2012-2013 FACULTY SENATE
California State University, Sacramento

Thursday, May 16, 2013
Foothill Suite, Union
3:00 – 5:00 pm
(Updated: 5/15/13)

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

- Chair's Annual Report: *Janet Hecsh, Faculty Senate Chair, May 15, 2013*
- Financial Aid Regulations Update: *Correspondence from AVP Mills to the Faculty Senate, May 15, 2013*
- SB 440: *Correspondence from ASCSU Chair Guerin to Senator Padilla. May 6, 2013*

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

CONSENT ACTION

FS 12/13-145/APC/EC   **YEAR-END REPORT – ACADEMIC POLICIES COMMITTEE**

The Faculty Senate receives the year-end report from Academic Policies Committee and thanks and commends the Committee and its Chair for their work.   Attachment: FS 12/13-145

FS 12/13-146/CPC/EC   **YEAR-END REPORT – CURRICULUM POLICIES COMMITTEE**

The Faculty Senate receives the year-end report from Curriculum Policies Committee and thanks and commends the Committee and its Chair for their work.   Attachment: FS 12/13-146

FS 12/13-147/FPC/EC   **YEAR-END REPORT – FACULTY POLICIES COMMITTEE**

The Faculty Senate receives the year-end report from Faculty Policies Committee and thanks and commends the Committee and its Chair for their work.   Attachment: FS 12/13-147

FS 12/13-148/GE/GRPC/EC   **YEAR-END REPORT – GENERAL EDUCATION / GRADUATION REQUIREMENT POLICIES COMMITTEE**

The Faculty Senate receives the year-end report from General Education/Graduation Requirement Policies Committee and thanks and commends the Committee and its Chair for their work.
Attachment: FS 12/13-148

FS 12/13-149/GSPC/EC   **YEAR-END REPORT – GRADUATE STUDIES POLICIES COMMITTEE**

The Faculty Senate receives the year-end report from Graduate Studies Policies Committee and thanks and commends the Committee and its Chair for their work.   Attachment: FS 12/13-149

FS 12/13-150/CC   COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS - SENATE

The Faculty Senate recommends appointment of the following faculty members to the committees listed below:

Academic Policies Committee (APC) – Term 2013-2016
- Ann Bradley, Library
- Milica Markovic, Electrical and Electronic Engineering (ECS)
- Todd Migliaccio, Sociology (SSIS)

Curriculum Policies Committee (CPC) – Term 2013-2016
- Brett Holland, Biological Science (NSM)
- Vera Margoniner, Physics & Astronomy (NSM)
- Dan Melzer, English (A &L)
- Liam Murphy, Anthropology (SSIS)

Faculty Policies Committee (FPC) – Term 2013-2016
- Sue Holl, Mechanical Engineering (ECS)
- Rodney McCurdy, Kinesiology & Health Science (HHS)
- Adam Rechs, Biological Science (NSM)
- Hakan Ozcelik, Marketing (CBA)
- Sylvester Bowie, Social Work (HHS)
- Donald Grushkin, Special Education, Rehabilitation, School Psychology, and Deaf Studies (EDUC)

General Education/Graduation Requirements Policies Committee (GE/GRPC) – Term 2013-2016
- Jeff Niu, Management (CBA)
- Mitch Numark, History (A&L)
- Tanya Altman, Nursing (HHS)

Graduate Studies Policies Committee (GSPC) – Term 2013-2016
- Jonathan Kaplan, Economics (SSIS)
- Rob Wassmer, Public Policy and Administration (SSIS)
- Julian Heather, English (A&L)
- Tracy Hamilton, Mathematics and Statistics (NSM)

Committee on Diversity and Equity (CODE) – Term 2013-2016
- Nassrine Noureddine, Nursing (HHS)
- Marlyn Jones, Criminal Justice (HHS)

Faculty Endowment for Student Scholarship – Term 2013-2016
- Jeffrey Wilson, History (A&L)

John C. Livingston Annual Faculty Lecture Committee – Term 2013-2016
- Katherine Kelly, Nursing (HHS)

FS 12/13-155/EX   PROVOST SEARCH COMMITTEE

The Faculty Senate endorses the following faculty members for consideration by the President as members of the Provost Search Committee, in accordance with the Faculty Consultation with the President on the Appointment of Administrators policy (http://www.csus.edu/umanual/hr/UMF04425.htm). Specifically, the Faculty Senate recommends inclusion of Chair Hecsh on the Committee and sufficient additional faculty members to make up the majority of the voting members of the Committee. In order to avoid double representation from a single college, per the policy, where there is more than one member from the same college the President is requested to choose from among the faculty members nominated.

College	Name	Dept/Unit
A&L	Glade, Fiona	English
A&L	Miller, Christine	Communication Studies
CBA	Alvayay, Jaime	Finance
EDU	Hecsh, Janet	Teacher Education
ECS	Marbach, Tim	Mechanical Engineering
HHS	Jones, Marlyn	Criminal Justice
HHS	Kennedy, Robin	Social Work
HHS	Pinch, Kath	Recreation, Parks & Tourism Administration
LIB	Peigahi, Reza	Library
NSM	Taylor, Chris	Physics and Astronomy
SSIS	Chirapravati, Pat	Asian Studies Program
SSIS	Lang, David	Liberal Studies Program and Social Science Program
SSIS	Shen, Dong	Family and Consumer Sciences
SSIS	Sturtz Sreetharan, Cindy	Anthropology

FS 12/13-151/EX   FIRST READING ITEMS, REFERRAL TO THE 2013-2014 FACULTY SENATE EXECTIVE COMMITTEE FOR SCHEDULING IN FALL 2013

The Faculty Senate refers the following items of business to the 2013-2014 Executive Committee for placement on a future Faculty Senate agenda.

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

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

FS 12/13-108/CPC/EX   E-LEARNING POLICY, AMENDMENT OF PM 95-01; FS 01-23; FS 09-78 (FSD00010.htm)

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

FS 12/13-152/EX   COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT – UNIVERSITY GRADE APPEAL PROCEDURAL APPEALS BOARD

The Faculty Senate recommends the appointment of Miles Roberts (Geography) to the Grade Appeal Procedural Appeals Board. Term: 2013-2016

The Faculty Senate recommends approval of the following program proposal for the 2013-2014 admissions cycle only.

College of Health and Human Services
BS in Speech Pathology (2nd Bachelor)   Attachment: FS 12/13-154

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.~~

FS 12/13-153/APC/EX   <u>BIOLOGY PRE-MAJOR PROGRESS POLICY, PILOT STUDY, ESTABLISHMENT OF</u>

The Faculty Senate recommends the establishment of a pilot study to assess the creation of a policy for evaluating progress in the Biology pre-major that will occur immediately upon passage of this bill. The policy will be evaluated after three years to determine impact on both the department and students. Each year, the Biology department will submit to APC a summary of their use of the pilot study.

Rationale:

Concerns over student graduation and retention rates have lead to questions of progress in the degree in general. Progress in the major has been a part of this discussion to assist students to graduate, which involves intrusive advising. This policy allows the department of Biology to give more intrusive advising and guidance to students when they are not progressing in the major.

With the limitation of resources throughout the university, especially with the recent rise of impacted programs, programs, in an effort to avoid impaction (or to protect the limited resources they have after declaring impaction), need to be more aware of the use of the resources. Students who are in a major (or pre-major) but who are not progressing in the program are using resources that could be benefit students who are interested in completing a program.

At present time, Biology is the department that has been most affected by this issue, but with the number of impacted programs growing, this may expand to other departments. This pilot policy would allow us to study the impact such a policy would have on students and departments as well as how to implement the policy throughout the university, or if it is even feasible to do so.

Background Attachment: FS 12/13-153a
Procedures Attachment: FS 12/13-153b

Pilot Study Information:

The Department of Biology defines progress in the major as being regularly enrolled in courses defined as part of the pre-major, as identified below:

A degree in the Biological Sciences requires the following lower division courses:

BIO 1, BIO 2, CHEM 1A, CHEM 1B, CHEM 20 (or 24), PHYS 5A, PHYS 5B, MATH 26A, and STAT 1; some concentrations have additional requirements

Students cannot readily enter all of these classes; most have a math requirement and/or a diagnostic that determines entry. The only "true" introductory course is BIO 1.

Viewing these introductory courses as "stages", depending on student readiness, one could determine progress in the major by ensuring students are moving through the various stages of preparation, as described below.

THUS, to progress in the major, students would be expected to make minimal movement (taking one of these courses at least once a year) through the stages of the pre-major as follows (highlighted courses are part of the pre-major):

Stage 1	Stage 2	Stage 3	Stage 4
BIO 1	CHEM 1A (or CHEM 4 if they fail diagnostic)	BIO 2 (pre-req. CHEM 1A) CHEM 1A or CHEM 1B	Apply to major
Preparatory Math if needed otherwise Stat 1 or Math 26A	STAT 1 or MATH 26 Or PHYS 5A	Remaining Math or PHYS 5A or 5B (both are required)	

In the above description, Stage 1 is true introduction; Stage 2 requires more math readiness; Stage 3 includes pre-requisite courses that are in the earlier stages.

Students who consistently do not make progress in the major (pre-major), will have their status changed to "Undeclared." To determine this, the Department of Biology will follow explicit procedures before changing the status of a student. A student can return to the Biology pre-major after showing progress in the major.

REGULAR AGENDA

FS 12/13-144/FL   **MINUTES** – MAY 9, 2013

SECOND READING (OLD 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.

Background: FS 12/13-78a
Proposed Amendment: FS 12/13-78b

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.

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

Background Information: FS 12/13-128a
Program Review Manual: FS 12/13-128b
Proposed Substitute Amendment: FS 12/13-128c

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.

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.

Background Information: FS 12/13-142a
Proposed Amendment: FS 12/13-142b

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.

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 of Academic Affairs.

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
Proposed Amendment: FS 12/13-126b

III.   RESPONSIBILITIES OF STUDENTS

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

1. Reading the catalog in order to be aware of University, College, and department/area academic policies, regulations, and deadlines.
2. Complying with University, College, and department/area academic policies, regulations, and deadlines.
3. Meeting regularly with an advisor in their academic department/area and with a General Education advisor.
4. 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.**
5. Understanding academic performance standards for the University and their major.
6. Understanding requirements to maintain good standing and the consequences for failure to do so.
7. 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:
   a.   Required advising meetings with program advisors.
   b.   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).
   c.   Consequences of failure to comply with mandatory advising requirements (e.g., setting advising holds for students who have not met with advisors).

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

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

4. Providing advising for all undeclared students on probation.

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

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

7. 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.

8. **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:
1. Establishing advising goals which will guide the program's advising efforts.
2. Developing an academic advising plan which, at a minimum, informs students of the following:
    a. Required advising meetings with program advisors at least once a year.
    b. 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).
    c. Consequences of failure to comply with mandatory advising requirements (e.g., setting advising holds for students who have not met with advisors).
    d. Provisions that are in place for advising evening students, graduate students, and students studying at off-campus sites, if applicable.
3. Devising a means of implementing and coordinating the program's advising policy and procedures, including, but not limited to:
4. Identifying faculty and staff who will be responsible for advising students in their major/program.
5. Organizing training activities for program advisors.
6. Providing advisors with advising materials.
7. Keeping advisors apprised of changes in requirements and availability of campus resources.
    a. Setting and removing advising holds for students who have not met with advisors, in programs with such a policy.
8. 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
Proposed Amendment: FS 12/13-127b

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.

NEXT SENATE MEETING: May 23 (if needed)