion from the floor to reconsider FS 12/13-53b GE PROGRAM REGULATIONS, AMENDMENT OF AREA D: THE INDIVIDUAL AND SOCIETY, STRUCTURAL REVISIONS AND REDUCTION OF MINIMUM UNIT REQUIREMENT.*

*This is a two part process:*

- 1) *First, the Chair will entertain a motion to reconsider, and the motion will be debated and decided. Senator Barrena, who voted in favor of the action that is the subject of the motion to reconsider, has indicated that she hopes to be able to introduce the following specific motion*

FS 12/13-XX Fl      GE PROGRAM REGULATIONS, AMENDMENT OF AREA D: THE INDIVIDUAL AND SOCIETY, TITLE CHANGE, STRUCTURAL REVISION AND REDUCTION OF MINIMUM UNIT REQUIREMENT, RECONSIDERATION OF FS 12/13-53B

*The Faculty Senate approves reconsideration of its final action on FS 12/13 53b (GE PROGRAM REGULATIONS, AMENDMENT OF AREA D: THE INDIVIDUAL AND SOCIETY, TITLE CHANGE, STRUCTURAL REVISION AND REDUCTION OF MINIMUM UNIT REQUIREMENT) as approved on December 13, 2012 and reported in the [Minutes of December 13, 2013](#).*

- 2) *Next, should the Faculty Senate agree to consideration, (requires a majority vote and is debatable) then the motion before the Faculty Senate will be as follows:*

FS 12/13 53b  
GE/GRPC/EX/FL      GE PROGRAM REGULATIONS, AMENDMENT OF AREA D: THE INDIVIDUAL AND SOCIETY, TITLE CHANGE, STRUCTURAL REVISION AND REDUCTION OF MINIMUM UNIT REQUIREMENT

The Faculty Senate recommends revising the General Education Program Section I. C. General Education Program Structure: 1992-93 and Subsequent G.E. Pattern; 1. Standard Program, Area D and Section I.D.2. Area D as follows to take effect beginning in Fall 2013:

1. Reduce Area D total unit requirement from 15 to 12 units.
2. Combine the Area D sub-areas into a single Area D and require coursework in a minimum of 3 disciplines (e.g. Anthropology, Economics, Ethnic Studies, Family and Consumer Sciences, Government, History, RPTA, Women's Studies, etc.).
3. Suspend the criteria descriptions in Section I. D.2., Area D. pending development of new criteria for Area D.
4. Maintain courses currently in Area D in the new structure pending the development of new Area D Learning Outcomes.
5. Amend language on challenge examinations in U.S. Constitution, California State and Local Government and U. S. History to reflect Area D restructuring and unit reduction.

*The Faculty Senate Office will provide paper copies of the December 13, 2013 resolution and any proposed amendments received prior to April 17, 2013.*

## SECOND READING (OLD BUSINESS)

FS 12/13-99/UARTP/EX

### UARTP - SECTION 5.05.E.1.C(1) EXCEPTIONS TO THE RULE REQUIRING ALL CLASSES TAUGHT TO BE EVALUATED OF UNIVERSITY ARTP POLICY, AMENDMENT OF

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>

# FIRST READING (NEW BUSINESS)

**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](#)

*Typically a proposal of this sort would go directly on the agenda as Consent Action, however, the Executive Committee was asked by the ASI President in 2012 to place proposals of this sort on the Regular Agenda. It is expected that the Chair of Criminal Justice will be at the Senate meeting to address the 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](#)

**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), 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 12/13-92/EX**                      **PROGRAM PROPOSAL**

The Faculty Senate recommends approval of the following program proposal.

College of Business Administration  
Operations Management

[Attachment: FS 12/13-92](#)

**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).

**1.2. 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](#)

**FS 12/13-106/CPC/EX**                      **SERVICE LEARNING COURSE DESIGNATION,  
ESTABLISHMENT OF**

The Faculty Senate recommends the following definition, criteria, and process for Service Learning course designation to replace the current policy FS-98-58 (<http://www.csus.edu/umannual/AcadAff/FSC00030.htm>):

**Definition of Service Learning:**

Service learning is an academic study linked to community service through structured reflection so that each reinforces the other. The academic study may be in any discipline, and the service may address a variety of community needs. In addition, the service activity is used to clarify, illustrate, challenge, or stimulate additional thought about the academic topics covered in the classroom.

The following are criteria upon which courses will be evaluated for service learning designation:

1. The service experience must relate course content to clearly articulated course objectives and student learning outcomes, which helps to foster or strengthen the students' awareness of social responsibility and sense of civic duty.
2. At least 20 hours of service learning is required for the course. The service learning must link course content with a community service component that addresses a need identified by the community. Requirements for the service learning component of the course must be described in the course syllabus.
3. Since knowledge from the course informs the service experiences with which the students are involved, service opportunities must be appropriate for the course and its content.

4. Service learning courses must provide a method to assess the learning derived from the service as it applies to course content, and academic credit must be based on learning outcomes—not the service itself. This may include assignments, such as papers or presentations, that integrate specific course content and service learning with the goal to achieve student learning outcomes.
5. Structured and organized opportunities for critical reflection of the learning gained through the service experience and how the service relates to the course content must be evident.

A department seeking a Service Learning or “SL” designation for a course will adhere to the following procedures:

1. Prior to completing a course change proposal or new course proposal, proposers will review all criteria for service learning course designation.
2. Proposers will complete a course change proposal or new course proposal, acquire all of the required signatures, and move the proposal through the typical approval process in the college.
3. As a supplement to the course change proposal or new course proposal, proposers will also submit a statement about how the course will meet each of the Service Learning criteria (listed in the previous section). The statement will accompany the Course Change Proposal Form A throughout the entire approval process. In addition, if there is an existing course with the same course number, aside from the “SL” designation, proposers will address how the courses differ in the justification. They will also provide a copy of the Form A of the other course for comparison.
4. Upon college approval, the course change proposal or new course proposal and accompanying statement will go to the Service Learning Subcommittee of the University Curriculum Policies Committee for review.
5. Upon approval by the Service Learning Subcommittee the course change proposal or new course proposal and accompanying statement will proceed to the Curriculum Subcommittee and follow the typical course approval process from that point forward. Courses seeking GE status will follow the typical approval process through the General Education Course Review Subcommittee.
6. Once the course has been approved with a Service Learning designation and community partnerships are formed, all partnerships must fulfill Sacramento State risk management requirements. Course instructors are advised to contact the Community Engagement Center for purposes of course collaboration, faculty development opportunities, student development opportunities, and community agency networking.

**Background Information:** [FS 12/13-106a](#)

The Faculty Senate recommends the establishment of the Service Learning Subcommittee of the Faculty Senate's Curriculum Policies Committee:

**Charge:**

1. Review course change proposals or new course proposals and accompanying statements for courses seeking Service Learning designation.
2. Discuss and review current issues and best practices related to the service learning field.
3. Consider/Develop assessment processes for Service Learning courses as a means to analyze various aspects of Service Learning courses including but not restricted to service learning activities, learning gleaned from service learning experiences, and students' perceptions of civic duty.

**Membership:**

Voting Members:

Seven faculty members will be appointed by the Curriculum Policies Committee, drawing on information from the Senate Preference Poll, to a three-year term. Every effort will be made to recruit faculty who currently teach or have taught service learning courses. More than one member may be from a single college but no two members may be from the same department/unit. Every effort shall be made to encourage membership from each college.

Non-voting members:

One liaison from the Curriculum Subcommittee and one staff member from the Community Engagement Center

**Election and Role of Chair:**

Election of the Chair of the Service Learning Subcommittee will occur in the first meeting of the academic year.

The term of office of a Service Learning Subcommittee Chair shall be one year.

The Service Learning Subcommittee Chair shall schedule meetings, set the meeting agenda, and distribute the agenda and supporting materials to members.

**Operations:**

The Service Learning Subcommittee shall meet at least once a month.

A quorum of the Service Learning Subcommittee shall require the presence of at least four voting members. The Service Learning Subcommittee shall not act in the absence of a quorum.

The meeting agenda and supporting documentation shall be distributed to the Service Learning Subcommittee members at least 72 hours prior to the meeting.

**Procedures and Implementation:**

Course change proposals or new course proposals (and associated materials) for Service Learning designation must be prepared, reviewed and approved by the appropriate program.

Program-approved proposals (and associated materials) must be forwarded to the Curriculum Subcommittee who will forward then to the Service Learning Subcommittee.

Service Learning Subcommittee approved proposals must then be forwarded to the Curriculum Subcommittee.

Curriculum Subcommittee approved proposals must then be forwarded to the Faculty Senate for final approval.

If after extensive committee discussion, the Service Learning Subcommittee seeks to revise the definition of Service Learning, the criteria upon which courses are evaluated for Service Learning designation, or the charge/membership of the Service Learning Subcommittee, the proposed revisions will be forwarded to the Curriculum Policies Committees.

Curriculum Policies Committee approved revisions to the definition of Service Learning, the criteria upon which courses are evaluated for Service Learning designation, or the charge/membership of the Service Learning Subcommittee will be brought to the Faculty Senate for approval.

**Background Information:** [FS 12/13-107a](#)

**FS 12/13-XX/CPC/EX**

**E-LEARNING POLICY, AMENDMENT OF PM 95-01; FS 01-23;  
FS 09-78 (FSD00010.htm)**

The Faculty Senate recommends the following revisions to the e-Learning policy PM 95-01; FS 01-23; FS 09-78 (FSD00010.htm) (<http://www.csus.edu/umannual/AcadAff/FSD00010.htm>):

- 1) Add sections related to credit hours in e-Learning courses, student accessibility to technological resources, and student privacy protection;
- 2) Add language within sections related to the introduction to the policy, program approval guidelines, online course approval, evaluation and approval of eLearning courses established prior to the approval of this policy, and copyright, patent, and ownership policy;
- 3) Strike through out-of-date language within sections related to the introduction of the policy and to the evaluation and approval of eLearning courses established prior to the approval of this policy.

*The purpose of the changes are as follows:*

- 1) *Added language in the introduction clarifies the general purpose of the policy and the fact that hybrid or online course must be identified in the course schedule as recommended by the Faculty Senate and approved by the President ([http://www.csus.edu/acse/10-11\\_actions.htm#FS 11-14](http://www.csus.edu/acse/10-11_actions.htm#FS 11-14))*
- 2) *Added language to the program approval guidelines prompts college, departments or programs to include statements in their policy manual regarding any additional guidelines for hybrid or online learning that will be incorporated in the course approval process. It also suggests including faculty with e-Learning expertise in the course and/or program approval process.*
- 3) *Added language to the Online Course Approval section identifies e-Learning standards and recommends their incorporation to those providing e-Leaning courses.*
- 4) *The new language within the added credit hour section conforms to both the CSU credit hour definition (Coded Memorandum AA-2011-14) and to the Sacramento State credit hour definition (forthcoming)*

- 5) *The new section for Accessibility is added to provide references to and language in legal requirements related to accessibility.*
- 6) *The new section for Student Privacy Protection references the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act that regulates what student information can and cannot be released without student consent. It also compels faculty to ensure that student information remain protected in courses that use external web-based software.*
- 7) *Added language to the Evaluation and Approval of e-Learning Courses section enables Academic Technology and Creative Service to periodically conduct surveys focused on satisfaction and interactivity with online tools such as... (not faculty or course evaluation).*
- 8) *Added language to the Copyright, Patent and Ownership Policy section corresponds to CSU policy and U.S. law.*

**Background Information:** [FS 12/13-108a](#)

### **Proposed Amendment to the Policy**

*The current policy may be accessed at (<http://www.csus.edu/umannual/AcadAff/FSD00010.htm>): Please note that additions are indicated using **bold and/or underlined modes**; deletions are in **~~bold and in strike-out mode~~**:*

#### **Introduction**

This policy shall apply to all matriculated e-Learning courses and degree/certificate programs offered by California State University, Sacramento. **It is not the intent of this policy to supplant any existing policies set forth by the University, but where necessary, to define new or to expand existing policies and procedures to ensure the most effective implementation and support of hybrid and online courses and programs.**

...[next two paragraphs unchanged]

**~~Three methods are utilized to deliver e-Learning to California State University, Sacramento students. These include video-based, web-based and mixed media (video and web) delivery. Cable television, two-way compressed video, microwave, satellite, videotape, CD-ROM, web-based conferencing systems and video streaming are current video-based methods of delivery.~~** Web-based courses typically use a variety of technologies to deliver instruction and engage students.

...[next paragraph unchanged]

**Courses that are delivered in a hybrid or online format must be identified in the course schedule during the registration period for semesters in which they are to be offered.** e-Learning technology and pedagogy continue to evolve. In addition, each new student cohort brings a stronger set of information technology skills to the campus and has the expectation that information technology will inform and enrich their educational experience. This policy allows the University to meet the demands of student expectations as well as continue to provide broad based high quality educational opportunity to all its students.

[1. General Guidelines unchanged]

#### **2. Program Approval Guidelines**

2.1 Departments or colleges that wish to offer an e-Learning degree/certificate program shall designate a

faculty e-Learning curriculum group who will develop a plan that includes the items described in 2.1.1 - 2.1.4. **Colleges, Departments, or Divisions shall include a statement in their policy manual regarding any additional guidelines specific to hybrid and online learning that will be incorporated in the course approval process.**

[2.1.1 – 2.1.4 unchanged]

2.2 Once the program plan is developed it needs to be approved by both the department/division and the college dean in consultation with the appropriate curriculum committees employing the "Procedures for Submitting Substantive Program Change Proposals" and utilizing Form B. **Colleges, Departments, or Divisions should consider uncluing faculty with e-learning expertise in the course and/or program approval review process.**

[2.3 unchanged]

[3. Hybrid Course Approval unchanged]

**4. Online Course Approval [added at end of section 4 after 4.1 and 4.2.]**

**Many times, faculty must serve as the de facto front-line support resource for online courses. It is because of this that technology-enhanced learning along with its technology-driven delivery more often than not requires an increased skill set to contend with the multitude of challenges that arise. Technological readiness is extremely important to the success of any online course. Inadequate technological readiness disrupts student learning and e-learning efforts and generally manifests itself in course evaluations. It is therefore highly recommended that Colleges, Departments, or Divisions who are interested in pursuing online education become familiar with the standards and best practices associated with e-learning. The Sacramento State approved standards are listed below.**

- A. California State University E-Learning Standards developed by Academic Technology and Creative Services (ATCS).**
- B. Quality Matters Program Rubric:**

**The Quality Matters Program created a list of eight broad standards, comprising a total of 40 specific elements that can be used to evaluate the design of online and hybrid courses. The web-based, fully interactive rubric includes annotations that explain the application of the standards and the relationships among them.**

[Add section 5]

## **5. Credit Hour**

**Because of the nature of online education, it is often difficult to associate a specific length of online e-learning time to its face-to-face classroom counterpart. Additionally, both hybrid and online learning typically do not separate out the traditional homework-related activities that are a part of the face-to-face learning experience.**

**Although "seat-time" is still the federal standard for measurement with regard to the credit-hour, built into this standard is an effort to align "time" with "the amount of work represented in**

**intended learning outcomes that is verified through evidence of student achievement." Therefore, since some sort of alignment is necessary the following guidelines should be used:**

**At a minimum, an online or hybrid course must provide the minimum time (hours) necessary through its synchronous and asynchronous presentations, activities, assignments, and assessments to meet its learning outcomes.**

**At its maximum, the estimated weekly and semester student workload of synchronous and asynchronous activities, assignments, and assessments should be consistent with equivalent face-to-face courses.**

**6. 5.** Faculty Training and Development [text remains unchanged in section 6]

[Add section 7]

## **7. Accessibility**

**"The California State University system, pursuant to Executive Order 926, is committed to ensuring that all of its programs, services, and activities are accessible to students, faculty, staff, and the general public. This extends to all information resources and services including web sites and electronic documents. The CSU is further committed to conforming with all legal requirements set forth in California Government Code 11135, Sections 504 and 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1996, as amended, and the Americans with Disabilities Act." *California State University Accessible Technology Initiative.***

**Faculty shall make every effort to know and make known to students the technological resources needed to be successful in online and hybrid courses including resources targeted to disadvantaged and underrepresented groups.**

**"It is the policy of the CSU to make information technology resources and services accessible to all CSU students, faculty, staff and the general public regardless of disability." *California State University Accessible Technology Initiative.***

[Add section 8]

## **8. Student Privacy Protection**

**Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) regulates what student information can and cannot be released by universities without their consent. It is also the policy of the CSU to recognize the right to privacy, a right protected under the California Constitution. Faculty shall ensure the privacy of a student's protected information in courses that use external web-based "social" software where a student's identification is required and shared.**

## **9. 6.** Evaluation and Approval of e-Learning Courses Established Prior to the Approval of this Policy

The Program Review process will be used to review and evaluate courses established prior to the

implementation date of this policy. The course and program approval guidelines specified in this policy will be used to verify compliance commencing with Academic Program Reviews conducted after Fall 2013.

**For the purposes of providing technology and pedagogical support, Academic Technology & Creative Services will periodically conduct institutional level eLearning interactivity and satisfaction surveys of courses designated as online and hybrid. This information will be in aggregative form and used for planning and programmatic consultation, not faculty evaluation. The survey will focus on the students' and instructors' practices associated with the online tools themselves (e.g. online discussions with SacCT) as well as their satisfaction and usage level of the tools (e.g. how often students interact with the online tools)**

[10. Institutional Support was formerly section 7. Only numbering is changed. Text remains unchanged]

## **11. 8- Copyright, Patent and Ownership Policy**

Ownership of materials, faculty compensation, copyright issues, and the utilization of revenue derived from the creation and production of software, telecourses, or other media products shall be agreed upon by the faculty and the University in accordance with the University's Copyright and Patent Policy and guidelines (UMC02750).

**"As a university system and creators of intellectual property, the California State University system has a significant interest in ensuring that all copyrighted material is protected and that the rights of copyright holders and creators of intellectual property are respected and maintained." *Introduction CSU Executive Order 999***

**It is the policy of the CSU to use any and all information technologies in a manner consistent with the federal laws governing copyright protection as outlines in California State University Executive Order 999.**

[12. Review Process was formerly section 9. Only numbering is changed. Text remains unchanged]

## **APRIL AND MAY SENATE MEETINGS**

- **April 18:**
  - 3:00 – 3:30 pm: 2013-2014 Senate 1<sup>st</sup> Organizational Meeting – Nomination of Officers
  - 3:30 – 5:00 pm: 2012-2013
- **April 25:** Regular Senate meeting
- **May 2:**
  - 3:00 – 3:30 pm: 2013-2014 Senate 2<sup>nd</sup> Organizational Meeting – Election of Officers
  - 3:30 – 5:00 pm: 2012-2013 Regular Senate Meeting
- **May 9:** Regular Senate meeting ( if needed).
- **May 16:** Regular Senate meeting (if needed)