2012-2013 FACULTY SENATE
California State University, Sacramento

Thursday, May 9, 2013
Foothill Suite, Union
3:00 – 5:00 pm
AGENDA
Updated: May 7, 2013

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.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

CONSENT ACTION

FS 12/13-122/EX   PROGRAM REVIEW – PUBLIC POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION

The Faculty Senate recommends that the MA program in the Department of Public Policy and Administration be approved for six years or until the next scheduled program review.

Program Review: FS 12/13-122

FS 12/13-130/COCO   COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT - SENATE
JOHN C. LIVINGSTON ANNUAL FACULTY LECTURE COMMITTEE

The Faculty Senate recommends the following faculty member for appointment to the John C. Livingston Annual Faculty Lecture Committee, 2013-2016 AY
- Thomas Pyne, Philosophy

FS 12/13-123/EX   PROGRAM PROPOSAL

The Faculty Senate recommends approval of the following program proposal.

College of Health and Human Services
BS in Nursing: Pre-Licensure (Traditional)
Attachments: FS 12/13-23a

FS 12/13-124/EX   PROGRAM PROPOSAL

The Faculty Senate recommends approval of the following program proposal.

College of Health and Human Services
RN to BSN Program: Post-Licensure
Attachments: FS 12/13-124a

FS 12/13-131/EX   PROGRAM PROPOSAL

The Faculty Senate recommends approval of the following program proposal.

College of Education
MS in Education - School Psychology and Pupil Personnel Services Credential: School Psychology Endorsement
Attachment: FS 12/13-131

FS 12/13-132/EX   PROGRAM PROPOSAL

The Faculty Senate recommends approval of the following program proposal.

College of Health and Human Services
BS in Health Science   Attachment: FS 12/13-132

FS 12/13-133/EX   PROGRAM PROPOSAL

The Faculty Senate recommends approval of the following program proposal.

College of Health and Human Services
Bachelor in Social Work (BSW)   Attachment: FS 12/13-133

FS 12/13-134/EX   PROGRAM PROPOSAL

The Faculty Senate recommends approval of the following program proposal.

College of Health and Human Services
KINS – Physical Education (Physical Activity, Conditioning and Coaching [PACC]; Physical Education Teacher Education [PETE]   Attachment: FS 12/13-134

FS 12/13-135/EX   PROGRAM PROPOSAL

The Faculty Senate recommends approval of the following program proposal.

College of Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies
BA in Family and Consumer Sciences: Concentration in Apparel Marketing and Design
Attachment: FS 12/13-135

FS 12/13-136/EX   PROGRAM PROPOSAL

The Faculty Senate recommends approval of the following program proposal.

College of Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies
BS in Gerontology   Attachment: FS 12/13-136

FS 12/13-137/EX   PROGRAM PROPOSAL

The Faculty Senate recommends approval of the following program proposal.

College of Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies
BA Family and Consumer Sciences: Concentration in Nutrition and Food
Attachment: FS 12/13-137

FS 12/13-138/EX   **PROGRAM PROPOSAL**

   The Faculty Senate recommends approval of the following program proposal.

   College of Business Administration
   MBA: Entrepreneurship and Global Business   Attachment: FS 12/13-138

FS 12/13-139/EX   **PROGRAM PROPOSAL**

   The Faculty Senate recommends approval of the following program proposal.

   College of Business Administration
   MBA: Business Analytics in Healthcare   Attachment: FS 12/13-139

FS 12/13-140/EX   **PROGRAM PROPOSAL**

   The Faculty Senate recommends approval of the following program proposal.

   College of Business Administration
   Master of Science in Finance Attachment: FS 12/13-140

FS 12/13-141/EX   **PROGRAM PROPOSAL**

   The Faculty Senate recommends approval of the following program proposal.

   College of Business Administration
   MS Accountancy Program Attachment: FS 12/13-141

FS 12/13-125/CPC/EX   **COUNCIL ON THE PREPARATION OF SCHOOL PERSONNEL POLICY, AMENDMENT OF POLICIES; AS 90-131, AS 96-78A/CPC/EX, and FS 02-79, FS 03-58/CPC/EX (FSC00050.htm**
      http://www.csus.edu/umanual/AcadAff/FSC00050.htm)

The Faculty Senate recommends the following revisions to Council on the Preparation of School Personnel (CPSP) Policy FSC00050.htm:

1) *Update the policy to reflect the current structure of the College of education and the current accrediting bodies and associated acronyms;*
2) *Revise the policy to comply with university policy related to ex officio membership;*
3) *Insert language related to the credential unit's conceptual framework and associated forms;*
4) *Revise the policy to clarify CPSP's role related to accreditation documents and program review reports; and,*
5) *Revise the membership to ensure representation and communication across the university's credential and subject matter programs.*

   CPSP Policy: http://www.csus.edu/umanual/AcadAff/FSC00050.htm
   Background Information: FS 12/13-125a

Proposed Policy (additions bolded and underlined; deletions are struck through):

I. DEFINITIONS

" Subject Matter Program " refers to a planned body of courses and experiences developed in consultation with the community and approved by the University and by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC), that meet CCTC Standards for subject matter preparation for the California basic teaching credentials in Multiple Subject, Single Subject, and Education Specialist in Special Education. A Subject Matter Program may stand apart from Professional Preparation Programs leading to basic teaching credentials or it may be "blended" with a basic teaching

credential program, if the blended option has been approved by the University and by the CCTC as meeting separate CCTC Standards for Blended Programs.

" Professional Preparation Program " refers to a planned body of courses and experiences, developed in consultation with the community and approved by the University and by CCTC, that prepare candidates for basic teaching credentials, specialist credentials, and/or service credentials and certificates. Such programs prepare certificated personnel for work in a variety of professional roles in California's schools. As noted above, Professional Preparation Programs leading to basic teaching credentials may be articulated with Subject Matter Programs and seek University and CCTC approval as Blended Programs.

II. AUTHORITY

The Council On The Preparation Of School Personnel (CPSP) is a permanent subcommittee of the Curriculum Policies Committee (CPC). The Council shall:

A. Review all Subject Matter Programs and Professional Preparation Programs for compliance with the University's academic policies and regulations and for compliance with the CCTC **policies and** guidelines, **as well as the alignment with the unit's conceptual framework, and compliance with the guidelines of other bodies that have granted program accreditation.** ~~the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and other accrediting bodies for submission through appropriate review procedures of the University and for submission to the CCTC for approval by that agency.~~ **Review should follow procedures established by the University. It should also adhere to accreditation guidelines established by the CTC and other relevant accrediting bodies.**

B. Review policies and programs pertaining to the ~~Professional Education Programs~~ **Subject Matter Programs and Professional Education Programs. (Access information about the university's accreditation programs here:** http://edweb.csus.edu/accreditation/cctc/program_assessment/biennial_reports.html.)

C. Recommend, as appropriate, revisions of course work or programs in the Subject Matter and/or Professional Preparation Programs.

III. CHARGE

A. Stimulate and model cooperation among all areas concerned with Subject Matter and Professional Preparation Programs. **In particular, streamline the sharing of information about Subject Matter and Professional Preparation Programs, especially as this pertains to advising of and support to students and candidates.**

B. Identify and define issues related to the effective implementation of Subject Matter and Professional Preparation Programs**, particularly as they relate to the Sacramento State Strategic Plan and the unit's conceptual framework**.

C. Organize and direct a response to defined problems.

D. Review, study, and make recommendations concerning Subject Matter Programs, Blended Programs, and all aspects of the ~~professional education program~~ **Professional Preparation Programs.**

E. Recommend policy concerning curricular aspects of the Subject Matter and Professional Preparation Programs.

F. ~~Review and respond as appropriate to findings and recommendations contained in all Program Review and Accreditation Reports for Subject Matter and Professional Preparation Programs.~~ **Be apprised of findings and recommendations contained in all Program Review Reports for Subject Matter Programs and CTC Accreditation Reports (e.g., Biennial Reports, Program Assessment Reports) for Professional Preparation Programs. If programs have accreditations in addition to CTC accreditation, be informed of findings and recommendations from these bodies. As appropriate, review and respond to findings and recommendations.**

IV. PROCEDURES AND IMPLEMENTATION

A. Course change proposals, program change proposals, new course proposals and/or new program proposals for Subject Matter and Professional Preparation Programs must be prepared, reviewed and approved by the appropriate program.

NOTE. ~~The proposal forms and associated materials are specified in the University Manual, which is accessible from the University's Web page.~~ The University-level curriculum approval process is specified in the University Manual and all proposal forms and associated materials are also specified in the University Manual. These items are accessible from the University's Webpage. All University procedures apply except for review and approval by the Curriculum Subcommittee.

1. For course change specifications go to http://www.csus.edu/acaf/univmanual/crspsl.htm .
2. For program changes go to http://www.csus.edu/acaf/univmanual/mdftnprg.htm .
3. For new programs go to http://www.csus.edu/acaf/univmanual/newdegpro.htm .
4. All course proposals routed to CPSP must also use the Form A cover sheet: (forthcoming online)

~~**B. Accreditation documents associated with proposed course change proposals, program change proposals, new course proposals and/or new program proposals for Subject Matter and Professional Preparation Programs must be prepared, reviewed and approved by the appropriate program.**~~

B. ~~C.~~ Program approved proposals ~~**and associated accreditation documents**~~ must be forwarded to the College Academic Council for review and recommendation.

C. ~~D.~~ College Academic Council approved proposals ~~**and associated accreditation documents**~~ must then be forwarded to Academic Affairs. The Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Programs or designee is then responsible for moving the proposals to CPSP for review and recommendation.

D. ~~E.~~ CPSP approved proposals must then be forwarded to the Senate for final approval.

E. Accreditation documents for Subject Matter and Professional Preparation Programs are maintained at the program level and should reflect changes due to adopted course and program proposals, changes in program standards, and changes occurring because of other policies and policy changes. These accreditation documents must be reviewed and approved at the appropriate program, department and college levels. They should be reviewed by CPSP as informational items prior to submission to any accreditation agency.

~~**NOTE. The University-level curriculum approval process is specified in the University Manual, which is accessible from the University's Web page. All University procedures apply except for review and approval by the Curriculum Subcommittee.**~~

~~**1. For course change specifications go to http://www.csus.edu/acaf/univmanual/crspsl.htm .**~~
~~**2. For program changes go to http://www.csus.edu/acaf/univmanual/mdftnprg.htm .**~~
~~**3. For new programs go to http://www.csus.edu/acaf/univmanual/newdegpro.htm .**~~

F. ~~**When General Education and Graduation Requirements are to be satisfied within the program (e.g., Liberal Studies, Child Development B) the proposal must receive approval from the General Education Policies/Graduation Requirements Committee before submission to CPSP for final recommendation to the Senate.**~~ **For course and program approvals sought by approved subject matter programs, approval requests must be routed through the appropriate university committees (e.g., GE policies). CPSP shall receive these course and program proposals after these bodies have completed their reviews. An informational review by CPSP is also strongly recommended for programs that operate as subject matter programs but are not currently approved by CTC as such (e.g., Liberal Studies, Child Development pre-credential, etc.).**

G. In addition to the process as specified above, copies of the agenda and minutes of each CPSP meeting should be forwarded to the Curriculum Policies Subcommittee.

H. Election of the chair will occur in the first meeting of the fall semester.

I. A simple majority of the voting members will constitute a quorum.

J. Academic Affairs shall provide for the clerical support, including but not limited to notice and establishing meeting dates, taking and disseminating meeting minutes, circulating printed materials, general correspondence and the preparation of draft and final reports, posting of information on a WEB page, etc.

V. MEMBERSHIP

~~**There shall be the following voting members**~~ **nominated by the respective Deans and confirmed by the Curriculum Policies Committee or, absent a timely meeting of the Committee, by the Committee Chair:**

There shall be 16 voting members. The Faculty Senate will seek nominations from the College Deans for new term appointments during Spring semester for terms beginning in the following academic year and to fill any vacancies. Having been nominated by the respective College Deans, committee members will be confirmed by the Curriculum Policies Committee, or, absent a timely meeting of the Curriculum Policy Committee, by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

A. Seven members from the College of Education ~~**(at least one of the seven members must also be a Faculty Senator**~~):

· 5 members at large **(1 from the Undergraduate Studies Department, 1 from the Graduate Programs and Professional Studies in Education Department, and 3 from the Teaching Credentials Department),**
· ~~**1 member from the Teacher Preparation and Credentials Office**~~
· 1 member, Chair of ~~**Teacher Education**~~ **Teaching Credentials**
· 1 additional faculty member with expertise in the area of Teacher Credentialing who is also a Faculty Senator.

B. Nine members from other Colleges involved with the preparation of school personnel. ~~**including:**~~ **Members should represent subject matter programs that lead to a Single and/or Multiple Subject credential. Membership should include:**

- Two members from the College of Arts and Letters ~~**(one member representing Single Subject Programs and one member representing Multiple Subject Programs - in addition, at least one of the two members must also be a Faculty Senator)**~~
· Two members from the College of Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies ~~**(one member representing Single Subject Programs and one member representing Multiple Subject Programs)**~~
· Two members from the College of Health and Human Services (one member representing Kinesiology and Health Science **and one member representing School Nursing, School Social Work or Speech Pathology**)
· Two members from the College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics ~~**(one member representing Single Subject Programs and one member representing Multiple Subject Programs)**~~
· One member from the College of Continuing Education

~~**D. Two student members appointed by Associated Students Inc. in the spring semester: one student representing Subject Matter Programs and one student representing Professional Preparation Programs.**~~

C. ~~**E.**~~ Ex officio (nonvoting) members:

· Liaison from **Faculty** Senate Curriculum Policies Committee.
· **1 member, College of Education Credential Analyst**

- **Associate Deans from the Colleges of Education, Arts and Letters, Natural Sciences and Mathematics, Health and Human Services, and Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies or designee**
- **Dean, Office of Graduate Studies or designee**
- **ASI Director of Education or designee**

D. F. Terms of membership:

1. A student term is one year with the possibility of reappointment.

2. ~~All other terms will be three years, with the possibility of reappointment.~~ **Terms served by members other than students will be three years, with the possibility of reappointment. The exception is the member who is also a Faculty Senator whose term of office is one year, with the possibility of reappointment.**

Appointments will be staggered in order to insure, as far as possible, that approximately one-third of the members are appointed each year

~~3. Members will also serve on the CSUS Community Partnership Council on the Preparation of School Personnel during their term of service.~~

~~4. During the spring semester the Faculty Senate will seek nominations for new term appointments from the College Deans. The Curriculum Policies Committee will then approve the appointments of CPSP members with terms beginning in the following academic year.~~

REGULAR AGENDA

FS 12/13-129/FL   **MINUTES** – MAY 2, 2013

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

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 12/13-128/CPC/EX   **ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEWS, REPLACEMENT OF POLICIES: FS 02-03/CPC/EX; FS 02-04/CPC/EX;**
FS 03-57/CPC/EX; FS 04-13/CPC/EX; (FSA00010.HTM)
(http://www.csus.edu/umanual/AcadAff/FSA00010.htm)

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

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

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

I. Introduction and Rationale

A primary responsibility of institutions of higher education is the development and implementation of a formal and consistent system of quality assurance. Such a system includes an analysis of student achievement of learning objectives and outcomes at the program level; it reviews available program retention and completion data; and when appropriate, it examines licensure and job placement information and draws on evidence from external stakeholders, such as employers and professional organizations.

Program review is a central element in the broader effort of institutional quality assurance. Program review is a cyclical and systematic process for the evaluation and continuous enhancement and currency of programs. This evaluation begins with self-reflection and is followed by peer evaluation by external consultants—external to the program or department, and often external to the institution. Program review is intended to be a comprehensive analysis of program quality, analyzing a wide variety of data. The goal of this analysis is to ensure program effectiveness and to address any weaknesses that the program or external consultants identify.

The primary purpose of academic program review at Sacramento State is to acknowledge the strengths and seek ways of further enhancing the quality of academic programs. The California State University Board of Trustees and Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) accreditation regulations require that every academic unit be reviewed on a regularly scheduled basis. As the name implies, program review normally involves review of each academic program that leads to a specific degree. These programs will undergo program review based on a six-year cycle. For other academic units, e.g. the Library or the General Education program, Academic Affairs will be responsible for scheduling the program review. (For accredited programs, see section VI below.)

The locus of the program review process is the academic unit that administers the degree program(s). In most cases the academic unit is a department; in some cases the unit is a "program" (e.g. the Asian Studies Program) or another entity (e.g. the College of Continuing Education). For sake of convenience, in this document "department chair" refers to the individual in charge of the academic unit.

The policy governing conduct of program reviews at Sacramento State is recommended to the President by the Faculty Senate. The responsibility for implementing the program review process lies with Academic Affairs. Program review consists of a six-step process that includes: 1) completion and approval of a Self-study proposal; 2) Self-study by the academic unit; 3) review by an external consultant; 4) report by a campus program review team; 5) review and recommendation by the Faculty Senate; and 6) action by the University President.

The specific procedures guiding the program review process are outlined in the University's Program Review Manual.

II. Review Team Composition and Responsibilities

A. Team Membership: Program review teams shall have a minimum of three members, all of whom are to be from among the University's faculty.
1. At least one member is to be from the college of the academic unit under review.
2. The chair of the review team is to be from outside of the college of the academic unit under review.
3. The review team chair is a member of the Program Review Oversight Committee and therefore works collaboratively with the Committee in the conduct of the program review process.

B. Team Responsibilities:
1. Examines the academic unit's Self-study, the external consultant's report, and other relevant materials;
2. Prepares the program review report; and
3. Submits the report to the Program Review Oversight Committee by the end of the seventh week of the semester following the semester during which the review activities are completed.
4. The review team chair acts as a nonvoting consultant to the Program Review Oversight Committee when the report is under consideration.

III. Program Review Oversight Committee

A. Committee Membership: The Program Review Oversight Committee is composed of:
1. Chairs of program review team for academic units currently undergoing review (from commencement of the process to the final approval by the Faculty Senate),
2. A Faculty Senate appointee,
3. A representative from the Curriculum Policies Committee, and
4. A representative from the Office of Academic Program Assessment.

B. Program Review Approval Process:
1. The Program Review Oversight Committee determines the final disposition of the program review. Typically programs will receive a six-year approval. However, if the review team determines that serious issues warranting immediate resolution beset a program and the Program Review Oversight Committee concurs, a conditional approval, or under extreme circumstances disapproval, may be recommended. Conditional approvals ordinarily are to be given to address issues that significantly impair a program's academic effectiveness.

2. In the case of conditional approval, Program Review Oversight Committee provides written documentation of specific and clearly stated conditions including exactly the conditions to be met, a timeline for meeting the conditions, and measures to be enacted if the conditions are not met. The academic unit in conjunction with the Dean of the College must develop and submit a plan and a timeline for meeting the conditions within four weeks of notification by the Program Review Oversight Committee. The Committee must approve the plan and the timeline. At the conclusion of the agreed upon timeline, the academic unit will submit a report to Academic Affairs. If a satisfactory report is not submitted, Academic Affairs will apply appropriate sanctions.

IV. External Consultant Identification

The program review shall involve at least one external consultant. Academic Affairs invites the department chair to nominate potential external consultants. The Chair may request assistance from Academic Affairs in identifying consultant nominees.

V. Program Review Procedures

The specific procedures guiding the program review process are outlined in the University's Program Review Manual. The Manual is developed and revised by the Program Review Oversight Committee. It is updated at least once every three years, based on evidence regarding the efficacy of current procedures. Any substantive changes to the manual will be submitted to and approved by CPC.

VI. External Accreditation Review Process

Program review at our University attempts to integrate, to the extent reasonable, campus program review and accreditation by external agencies, so long as this can be made to comply with the normal six-year cycle of program review. Academic Affairs is responsible for orchestrating the integration (details are provided in the Program Review Manual). An academic unit has the right to request a full program review (including visit by an external consultant) regardless of accreditation status.

Background Information: FS 12/13-128a
Program Review Manual: FS 12/13-128b

FS 12/13-142/CPC/EX   CREDIT HOUR POLICY, AMENDMENT OF (FS 11/12-147/CPC/EX)

The Faculty Senate recommends the following revisions to the Credit Hour Definition (FS 11/12-147/CPC/EX located at
http://www.csus.edu/acaf/academic%20resources/policies%20and%20procedures/Credit%20Hour%20Policy.html :

1) Add credit hour definition table to further define expectations for students related to specific course types as requested by the Faculty Senate in Spring 2012;
2) Add procedures for monitoring the credit hour definition as required by WASC;

Proposed Policy: (additions bolded and underlined; deletions are struck through):

A credit hour unit (a 50-minute period) is defined as the amount of work represented in intended learning outcomes and verified by evidence of student achievement that is not less than and does not significantly exceed:

1. 50 minutes of classroom or direct faculty instruction and a minimum of two hours of out-of-class student work each week for approximately fifteen weeks for one semester or trimester hour of credit, or ten to twelve weeks for one quarter hour of credit, or the equivalent amount of work over a different amount of time; or

2. at least an equivalent amount of work as required in (1) of this definition for other academic activities, including laboratory work, internships, practica, studio work, and other academic work leading to the award of credit hours. The type and amount of activities may vary among individual programs. See credit hour definition table below for clarification.

3. In courses, such as those offered online, in which "seat time" does not apply, a credit hour shall be measured by an equivalent amount of work by the students as defined by the eLearning policy PM95-01 at http://www.csus.edu/umanual/AcadAff/FSD00010.htm. [If the revised eLearning policy is assigned a new number and web address, the new information will be reflected here.]

[Entire table that follows is an addition to the current interim policy]

Credit Hour Definition Table for Undergraduate Courses

Course Type	Typical Number of Student Hours *in Class* Weekly per Unit	Typical Number of Student Preparation/Activity Hours *Out of Class* Weekly per Unit	Minimum *Total* Hours per Unit	Number of Semester Credit Hours Earned across 15 Weeks
Lecture, seminar, discussion, recitation	1 hour	2 hours	3 hours weekly	1 unit
Activity supervised as a group (laboratory, field trips, practicum, workshop, group studio, physical education)	2-3 hours	0-1 hour	3 hours weekly	1 unit
Independent study, individual studio, tutorial, culminating experience: study given initial guidance, criticism, review and final evaluation of student performance by a faculty member	0-1 hour: time spent in initial guidance, criticism, review and final evaluation of student performance	2-3 hours	45 hours per semester	1 unit
Practice (supervised clinical rounds, visual or performing art studio, fieldwork)	0 – 1 hour	2-3 hours in supervised and/or independent practice	3 hours weekly	1 unit
Practicum/Internship	N/A	variable	45 hours per semester	1 unit
Credit by Examination: student showing mastery through credit-by-examination	N/A	N/A	N/A	Units assigned at the discretion of the University

Sessions (e.g. summer sessions, intersessions, special sessions, shortened sessions, term sessions)	Variable but proportional to hours spent for the same activity during a regular term	Variable but proportional to hours spent for the same activity during a regular term	45 hours	Units assigned proportionately to those earned for the same activity during a regular term; units assigned at the discretion of the University with no more than one credit per week of full-time study

Monitoring of the Credit Hour Definition

~~Initial review of compliance with the interim credit hour definition will be part of the regular course review done by the Curriculum Subcommittee to confirm via departmental self-report in course or program proposals that workload is appropriate for the credit hours.~~

~~During this interim policy the CPC will work with OIR to survey students and instructors in a sampling of courses across colleges to investigate credit hour workloads in order to gather initial data to inform our discussion of a policy for monitoring credit hour.~~

In order to address the WASC requirement to monitor the implementation of Sacramento State's credit hour definition for courses in the course approval process, course proposals should clearly indicate the course type using the Credit Hour Definition Table for Undergraduate Courses as a guideline. It is not the intent of the Credit Hour Definition Table for Undergraduate Courses to describe all individual courses across the University, but rather to describe typical practices within course types. Programs having courses whose expectations lie significantly outside of those delineated in the Credit Hour Definition Table for Undergraduate Courses shall provide a justification within the course proposal.

For existing courses, each department will review their current courses and determine if each course adheres to the guidelines delineated in the Credit Hour Definition Table for Undergraduate Courses. Any courses that have expectations that lie significantly outside of those delineated in the Credit Hour Definition Table for Undergraduate Courses shall provide a justification for the deviations. Departmental course credit hour review will be requested every five years by the Office of Academic Affairs.

Background Information: FS 12/13-142a

FS 12/13-143/GSPC/EX   **ESTABLISHMENT OF A CREDIT HOUR DEFINITION FOR POST-BACCALAUREATE COURSES**

The Faculty Senate recommends the establishment of the following definition of the credit hour for post-baccalaureate courses.

Credit Hour Definition for Post-Baccalaureate Courses

I.   General Policies

Credit hours for post-baccalaureate courses are based, in general, on contact hours plus independent work. For example, each credit hour in lecture or discussion courses consists of one contact hour accompanied by 2 to 3 hours of time spent in independent work (readings, papers, or other out of class assignments). In this policy, the term *contact hour* refers to time spent in required instructional contact with the course instructor.

Since "seat time" is the federal standard for measurement with regard to the credit hour, in courses such as those offered online to which this standard may not apply, a credit hour shall be measured by an equivalent amount of work by students as defined by the appropriate University policies.

Guidelines for common course types are provided below. For courses that do not fall into one of the categories listed below, the course description must explain the conditions for credit which must

reasonably approximate the standard for lecture and discussion courses.   For instance, conditions for credit may be addressed by number of contact hours per week and/or expected time spent in independent work.

Courses may be offered for variable credit hours (either for a range of credits in a single term, or for a different number of credits from one term to another).

II. Guidelines for Common Course Types

A. Lecture or Discussion

One weekly contact hour per credit.

B. Seminar

For each seminar, the average number of weekly contact hours may range from 2/3 of an hour to 2 hours per credit

(1)   There may be *fewer* contact hours per week for seminars which have higher expectations for outside independent work.

(2)   There may be *more* contact hours per week for seminars which have lower expectations for outside independent work.

C. Laboratory

One to four weekly contact hours per credit.

(1)   There may be *fewer* contact hours per week for laboratories which have higher expectations for outside independent work.

(2)   There may be *more* contact hours per week for laboratories which have lower expectations for outside independent work.

D. Independent Study (including Culminating Experience)

Contact between instructor and student is required, but variable and not necessarily on a weekly basis.

E. Experiential (e.g. Internship/Practicum/Field Experience)

Contact between instructor and student is required, but variable and not necessarily on a weekly basis.

(1)   *Fewer* contact hours will be necessary for an experiential course in which a considerable amount of the student's time is devoted to reading, research, and other academic activities to which the field experience is supplemental. *More* contact hours will be necessary if the academic component involves a less significant proportion of the student's time.

(2)   *Fewer* contact hours in the setting will be necessary for an experiential course in which the student receives a significant amount of supervision and instruction from a regular member of the faculty. *More* contact hours in the setting will be necessary if the student receives less direct supervision, or less time devoted to instruction, from the faculty.

F. Short Courses

The following guidelines will be used to determine the appropriate credit for post-baccalaureate courses of shorter duration than the regular full- or half-term offerings.

(1)   In short courses, the total number of contact hours and independent work expected will be equivalent to a multiple of 15 times the weekly amount given in each category above. For example, a lecture or discussion course should have 15 contact hours per credit hour since these courses would normally have one contact hour per credit hour per week.

(2)   All short courses shall consist of at least three separate meetings for each credit hour and shall extend over a duration of at least five days.

III. Implementation of the Credit Hour Definition

In order to address the WASC requirement to monitor the implementation of Sacramento State's credit hour definition, for courses in the course approval process, course proposals should clearly indicate the course type. It is not the intent of the Credit Hour Definitions given in this document to describe all individual courses across the University, but rather to describe typical practices within course types. Programs proposing courses whose expectations lie significantly outside of those delineated in the Definitions above shall provide a justification within the course proposal.

For existing courses, each department will review their current courses and determine if each course adheres to the guidelines delineated in the Credit Hour Definitions for Post-Baccalaureate Courses. Existing courses that have expectations that lie significantly outside of those delineated in the Credit Hour Definitions for Post-Baccalaureate Courses shall provide a justification for the deviations. Departmental course credit hour review will be requested every five years by the Office

Background Information: 12/13-FS-142a
(The background information for this item is the same as the background for FS 12/13-142 – Credit Hour Policy Amendment)

FS-12/13-126/APC/EX   UNDERGRADUATE ACADEMIC ADVISING POLICY (POLICY ACA-0100), AMENDMENTS TO

The Faculty Senate recommends amending the Undergraduate Academic Advising policy, UPM ACA-0100 to reflect the changes suggested by the definition of "pre-major" and "expressed interest" that will occur within three semesters of the passage of this bill.
(Undergraduate Academic Advising Policy: http://www.csus.edu/umanual/acad/UMA00050.htm)

1. *The policy will amend the Academic Advising Policy, Responsibilities for students (Item A, bullet 4 and Item F)*
2. *The policy will amend the Academic Advising Policy, Responsibilities for Academic Advising Center (Item A)*
3. *The policy will amend the Academic Advising Policy, Responsibilities for Academic Programs (Item A, 2nd bullet, 2nd bullet under that)*

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.)

In defining "pre-majors" and "expressed interests" it became clear that one of the prominent issues with dealing with these two groups of students was who was suppose to be advising them, and more important, who was advising them. This policy reflects the intention of the definition on "pre-majors" and "expressed interests."

Background Information: FS 12/13-126a

III. RESPONSIBILITIES OF STUDENTS

A. The responsibility for academic success rests with the student and includes but is not limited to the following:

- Reading the catalog in order to be aware of University, College, and department/area academic policies, regulations, and deadlines.
- Complying with University, College, and department/area academic policies, regulations, and deadlines.
- Meeting regularly with an advisor in their academic department/area and with a General Education advisor.
- Declaring a major officially before 60 units or, in the case of Junior and Senior transfer students, by the end of their first semester. **Note: An Expressed Interest designation does not fulfill the requirement for declaring a major.**
- Understanding academic performance standards for the University and their major.
- Understanding requirements to maintain good standing and the consequences for failure to do so.
- Retaining copies of advising materials and bringing relevant materials to their advising sessions.

B. All students on academic probation are required to meet with an academic advisor in their major program or, in the case of undeclared students, with an advisor in the Academic Advising Center to develop a plan to return to academic good standing.

C. Entering freshmen are required to meet with an advisor during orientation to plan and enroll in appropriate courses for their first semester.

D. Freshmen must meet with an advisor during their first and second semester to plan and enroll in appropriate courses for following semester.

E. After their freshmen year, all students must meet with an advisor at least once a year.

F. All students must comply with the advising policies of their major program or, in the case of undeclared **and Expressed Interest** students, of the Academic Advising Center**, unless otherwise stated by the department in which the student has an Expressed Interest.**

V. RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE ACADEMIC ADVISING CENTER

A. The responsibilities of the Academic Advising Center include, but are not limited to the following:

1. Establishing advising goals which will guide the Center's advising efforts.
2. Developing an academic advising plan which specifies and informs students of their responsibilities as well as the University resources available for their use. The plan should include, but not be limited to the following:
    1. Required advising meetings with program advisors.
    2. Additional requirements for special student populations such as probationary students or pre-professional students (Note: Advising is mandatory for students on probation. Departments/areas are required to provide advising to these

students by the end of the second week of their first semester on probationary status).

    3. Consequences of failure to comply with mandatory advising requirements (e.g., setting advising holds for students who have not met with advisors).

    4. Provisions that are in place for advising evening students-and students studying at off-campus sites, if applicable.

1. Providing academic advising on General Education and the University's graduation requirements for all students.

2. Providing advising for all undeclared students on probation.

3. Coordinating orientation and general advising with academic departments/areas and specialized student support programs.

4. Developing and managing the University's academic-based orientation program (including mandatory freshman orientation) for new students and parents, including academic program advising.

5. Providing advising each fall and spring for all first-time freshmen not being advised by academic departments/areas. The current three-phase academic and career-advising model is designed to complement and enhance existing advising in academic departments/areas, not to replace it.

6. Establishing processes that enforce timely declaration of major for undeclared and expressed interest students.

B. The Academic Advising Center shall periodically assess the effectiveness of its academic advising plan, as it relates to its advising goals, and make improvements as needed

VI.   RESPONSIBILITIES OF ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

A.   All programs are responsible for the following:

- Establishing advising goals which will guide the program's advising efforts.
- Developing an academic advising plan which, at a minimum, informs students of the following:
  - Required advising meetings with program advisors at least once a year.
  - Additional requirements for special student populations such as probationary students, **pre-major students,** pre-professional students, or graduate students (Note: Advising is mandatory for students on probation. Departments/areas are required to provide advising to these students by the end of the second week of their first semester on probationary status).
  - Consequences of failure to comply with mandatory advising requirements (e.g., setting advising holds for students who have not met with advisors).
  - Provisions that are in place for advising evening students, graduate students, and students studying at off-campus sites, if applicable.

- Devising a means of implementing and coordinating the program's advising policy and procedures, including, but not limited to:
  - Identifying faculty and staff who will be responsible for advising students in their major/program.
  - Organizing training activities for program advisors.
  - Providing advisors with advising materials.
  - Keeping advisors apprised of changes in requirements and availability of campus resources.
    - o Setting and removing advising holds for students who have not met with advisors, in programs with such a policy.

- Recognizing and rewarding advising as part of faculty and staff workload.

B. Each academic program shall periodically assess the effectiveness of their academic advising plan, as it relates to its advising goals, and make improvements, as needed. In those cases where College advising programs are in place, the College shall periodically assess the effectiveness their academic advising plan and make improvements, as it relates to the its advising goals, and make improvements, as needed.

C. Understanding that students may seek advice in the Academic Advising Center; all programs should coordinate their advising policies and procedures with the Academic Advising Center, including updates to their advising requirements and/or list of advisors, as well as communicating any requirements for the courses selected by students.

FS 12/13-127/CPC/EX   **TIMELY DECLARATION OF MAJOR POLICY, AMENDMENT OF (FS 05-77/APC/EX)**

The Faculty Senate recommends the amendments to the Timely Declaration of Major Policy:

Summary of proposed changes:

1) *Modify the policy to reflect the recently defined terms: Pre-Major and Expressed Interest;*
2) *Draw a distinction between the two categories during the implementation of the policy*

Background Information: FS 12/13-127a

I. Undeclared freshmen**, including those with an Expressed Interest,** and lower division transfer students are required to submit a declaration of major form by the time they have completed 60 units; failure to do so will result in a hold on subsequent registration.

II. Undeclared junior-level transfer students**, including those with an Expressed Interest,** are required to submit a declaration of major form prior to registration for their second semester; failure to do so will result in a registration hold.

III. Implementation of the policy:

A. The 60 units of coursework identified above shall include only those courses that carry unit credit toward the degree. (This excludes, therefore, remedial courses and courses taken at non-accredited institutions.)

B. The Academic Advising Center shall have responsibility for placing and removing the registration holds specified above.

C. It is recognized that this requirement is for an initial declaration of major only; students still have the option of changing their major after completion of 60 units.

D. Declaration of an Expressed Interest does not constitute declaration of a major. If, under the time and unit requirements listed in this policy, an Expressed Interest student has not been accepted into the identified Expressed Interest major program, the student must visit the Academic Advising Center to formulate an alternative major plan.

> **For students declaring a major that classifies its entering students as pre-majors, submitting the declaration of major form will result in their being appropriately classified as pre-majors and satisfy this requirement.**

E. **If, under the time and unit requirements listed in this policy, a Pre-Major student has not yet met the requirements for entering the major, the Pre-Major may retain the Pre-Major status with the recommendation of the Major Department each semester.**

F. It is generally beneficial to seek academic advising early in your career, especially with respect to disciplines that have pre-majors or other pre-requisites.

G. Earlier declaration of a major or a pre-major is encouraged. Declaring a pre-major does not guarantee acceptance into the major program.

FS 12/13-119/GE/GSPC/EX   GENERAL EDUCATION AREA E LEARNING GOALS AND OUTCOMES, REVISIONS TO

The Faculty Senate recommends revising the "General Education Area E Learning Goals and Outcomes" (http://www.csus.edu/acaf/Portfolios/GE/geareaE.stm) as follows:

Rationale: The regularly scheduled review and revision process called for in the Sacramento State GE Policy typically occurs in each area every 5 years. The review and revision process was placed on hold for several years pending the review and revision of the Baccalaureate Learning Goals, completed in 2009. The review and revision process resumed in 2011 with Area B. These revised goals and outcomes will provide students with opportunities to clearly demonstrate their knowledge, skills and understandings, and will provide a coherent set of outcomes to permit GE program assessment.

Background: Attachment FS 12/13-119a

Area E – Understanding Personal Development

Learning Goals

1. Students will demonstrate an understanding of academic content knowledge regarding self-development as a physiological, social and/or psychological being.
2. Students will critically examine prior or current experiences or behaviors from their own lives in response to real world physiological, social and/or psychological contexts (may be evident in self-assessment, reflection or creative work).
3. Students will apply skills and knowledge regarding development of the self to differing situations, such as real world challenges, and/or to make connections across perspectives.

Learning Outcomes

1. Students will be able to identify their own perspective and make connections/comparisons across perspectives.
2. Students will be able to plan, monitor, and assess their own learning.
3. Students will be able to set personal and/or professional goals.

Area E Understanding Personal Development

1. Enhances the student's understanding of the development of the individual as an integrated physiological, psychological, and social being.

2. Includes a study of how internal and external influences interact in human development and behavior within the context of the human life span.

3. For courses enhancing understanding of the self as a physiological, social and psychological entity, address the following criteria statement:

4. Promotes critical self-understanding, and accordingly will involve consideration of such topics as individual behavior, the relation of the person to the social and natural environment, human sexuality, nutrition, health, stress, family, aging and death.

5. For courses developing an art or a skill, address the following criteria statement:

6. Promotes the lifelong understanding and development of students as integrated physiological and psychological entities, through the acquisition of a recreation, avocational, or artistic skill. [The course proposal must specify how the activities or performances will contribute to understanding the personal development of an integrated individual.]

*Note: Three unit courses in this area may include an activity/skills component, but it is not to exceed one-third of the course content. No more than one unit of activity/skills course work may be used to satisfy the Area E requirement.

Students will

1.Recognize and critically examine the development of the individual as an integrated physiological, psychological, and social being.

2.The student will be able to identify the internal and external influences that interact in human development and behavior within the context of the human life span.

For courses enhancing understanding of the self as a physiological, social and psychological entity, address the following criteria statement:

1. Critically examine their own individual behavior in relationship to topics as social and natural environment, human sexuality, nutrition, health stress, family, aging and death.

For courses developing an art or skill, addresses the following criteria statement:

1. Examine and create ways, through the acquisition of a recreation, avocation or artistic skill, that will enhance their own life long understanding of their development as an integrated physiological and psychological entity.

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/umanual/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

FS 12/13-107/CPC/EX　　　　**SERVICE LEARNING SUBCOMMITTEE, ESTABLISHMENT OF**

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 12/13-108/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/umanual/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)*

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/umanual/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 including 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]

FS 12/13-100/GSPC/EX   <u>**MODIFICATION IN OR DELETION OF EXISTING PROGRAMS, AMENDMENT OF**</u>

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. **E**ach 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: FS 12/13-100a

MAY SENATE MEETINGS: May 9, May 16, and May 23 (if needed)