

1988-89  
ACADEMIC SENATE  
California State University, Sacramento

AGENDA

Thursday, December 8, 1988  
2:30 p.m.  
Senate Chambers, University Union

**INFORMATION**

1. Reorganization Issues in Student Affairs

The administration has requested the opportunity to inform and obtain input from the Senate on reorganization issues in Student Affairs related to the coordination of educational support services in Student Affairs with programs in Academic Affairs. Up to 30 minutes of the meeting time may be devoted to this topic.

2. Mark your calendars for 1989:

January 26	Special Meeting--Senate Structure and Function
February 9	Regular Meeting
March 9	Regular Meeting
March 16	Special Meeting
April 13	Regular Meeting
April 20	Nominations, 1989-90 Academic Senate
May 4	Election, 1989-90 Academic Senate
	Special Meeting, 1988-89 Senate--G.E. Review
May 11	Regular Meeting
May 18	Special Meeting

**CONSENT CALENDAR**

AS 88-126/Ex. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS

Academic Policies Committee: JOHN HEATH, Professional Services, 1991 (repl. A. Malveaux)

Fiscal Affairs Committee: JEFFREY CLARK, Professional Services, 1990 (repl. A. Malveaux)

Council for University Planning:  
ANNE-LOUISE RADIMSKY, At-large, 1990

Student Academic Development, ad hoc Committee:  
EUGENE SHOEMAKER

University Patent Policy Committee:  
COLETTE COLEMAN, At-large, 1991  
JAMES RITCHIE, At-large, 1992

AS 88-127/CC, GPPC, EX. CURRICULUM REVIEW--DIVISION OF SOCIAL WORK

The Academic Senate recommends that:

1. the Master of Social Work degree program be approved for another five years or until the next program review with the stipulation that the Division of Social Work provide a report to the Academic Senate on the results of the visit of the accrediting team in Spring 1989.
2. the Bachelor of Arts degree program in Social Work be approved for another five years or until the next program review.
3. the Minor in Social Work be approved for another five years or until the next program review.

[For "Commendations and Recommendations," refer to Attachment G; the complete Academic Program Review is available for review in the Academic Senate Office, Adm. 264.]

AS 88-128/CC, FISA, Ex. PROGRAM CHANGE--COMMUNICATION STUDIES

The Academic Senate recommends approval of the addition of electives to the Media Concentration in the Broadcast News Area of Study, as follows:

In the Broadcast News Area of Study electives, add:

- Communication Studies 140, Critical Analysis of Social Issues OR
- Communication Studies 141, Theories of Criticism
- and
- Communication Studies 170, Data Analysis in Communication Research OR
- Communication Studies 171, Survey Methods in Communication Research OR
- Communication Studies 172, Content Analysis

[Fiscal Affairs Committee report: "addition of existing courses to the electives list holds no substantive resource implications for Communications Studies."]

AS 88-129/GPPC, FISA, Ex. PROGRAM CHANGE--HISTORY MAJOR: PUBLIC HISTORY OPTION

The Academic Senate recommends approval of the revision of the Public History Option of the History major subject to approval of the four new courses proposed for inclusion in the program (Attachment A).

AS 88-130/Ex. INDIRECT COSTS AND SERVICES CHARGES, HORNET FOUNDATION POLICY ON

The Academic Senate acknowledges receipt of the revised Hornet Foundation Policy on Indirect Costs and Service Charges recommended by the Hornet Foundation Advisory Group and approved by the President (Attachment B).

AS 88-131/FisA, Ex. LOTTERY REVENUE BUDGET 1988-89

The Academic Senate adopts the Report of the Fiscal Affairs Committee on the Lottery Revenue Budget 1988-89 and recommendations for revision of future lottery budgets (Attachment C).

## CONSENT - INFORMATION

AS 88-123/Ex. HONORARY DEGREE 1988-89

The Executive Committee, on behalf of the Academic Senate, recommends that CSU, Sacramento not participate in awarding an honorary degree this year due to the unreasonable deadline (December 1, 1988) set by the Chancellor's Office. The Executive Committee also requests that the President express to the Chancellor's Office their objection regarding such a short time-line, which prevents the consultative process necessary for gathering nominations.

AS 88-124/FPDC, Ex. FACULTY RESOURCE CENTER

The Executive Committee, on behalf of the Academic Senate, adopts the report and recommendations of the "Faculty Professional Development Committee Recommendations: Faculty Resource Center and Center Director" (Attachment D).

## REGULAR AGENDA

AS 88-125/Flr. MINUTES

Approval of Minutes of the regular meeting of October 13, 1988.

[For items AS 88-119A through AS 88-119D, refer to the Attachment to the November 17, 1988, Academic Senate Agenda]

AS 88-119A/Flr LIBRARY

*Carried* The Academic Senate *supports the Library action to centralize* recommends that the periodical collection be centralized on the fourth floor of the Library.

*Carried*

AS 88-119B/Flr. LIBRARY

*supports the Library*

The Academic Senate recommends that the unbound periodical collection be shelved separately from the bound.

*Defected*

AS 88-119C/Flr. LIBRARY

The Academic Senate recommends that the Library periodical collection be cataloged and classified according to the Library of Congress classification system.

AS 88-119D LIBRARY

The Academic Senate recommends that the appropriate funding at the University level be made available for cataloging the periodical collection by Library of Congress numbers.

AS 88-132/Ex. PLAGIARISM (POLICY ON ADVERTISEMENTS CONCERNING PREPARATION, SALE AND DISTRIBUTION OF TERM PAPERS, THESES, OR OTHER WRITTEN MATERIAL)

Whereas, The Academic Senate considers the submission of term papers or other written material based, in whole or in part, on ready-made papers or written materials purchased from companies or individuals that market such materials under the guise of "editorial assistance" or "research, editing and writing services" to be a form of plagiarism, and

Whereas, The Academic Senate considers plagiarism an unconscionable act of contempt for the values of the academy, and

Whereas, Plagiarism is cause for disciplinary action, including expulsion, under the provisions of Article 1.1, Title 5, Section 41301 of the California Administrative Code, and

Whereas, The Donahoe Higher Education Act (Section 40) of the California Education Code, Chapter 6, Section 66401 (operative April 30, 1977) provides that "No person shall make or disseminate, with the intent to induce any other person to enter into any obligation relating thereto, any statement, written or oral, that he will prepare, cause to be prepared, sell, or otherwise distribute any term paper, thesis, dissertation, or other written material, for a fee or other compensation, for or on behalf of any person who has been assigned the written preparation of such term paper, thesis, dissertation, or other written material for academic credit at any public or private college, university, or other institution of higher learning in this state." and

Whereas, The following which advertisement which appeared in Volume 44, Number 20 edition of The Hornet (November 11, 1988):

"Research, Editing, Writing Services. Article, paper, thesis assistance. Editing. All subjects. Qualified writers. Resumes. Work guaranteed. File copies. Berkeley Communications. Highest quality,"

and others like it that have appeared in other editions of The Hornet and bulletin boards on campus, are in direct violation of the referenced provision of the Donahoe Higher Education Act, and

Whereas, The Donahoe Higher Education Act (Section 40) of the California Education Code, Chapter 6, Section 66403 provides that:

"Actions for injunction under provisions of this chapter may be brought in the name of the people of the State of California upon their own complaint or upon the complaint of any person, or in the name of any public or private college, university, or other institution of higher learning acting for the interest of itself, its students, or the general public," and

Whereas, The Academic Senate has been informed that at least one case has been prosecuted successfully under applicable provisions of the Donahoe Higher Education Act, therefore be it

Resolved, The Academic Senate recommends the following University policy on advertisements concerning preparation, sale, and distribution of term papers, theses or other written material:

**Policy on advertisements concerning preparation, sale and distribution of term papers, theses, or other written material.**

A. The submission of term papers or other written material based, in whole, or in part, on ready-made papers or written materials purchased from companies or individuals that market such materials constitutes plagiarism, and is, therefore, cause for disciplinary action, including expulsion, under the provisions of Article 1.1, Title 5, Section 41301 of the California Administrative Code.

B. Placement of advertisements pertaining to the preparation, sale, or distribution of any term paper, thesis, dissertation, or other written material is in violation of the Donahoe Higher Education Act (Section 40) of the California Education Code, Chapter 6, and shall be prohibited on the CSUS campus. This

prohibition shall extend to The Hornet newspaper, all other campus publications, and campus bulletin boards.

C. Notice shall be placed on each campus kiosk and major campus bulletin boards citing Section 40, Chapter 6, Section 66401 of the Donahoe Higher Education Act and warning that the University may seek legal action against offenders under Chapter 6, Section 66403.

D. At least once per semester, the University shall cause to be published in The Hornet newspaper, part A of this policy statement.

E. If, despite the University's effort to implement this policy, ads are placed in The Hornet newspaper, other University publications or on bulletin boards, the University shall advise those responsible that the act constitutes a violation of University policy and California Statute, and shall, if necessary, bring action for injunction in order to enforce these provisions.

AS 88-133/Ex. ATHLETIC DIRECTOR, SEARCH COMMITTEE

The Academic Senate recommends that the Athletic Director Search Committee comprise the following:

- Vice President, Academic Affairs, Chair
- Two faculty appointed by the Academic Senate
- One coach selected by coaches
- Chair of Athletic Advisory Board or his designee from among faculty A.A.B. members
- Staff member selected by Athletics staff
- One student recommended by A.S.I. from nominees selected by student athletes
- One community representative selected by the President

The Academic Senate further recommends that ROSE LEIGH VINES and ORIE A. BROWN be appointed to the at-large faculty positions provided above.

AS 88-134/FPDC, Ex. FACULTY PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM--  
ASSIGNED TIME REIMBURSEMENT

The Academic Senate adopts the following resolution recommended by the Faculty Professional Development Committee and amended by the Executive Committee (strikeover/underline), and notes the concerns raised by the Research and Scholarly Activity Committee in a memorandum from RSA Chair Gelus (Attachment E):

Whereas, The intention of the University's Faculty Professional Development Program is to make resources available to all faculty members in order to improve

individual capacities and contributions to the University's academic programs; and

Whereas, The policy for reimbursement to schools, divisions and departments for the grants for assigned time which are funded from the University budget, from lottery funds and from other sources may not fully cover replacement costs for faculty; and

Whereas, Schools, divisions and departments must often supplement the reimbursement from the University to pay for replacement costs for faculty who receive assigned time grants; therefore be it

Resolved, That the Academic Senate recommends that the University administration, in consultation with the schools, ~~divisions and departments,~~ develop a reimbursement formula to determine actual replacement costs, for each school, the average costs for replacing faculty members who receive assigned time grants in order to participate in (from the University's Faculty Professional Development Program) with part-time faculty, for the purpose of providing appropriate levels of reimbursement.

AS 88-135A/Fisa, Ex. SABBATICAL LEAVES

The Academic Senate adopts the November 14, 1988, report of the Fiscal Affairs Committee on Sabbatical Leaves (refer to Attachments F-1 through F-3).

TIME CERTAIN: 3:30 p.m., Fiscal Affairs Committee

AS 88-135B/Ex. SABBATICAL LEAVES

The Academic Senate refers to the Faculty Affairs Committee the Fiscal Affairs Committee's report on sabbatical leaves and asks that the campus policy/procedures for sabbatical leaves be reviewed in light of the report with specific attention to 1) whether the policy should be revised to improve the chances of faculty with fewer years (more than seven, less than twelve) accrued service to receive leaves, and 2) whether previous release time should be considered in making recommendations for sabbatical leaves.

(Form B)

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO  
PROGRAM CHANGE PROPOSAL

Academic Unit: History Date of Submission  
to School Dean: February 26, 1988

Requested Effective Fall X Spring     , 1989

Type of Program Change: \_\_\_\_\_ Required forms attached: \_\_\_\_\_

- Modification in Existing Program
  - Substantive Change  Form C
  - Non Substantive Change  no form required
- Deletion of Existing Program  Form D
- Initiation (Projection)  Form E
  - of New Program
- Implementation of New Program  Form F
- Addition of New Minor, Concentration, Option,  
Specialization, Emphasis  Form G
- Addition of New Certificate  Form H  
Program

Briefly describe the change requested and the justification for the change: The change establishes a 36 unit option in Public History for the Masters degree. It includes the M.A. core (History 201, 202, 290 = 9 units), four new seminars (History 282A, B, C and 283 = 12 units), two internships (History 295 and 297 = 12 units), and a thesis or project (501 or 502 = 3 units). The new program will provide professional training in course work and internships in one of three areas of concentration: public sector research and analysis, archives and manuscripts, and oral history. The program qualifies graduates for a wide variety of jobs in public and private employment requiring research and archival skills.

Transaction:

School Review Completed (date): 9-20-88  
University Review Completed (date): \_\_\_\_\_  
Chancellor's Review Completed (date): \_\_\_\_\_

Approvals:

Department Chair: Jean Brown Date: 2-26-88  
School Dean: [Signature] Date: 9-23-88  
Associate Vice President-Curriculum: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_



## Procedures for Submitting Substantive Program Change Proposals

Substantive program changes are those that involve one or more of the following: 1) increase or decrease the number of units in the major or the degree program; 2) carry a programmatic or fiscal impact on another academic unit's offerings; 3) change substantially the character or the purpose of the program; 4) require additional resources to implement; 5) are judged to be substantive changes by school/university review bodies or appropriate administrator.

Substantive program change proposals are to follow the format below, and are to be attached to the completed Form B. Submit fifteen copies of the proposal to the Associate Vice President for Program Development and Evaluation, Adm. 234.

1. Name of academic unit submitting proposal.

Department of History

2. Full title of degree program to be changed:

Master of Arts in History, Public History Option

3. Purpose of the change:

To develop a professional school structure for the program, with specialization in three areas of public history.

4. Need for the change:

The change will improve the quality of training in the program, with three primary results: (1) the program will attract more students, permitting a selective admission policy; (2) the improved program will offer a more thorough professional training in the areas of specialization; (3) program graduates will be better prepared to fill available openings in a highly competitive area of employment.

5. Indicate programmatic or fiscal impact which this change will have on other academic units' programs, and describe the consultation that has occurred with affected units.

There will be no fiscal impact on other departments. No consultation was required.

6. List side by side the old program requirements as presented and the new ones as they will be presented in the University Catalog.

7. Indicate according to the questions below the resources needed to implement the program change.

- a. Complete the following table for each course added, deleted, modified or otherwise affected. Provide an estimate of the number of sections per semester to be added or deleted, average enrollment per section, change in staffing requirements (increase or decrease in scheduled wtu's), and gain or loss of FTE.

Course Sections Added (+) Sections Deleted (-)		Enrollment per Section		Staffing			
F	S	F	S	+/- wtu's		+/- FTE	
				F	S	F	S
	-282		(-6)		-3		-1.
+282A		10		+3		+2	
	+282B		10		+3		+2
+282C		10		+3		+2	
	+283		10		+3		+2
	+297		10	0 (carried as an overload)			+2
	+500/502		10	0 (carried as an overload)			+2

- b. How will the above changes in FTE and wtu's be accommodated?

Over a two-year period the increase will be +9 wtu's or .6 of a position. We will request additional allocation from Arts and Sciences to cover these courses. If there is no increase, the department will try for a limited time to absorb the units.

**NOTE:** If the program enrolls less than 10, the new students can be accommodated in our current core courses: History 201, 202, 290. When the program reaches a maximum, it would be necessary to occasionally add additional sections of these core courses. This could be done on a temporary basis by reducing the frequency of some upper division classes. However, once the program has stabilized at maximum, additional units would probably be needed to staff additional sections of the core courses. The enrollment history for these courses for a five year period follows:

Semester No.	Title	Enrollment	wtu's	FTE
F83	201 Seminar in Historiography	10	3	
F84		17	3	
F85		15	3	3.
F86		10	3	2.
F87		9	3	1.
S83	202 Contemporary Theory and Practice			
S84				
S85		12	3	2.
S86		7	3	1.
S87		10	3	2.
F83	290 Research Seminar in History	6	3	1.
S84		9	3	1.
F85		11	3	2.
F86		9	3	1.
F87		9	3	1.

We also assume students might enter the Public History Option instead of the Standard Option. It is therefore difficult to estimate what our net gain would be.

- c. What additional space, equipment, operating expenses, library, computer, or media resources, clerical/technical support, or other resources will be needed? Estimate the cost and indicate how these resource needs will be accommodated.

Public History Director 3 units/semester  
 To be funded by an additional Arts and Sciences allocation (requested Fall 1987) or from the department allocation.

Student Assistant 10 hrs/wk x 30 wks x \$5./hr = \$1,500/yr

To be funded by an additional student assistant request to Arts and Sciences of \$750. The department will cover the rest from concurrent enrollment money.

Office

The department is negotiating with the Center for California Studies for office space in the Goethe House.

Equipment

Computer: The Director has applied for matching funds to purchase a computer.

Typewriter: The department will furnish a typewriter.

Desks, chairs: From office stores

Supplies

The department will furnish supplies from concurrent enrollment money.

**NOTE:** For the Spring 1988 semester, the Director received a grant of \$2,900 from the Academic Senate for travel, student assistants, and the development of a brochure. The department has requested \$2,500 for the brochure and \$750 in student assistants for the 1988-89 academic year.

FISCAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE  
 FISCAL IMPACT EVALUATION  
 M.A. IN HISTORY, PUBLIC HISTORY OPTION

The Department of History proposes a restructuring of the current 30 unit Public History Option. The change would establish a 36 unit option for the M.A. A comparison of the current and proposed programs yields the following results:

- Core requirements and courses (9 units) remain the same
- "Other" required courses are changed substantially, including 4 new 3-unit courses (12 units).
- The internship requirement is changed substantially, from 3 units to 12 units.
- The culminating requirement remains the same.
- Total units change from 30 to 36.

The Department plans to offer the new program on a two-year cycle, working with a cadre of 15 full-time students through completion before a new group begins. The Department hopes to recruit new students to the program; however, existing students may choose the Public History Option rather than the Standard Option.

The Department requests additional resources from A&S in support of the changed program.

Analysis of Resource Needs

Core classes (201, 202, 290): The history core classes, offered once per year, have class size limits of 15. Enrollment data from spring and fall 1988 indicate that these classes are near maximum in enrollment. Should the revised Public History Option actually attract new students to the core, the Department may need to schedule additional sections of core classes.

WTU's Added/Deleted Over Two-year Cycle:

FALL	SP	FALL	SP
+282A (+3)	-282 (-3)		-282 (-3)
	+282 B (+3)	+282 C (+3)	+283 (+3)
	+295* (+7.2)		+297** (+6)
			+500/502*** (+4.8)
+3	+7.2	+3	+10.8
+12 wtu avg per year			
.5 FTEF avg per year			

October 17, 1988

- \* Internship for 15 students
- \*\* Internship for 12 students
- \*\*\* Thesis/Project for 10 students

Program Support: In addition to the half position needed to support the program change, the Department requests the following resources:

- Public History Director: 6 wtu's assigned time per year
- Student Assistant: \$1500 per year (\$750 in additional funds requested)
- Office & Equipment: Office space and general issue office furniture needed; funds to purchase a computer needed; office supplies to be covered by existing Department resources.
- Brochure: \$2500 requested in 88-89 AY

#### Summary and Conclusion

The revised Public History Option will need increased faculty support--a predictable average increase of 18 wtu's per year. If the revised program attracts new students, additional sections of core classes may be required. Space, equipment, student assistant funds, and support for a brochure also are requested. The revised program would serve 15 students in a two-year program of 36 units, an average of 18 FTES per year. The Department is requesting additional support from A&S for the revised program. There is no indication whether A&S will provide the needed support from its existing allocation. The Fiscal Affairs Committee recommends that A&S comment on the resource implications of this proposal.

10/18/88 - Approved by the Fiscal Affairs Committee

California State University  
Sacramento



Attachment B  
Academic Senate Agenda  
December 8, 1988

November 8, 1988

California State University Sacramento  
6000 J Street  
Sacramento, California 95819

NOV 8 1988

Academic Senate Received  
413

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Council of Deans

FROM: Donald R. Gerth *DRG*

Last March I asked five of our colleagues: Dr. Richard Dickinson Chair--Hornet Foundation Board, Dean Donald Gillott, Vice President Robert Jones, Dean William Sullivan, and Dean Arthur Williamson to serve as an ad hoc group to advise both Mr. Bills (as the new Executive Director) and me about "relationships between the Hornet Foundation and University programs." One of their specific tasks has been to look at service charges for accounts, and another has been to address indirect costs.

With the active cooperation of Mr. Bills, and then an action of the Hornet Foundation Board on September 26, this has been accomplished. Dr. Dickinson's statement describing this is attached. I am approving it. I should note that the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate asked for the opportunity for the chair of the Research Committee to review this, and she did so.

Mr. Bills is implementing this new service charge policy retroactive to July 1, 1988, and is notifying both current users and the campus at large.

Dr. Dickinson has, incidentally, prepared an agenda for the ad hoc group which he chairs. The group will complete this agenda, and they will have completed their work.

DRG/hd

Attachment

cc: Mr. Charles Bills  
Dr. Richard Dickinson  
Dr. Arnold Golub



# California State University, Sacramento

6000 J STREET, SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95819-2694

24 October 1988

## MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

TO: Donald R. Gerth

SUBJECT: Hornet Foundation Advisory Group,  
Recommendation on Indirect Cost Rates

ENCLOSURE: Hornet Foundation Policy on Indirect Costs and Service Charges

At its meeting on 19 October 1988, the HFAG reviewed the HF policy (enclosed). The HFAG's response to the overall policy is that it appears reasonable as written, but should be reviewed annually by the HF Board of Directors, as the Foundation policy now requires.

The most recent policy change (affecting revenue, agency and trust accounts) will result in a 10 percent indirect cost/service charge being levied only against the following transactions: salaries, benefits, consulting, and travel. An indirect cost charge is applied to a revenue account, whereas a service charge is applied to an agency or trust account. The revision not only will result in a lower overall charge against an account, but it also is much simpler to understand. This change was approved by the HF Board of Directors on 26 September 1988, and awaits your review and approval. The HFAG supported this revision.

Much of the meeting was spent on how best to communicate with campus groups about the value of the Hornet Foundation and its services, and the distribution of recovered but unallocated indirect cost charges. This discussion will be continued at the next meeting.

The HFAG agreed to meet on a regular basis in an expeditious attempt to bring its agenda to closure. I shall keep you informed of our progress.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Dickinson".

Richard L. Dickinson

Enclosure

cc: Advisory Group  
Robert O. Bess  
Charles O. Bills  
Mernoy E. Harrison

Telephone-- O: 916-929-6633  
H: 916-944-1889  
Voice Mail: 916-278-6245  
Ext: 1000  
Password: 2787

8 1024  
HF



## Hornet Foundation

### POLICY ON INDIRECT COSTS AND SERVICE CHARGES

#### I. DEFINITIONS

- A. Indirect Costs are costs that are not readily identifiable as a direct expense of a particular externally sponsored research, training, or educational project. Indirect costs normally are charged on sponsored awards and on revenue accounts.
- B. Indirect Cost Rates are determined in accordance with Federal OMB Circular A-21 in negotiation with an identified cognizant agency, for Foundation the Department of Health and Human Services. The Foundation Board of Directors may define the lower limits of acceptable indirect cost rates. Indirect cost rates normally are expressed either as a percentage of direct costs (%TDC), as a percentage of modified direct costs (\$MTDC), or as a percentage of direct cost salaries and wages (%S&W). 8%
- C. Unclaimed Indirect Costs are those portions of authorized indirect cost recoveries which Foundation does not claim either because of funding agency restrictions in indirect cost recovery rates, as with Federal training and equipment grants, or because of voluntary Foundation acceptance of rates below the authorized rates.
- D. Cost Sharing with regard to indirect costs includes both actual cash and in-kind commitments made from indirect costs actually recovered and from unclaimed indirect costs.
- E. Service Charges are similar to indirect costs, and are similarly defined in terms of percentage of total direct costs. They are levied on investment earnings from endowment, memorial, loan and scholarship funds, and on agency or trust funds administered through Foundation.

#### II. GENERAL POLICY

The policy of the Foundation is to seek the full authorized federally negotiated indirect cost rate on all projects subject to that rate, and to seek the full authorized Foundation indirect cost recovery rate on all projects not subject to the federally negotiated rate. The policy of the Foundation also is to seek to recover the full Board-authorized service charge rate on all projects and accounts to which it is applicable. Exceptions to this general policy shall occur only within the guidelines provided in Section IV, below.

Approved 5/16/83  
Revised 9/30/87  
Revised 9/26/88

### III. CURRENT RATES

- A. The current negotiated federal indirect cost rates for Foundation are as follows:

On Campus	Off Campus
46% S&W	27% S&W for projects beginning by June 30, 1983
44% S&W	22% S&W " " " " July 1, 1983 to June 30, 1984

- B. The Foundation Board Approved Indirect Cost Rate for all sponsored projects not subject to the federal negotiated rate is:

25%TDC.

Recovered indirect costs in excess of 25%TDC will be allocated to the University Program Center from which the project originated, with the allocation to be made following the official close of the project. All such allocated funds are exempted from further indirect cost or service charges.

- C. The Foundation Board Approved Indirect Cost Rate for all revenue accounts is:

10 percent of the dollar value of the following transactions: salaries, benefits, consulting, and travel.

- D. The Foundation Board Approved Service Charge rates are:

15 percent of investment income on endowments, memorial, loan and scholarship funds, and

10 percent of the dollar value of the following agency and trust fund transactions: salaries, benefits, consulting, and travel.

### IV. EXCEPTIONS TO GENERAL POLICY

- A. Indirect cost and service charge rates lower than those specified in Section III above shall be approved only in cases where the impact of such lower rates will not impair the fiscal viability of Foundation.
- B. Fiscal viability of Foundation shall be defined as recovery of indirect costs sufficient to fund:
1. Expenses incurred in support of the Foundation's externally funded projects [ref: Title 5, 42500(a)(7)]. They include, but are not limited to, expenditures for general management and administration, facilities management and administration, and project cost sharing and support.
  2. Specific reserves which are established for the support of externally funded projects. These include, but are not limited to, reserves for working capital, current operations, planned replacement, and planned future operations.

- C. With regard to sponsored projects, the Executive Director may approve acceptance of projects at indirect cost rates lower than the approved rates if:
1. Such rates do not fall below a rate calculated to permit at least a breakeven level for the expenses and reserves noted in IV, B1 and B2 above.
  2. Such rates yield a higher net return to Foundation than other available alternatives.
  3. A project provides direct cost budget line items for Foundation in sufficient amounts to compensate for the impact of a lower indirect cost rate.
  4. A project, which fulfills the missions and goals of the University, is limited by agency and statute restrictions, and is approved by Foundation and CSUS management. All such projects shall be reported as per item IV.G.
- D. With regard to revenue accounts, exceptions to the standard rate may be granted only by the Foundation Board of Directors.
- E. With regard to trust or agency accounts, exceptions to the standard rate may be granted only by the Foundation Board of Directors.
- G. The Executive Director shall be provided with, and shall provide to the Board, specific terms and justifications for the authorization of lower indirect cost rates or service charge rates for each revenue or agency account requesting such lower rates. All exceptions to the general policy shall be reported to the Board.

## V. USES OF INDIRECT COSTS

Indirect cost reimbursements received by the Foundation shall be used for the following purposes:

- A. Expenses incurred in support of the Foundation's externally funded projects (ref: Title 5, 42500(a)(7)). They include, but are not limited to, expenditures for general management and administration, facilities management and administration, and project cost sharing and support.
- B. Specific reserves which are established for the support of externally funded projects. These include, but are not limited to, reserves of the categories above which relate specifically to externally funded projects, as well as others unique to externally funded project operations such as reserves for disallowances or project development.

## VI. REVIEW

The Foundation Board of Directors shall review this policy annually.



# California State University, Sacramento

6000 J STREET, SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95819-2694

ACADEMIC SENATE



## M E M O R A N D U M

November 16, 1988

TO: Ray Geigle, Chair  
CSU Academic Senate

FROM: *Juanita Barrena*  
Juanita Barrena, Chair  
CSUS Academic Senate (916-278-6593)

SUBJECT: CSU Lottery Revenue Budget 1989-90--Recommendations

---

The CSUS Academic Senate's Fiscal Affairs Committee has reviewed the CSU Lottery Budget 1989-90. Their recommendations are attached. Because of the short timeline, the recommendations have not been brought to our Senate. They will be presented to the Senate at a later date, at which time I will let you know if there are any additional recommendations.

JB:jlm

Attachment

cc: Donald Gerth, President  
Mary W. Burger, Vice President for Academic Affairs  
Mernoy Harrison, Vice President for Finance



# California State University, Sacramento

6000 J STREET, SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95819-2694

## M E M O R A N D U M

November 16, 1988

TO: Juanita Barrena, Chair  
Academic Senate

FROM: Michael Lewis, Chair  
Fiscal Affairs Committee

SUBJECT: Lottery Revenue Budget 1989-90/Recommendations

The Fiscal Affairs Committee has completed its deliberations on the document, Lottery Revenue Budget 1988-89. We have consulted with faculty and campus administrators, including members of the Lottery Fund Allocation Committee (LFAC). Our recommendations are as follows:

1. Decrease amount dedicated to endowment. Over time, lottery revenue has proved a relatively stable source of funding. It is doubtful that sizeable endowments are necessary to provide stability to activities funded through the lottery. Over time, a growing endowment might confound efforts to secure increased levels of State support.
2. Adjust base amount allocated to the endowment account of each campus. The desire to provide a base amount to smaller campuses is understandable. However, the base amount presently is too high, unfairly impacting large campuses.
3. Evaluate timelines and consider a two-year planning horizon for lottery activities. The 1988-89 budget timeline is a significant improvement over previous years. Campus committees must receive a broad budget outline in January if planning is to be thoughtful and meaningful. Moving to a two-year cycle for determining broad budget categories would provide needed stability for campus efforts to plan for the use of lottery funds.

November 16, 1988

4. Increase discretionary funds available to campuses. In 1988-89, the CSUS discretionary account is smaller than its account for campus-based programs. These funds represent a major source of funds to support enhancement activities that meet the unique needs of this campus. One faculty member judged the current difference in support "insulting".
5. Describe a consultation process for determining University initiatives and a procedure for evaluating effectiveness. Faculty do not doubt the importance of the Fine Arts Initiative and the Forgivable Loan Program. However, they question the process through which these efforts became "initiatives". What process led to the decision to tie some campuses more closely to the Fine Arts Initiative? Faculty agree that an open request for proposal (RFP) process should be used when individual campuses are to be selected as lead campuses with regard to an initiative.
6. Revise substantially the guidelines for campus-based programs. Faculty believe that there are too many campus-based programs; that their definition is too specific and restrictive; that the consultation process leading to the designation of a "campus-based program" is unclear; that specific programs and procedures are being required of campuses without appeal to a research base speaking to effectiveness.

Subrecommendations re: Campus-Based Programs:

- a) Increase or eliminate the limit on transfer of funds among categories of campus-based programs.
- b) Structure campus-based programs as priority statements requiring some response from campuses. Such priority statements should not be accompanied by specific plans/programs unless supported by a well-defined body of research.
- c) Describe a broad and meaningful system-wide consultation process that would feed into the decision to designate programs or efforts "campus-based". (Note: There also is considerable sentiment among faculty to eliminate any system-wide determination of campus-based programs, deferring decisions on the best use of funds to individual campuses.)

Memo re: Lottery Revenue . 3  
Budget 1989-90/Recommendations

November 16, 1988

7. Allow unexpended funds at the end of the fiscal year to be carried over in the discretionary account, rather than adding to endowments (refer to recommendations 1 and 3).
8. Eliminate maintenance item from continuing commitments. Faculty agree with the stated intention to eliminate this item from future budgets; they believe it is an inappropriate use of lottery funds.

These are our major findings and recommendations. I hope they are helpful to you and the Senate. Please call if you have any questions or concerns.

ML/jac

FPD COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS:

FACULTY RESOURCE CENTER AND CENTER DIRECTOR

---

I. Introduction: Rationale for Recommendations

The Faculty Professional Development Committee has been charged with defining the function of the Faculty Resource Center and the duties of its Director, and with providing continuing guidance for the Center.<sup>1</sup> When confronting the formidable number of complex issues involved in providing a blue-print for an effective Faculty Resource Center and an accurate job description for its Director, serious considerations appear. Any attempt to fill the position of Director for the Spring faces deadlines similar to those of the current PCP and Lottery programs. It is increasingly clear that the Director's job will be an enormous one, requiring a remarkable combination of talents and energies. In addition, writing an accurate and comprehensive job description in such a short amount of time is almost impossible, even if all other obstacles were negligible, which of course they aren't.

<sup>1</sup> "Faculty Professional Development: A CSUS Investment in Program Growth," endorsed by the Academic Senate and the President, Spring, 1988, p.5.



The necessity for care and precision in every step of the implementation of the various Faculty Professional Development programs extends to this Resource Center and its Director. We have been repeatedly cautioned about making sure that the Center responds to faculty needs, be faculty identified, and be free from any association with the RPT process of evaluation. There seems to be some danger in setting early precedents which are not well thought-out or in blundering, through haste, in a way that might jeopardize the future effectiveness of Director and Center. In light of these considerations, we make the following recommendations:

**II. Recommendations:**

1. A delay in the appointment of the Director of the Faculty Resource Center until the 1989-90 academic year.
2. The appointment of a Special Coordinator of Faculty Professional Development Activities for Spring 1989 to assess campus needs and to work with the FPD Committee to develop and articulate the scope and functions of the Faculty Resource Center and its future Director.
3. The phased-in establishment of the Faculty Resource Center beginning in Spring 1989. For Spring 1989 we recommend initial operational support for the Faculty Resource Center as follows:

--half-time clerical or student assistance; message machine; file cabinets; and postage and supplies (approximately \$1000).

This will not make the Center fully operational, but given the extent and number of faculty professional development activities on campus this spring, it will serve as a mechanism for clarifying current programs and organizing future activities.

4. The assignment of the following duties to the Special Coordinator of Faculty Professional Development:

--to work closely with the FPD Committee in clarifying and disseminating information about current faculty development activities on campus;

--to work closely with the FPD Committee to develop a description of the services, activities, and programs administered through or by the Faculty Resource Center;

--to work closely with the FPD Committee to develop a detailed description of the qualifications and duties of the Director of the Faculty Resource Center;

--to conduct such study as appropriate to ascertain a current and thorough assessment of faculty priorities for the Faculty Resource Center;

--to provide the FPD Committee with a briefing on similar offices at other campuses, and assessments of their effectiveness based on a review of the literature.

5. The FPD Committee be instructed to review applications for Special Coordinator and recommend a candidate to the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate, which in turn will recommend to the Vice President for Academic Affairs, who will make the appointment.

6. The procedures for application for the Special Coordinator be established as per attachment to this document. The Call for Applicants should go out by December 2nd. Letters of Intent, describing the applicant and his/her qualifications should be due by December 9th. Wednesday, December 14th the FPD Committee should make its recommendation.

**CALL FOR APPLICANTS:**

**SPECIAL COORDINATOR OF FACULTY PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT  
FOR SPRING 1989**

**DESCRIPTION:**

The Special Coordinator of Faculty Professional Development Activities for Spring 1989 will assess campus needs and work with the Faculty Professional Development Committee to develop and articulate the scope and functions of the Faculty Resource Center and its future Director. In particular, the Coordinator is charged:

- to work closely with the FPD Committee in clarifying and disseminating information about current faculty development activities on campus;
- to work closely with the FPD Committee to develop a description of the services, activities, and programs administered through or by the Faculty Resource Center;
- to work closely with the FPD Committee to develop a detailed description of the qualifications and duties of the Director of the Faculty Resource Center;
- to conduct such study as appropriate to ascertain a current and thorough assessment of faculty priorities for the Faculty Resource Center;
- to provide the FPD Committee with a briefing on similar offices at other campuses, and assessments of their effectiveness based on a review of the literature.

The Coordinator will receive six units of assigned time to fulfill these tasks.

**APPLICATION PROCESS:**

Applicants should submit a letter of application directly to the Faculty Professional Development Committee through the Academic Senate Office, 264 Administration Building, 278-6593.

The letter should include a description of past experience with faculty professional development, experience with planning and conducting organizational research such as needs assessments, and any other qualifications relevant to the job description above.

**EVALUATION:**

The Faculty Professional Development Committee will review applications and make a recommendation to the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate, which will make a recommendation to the Vice President for Academic Affairs, who will make the final appointment.

Letters of application are due by 5:00p.m. December 9 in the Academic Senate Office.



# California State University, Sacramento

6000 J STREET, SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95819-2694

DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES

California State University, Sacramento  
6000 J Street  
Sacramento, California 95819

NOV 14 1988

Academic Senate Received

To: Juanita Barrera, Chair  
Academic Senate

419

Date: November 14, 1988

From: Marjorie Gelus, Chair  
Committee for Research

Re: Assigned Time  
Reimbursement

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Marjorie Gelus".

At our committee's meeting of November 9, we discussed the November 2 resolution of the Faculty Professional Development Committee on assigned time reimbursement, as you requested.

Clearly, the question of whether to develop a formula to determine actual replacement costs for faculty members receiving assigned time is highly technical, and to debate it would go beyond both the expertise and the mandate of the Research Committee. Equally clearly, however, this is a decision that will have an effect on the fifteen positions of assigned time for research that are distributed annually by Vice President Mary Burger on the basis of our recommendations.

The concrete effects of devising and applying such a formula are as yet undefined, and we would need to have some understanding of them before we could offer a truly informed response to the resolution. What we would like to articulate at this point, nonetheless, is our strong desire to see the fifteen research positions protected. As it is, those positions are able to meet only a fraction of the demand for precious research time on this campus, and before the current resolution is passed, we would very much like to hear assurances that the number of those positions will not thereby be reduced.

cc Phyllis Mills, Chair  
Faculty Professional Development Committee



# California State University, Sacramento

6000 J STREET, SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95819-2694

## M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Juanita Barrera, Chair                      DATE: November 14, 1988  
Academic Senate

FROM: Michael Lewis, Chair                      SUBJECT: Sabbatical Leaves  
Fiscal Affairs Committee

---

The Fiscal Affairs Committee has completed its discussion of the sabbatical leave process at CSUS. The discussion was initiated by the stated concern over the average length of service preceding approval of a sabbatical and by the feeling among faculty that somehow this length of service is shorter elsewhere. Fiscal Affairs' discussion was guided by interviews with CSUS faculty, with Sheila Orman, Nancy Shulock, and Bill Pickens, as well as by interviews with faculty and staff affairs professionals at the campuses in Chico, San Diego, and Long Beach--campuses reputed to grant sabbaticals in a more timely manner than CSUS. This consulting process has yielded the following information:

-- sabbatical leaves are funded by formula from the Chancellor's Office; this formula provides sabbaticals to each campus based on a fixed proportion (presently 1 in 12.7) of faculty at each campus who are eligible to apply for sabbatical (MOU, Article 23). The funds so generated may not be augmented at the campus level. Thus, all campuses are treated equally with regard to the funding of sabbatical leaves; some variation among campuses would be expected due to the size of the pool of eligible faculty.

-- The process at CSUS for evaluating applications for sabbatical leave is quite different than the processes used at San Diego, Long Beach, and Chico. The CSUS process may be described as one in which most applications deemed meritorious are rank ordered according to the accrued service of the applicants; outstanding or exceptional applications of eligible faculty are recommended for funding regardless of accrued service. The CSUS process--administered by a campus-wide committee--effectively limits sabbatical recommendations in most cases to faculty with considerable accrued service; for the last three years, most sabbatical recommendations have been for

faculty with 11 or more years of service. At Chico, San Diego, and Long Beach, schools or colleges are granted a pool of sabbatical leaves based on the number of eligible faculty in the units. Recommendations are made by school/college committees based on university-wide criteria which may be augmented with criteria developed by the unit and approved by the university. San Diego and Long Beach report that sabbatical applications are evaluated and ranked by merit only--without appeal to accrued service; this practice would increase the variance in accrued service among faculty recommended for sabbatical. Chico allows some consideration of accrued service, along with teaching effectiveness and service to the community and institution, as a "balancing" factor in ranking applications already judged meritorious and relevant to professional development. One campus (Long Beach) allows some consideration of previous release time through grants or assigned time in finalizing recommendations for sabbatical leaves; this practice could lead to the perception that faculty have more frequent opportunities for release time--either through sabbatical leave or assigned time.

--The concern about sabbatical leaves at CSUS is genuine. A number of faculty have expressed concern over the competitiveness of CSUS in hiring and retaining faculty since many faculty presently wait at least 11 years for a sabbatical.

Conclusions: Faculty are concerned over the average length of service preceding a sabbatical leave at CSUS. The time generally required might influence an individual's decision to join the CSUS faculty. Differences among campuses with regard to sabbatical leaves may be traced to differences in campus procedures, not to Chancellor's Office policies. The process for recommending faculty for sabbatical leave could be altered to improve the chances of faculty with less accrued service, to provide more meaningful participation of faculty at the school level, to encourage the coordination of sabbatical leaves with other opportunities for release time. The Executive Committee might refer this issue to the appropriate committee to discover what changes, if any, are needed in our policies/procedures for recommending sabbatical leaves.

ML/CD



ACADEMIC SENATE

M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: March 9, 1988

TO: Michael Lewis, Chair  
Fiscal Affairs Committee

FROM: Juanita Barrera, Chair  
Academic Senate  
*Juanita Barrera*

SUBJECT: Sabbatical Leaves

At its meeting on March 3, 1988, the Executive Committee referred the attached request from Professor Joan Moon to the Fiscal Affairs Committee. Specifically, the Executive Committee requests that Fiscal Affairs provide a report that answers the questions raised by Professor Moon, and develop recommendations that will enhance funding of sabbatical leaves and shorten the period between leaves.

JB:j  
cc: w/attachment:  
D. Gerth, President  
M. Work, Chair, Professional Leave Committee  
M. Burger, Vice President  
N. Shulock, Associate Vice President  
E. Moulds, Dean  
w/o attachment:  
J. Moon, Chair, History Department



DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

M E M O R A N D U M

February 9, 1988

To: Juanita Barrera  
Chair, Academic Senate

From: Joan Moon  
Chair, Department of History  
*Joan Moon*

Subject: Sabbatical Leaves

This year's sabbatical list cut off faculty with ten and possibly eleven years seniority. I would like the Academic Senate to look at these issues:

- 1) How does this lengthy period compare to sister campuses?
- 2) How do sister campuses that award sabbaticals closer to seven years manage the funding?
- 3) How are we funded for sabbaticals?
- 4) What efforts are being made to increase funding?

I would be willing to serve on an ad hoc committee.





# California State University, Sacramento

6000 J STREET, SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95819-2694

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

October 22, 1984

California State University, Sacramento  
6000 J Street  
Sacramento, California 95819

OCT 30 1984

Academic Senate Received  
413

MEMORANDUM

PM 84-05

TO: *The Faculty*  
FROM: *Donald R. Gerth*  
SUBJECT: Policy on Leaves With Pay

The principle on which this policy is based, and which guided the deliberations that produced it, is that sabbatical leaves should be granted to those who have earned them. Discussion of the policy in its various earlier forms centered on how the process of earning them is to be understood. Consequently, the policy results from the broadest and most extensive deliberation among all the concerned segments of this University community, representing the efforts and best thoughts of many people. I hope it comes to constitute part of a shared understanding of the University's mission, and of the policies and practices needed to fulfill that mission.

The Academic Senate has requested the schools and the Library to proceed with elections for the Professional Leave Committee. The committee itself should be responsible for recommending timelines for the review process. However, I am setting November 30, 1984 as tentative deadline for receipt of 1985-86 sabbatical leave proposals. Leave application forms may be obtained from the Office of Faculty and Staff Affairs after October 29.

I wish again to thank the Academic Senate and the Senate Executive Committee for their thoughtful conduct of this important business.

POLICY ON LEAVES WITH PAY

Traditionally, paid academic leaves are not a privilege, but a right. In affirming that tradition, the Statement of Principles on Leaves of Absence, adopted by the American Association of University Professors in 1972, states:

Leaves of absence are among the most important means by which a faculty member's teaching effectiveness may be enhanced, his scholarly usefulness enlarged, and an institution's academic program strengthened and developed. A sound program of leaves is therefore of vital importance to a college or university, and it is the obligation of every faculty member to make use of the available means, including leaves, to promote his professional competence. The major purpose is to provide opportunity for continued professional growth and new, or renewed, intellectual achievement through study, research, writing, or travel.

The Statement further states that leaves should "be provided with reasonable frequency and preferably be available at regular intervals because they are important to the continuing growth of the faculty member and the effectiveness of the institution." At many reputable institutions of higher learning, sabbatical leaves are granted automatically as an incentive for professional growth. Sabbatical and other paid leaves are among the most precious assets that the University and its faculty possess and should be used as instruments of policy. Through the leaves faculty development and renewal occurs; faculty advance their disciplinary knowledge, attain additional competence in related or new fields of inquiry, and produce impressive scholarly and creative works. Through the experience gained by faculty on leaves the University benefits from revitalized people who bring new insights, vigor, and enthusiasm to their teaching assignments and other scholarly pursuits. The University promotes program development by assisting faculty through paid leaves to gain new awareness, knowledge, and skills in advancing and new fields. By not adhering to this standard policy on sabbatical leaves, the California State University has long been doing a disservice to its faculty, its students, and the people of the State.

Because the California State University does not provide sabbatical leaves according to the ideal pattern, a limited number of leaves must be allocated to a larger number of eligible faculty. CSU policy is defined in Articles 27 and 28 of the Memorandum of Understanding. The following shall be the policy of CSU, Sacramento; it conforms to and elucidates Articles 27 and 28.

The President shall allocate professional leaves on the basis of recommendations of a Professional Leave Committee. The Professional Leave Committee will be a University Committee, composed of nine elected members serving staggered three-year terms; to include four members elected by and from faculty members in Arts and Sciences, and one each elected by and from faculty members in Business and Public Administration, Education, Engineering and Computer Science, Health and Human Services, and the Library.\* The Professional Leave Committee shall recognize the importance to individual faculty members and to the University of professional leaves. The Committee shall function according to the following process and criteria.

APPLICATION PROCESS FOR PROFESSIONAL LEAVES

1. An eligible faculty member who applies for a sabbatical leave must submit two copies of his/her proposal on the form provided, by the announced University deadline, to the Office of Faculty and Staff Affairs.
2. The Associate Provost for Faculty and Staff Affairs shall send a copy of the proposal to the Professional Leave Committee, to the faculty member's home department or unit, and to the appropriate School Dean or Librarian.
3. The Department or library unit shall prepare a statement regarding the possible effect on the curriculum and the operation of the department during the time of the leave should it be granted. This statement shall be forwarded to the School Dean.
4. After considering the departmental statement, the Dean or Librarian shall forward to the Professional Leave Committee an assessment of the implications to the department's program, other campus programs, and the budget, should the leave be granted, and may comment concerning the merit of the proposal as compared with the specified criteria. The Dean shall include the departmental statement with the material forwarded to the Professional Leave Committee.
5. After reviewing all leave proposals against the specified criteria (6.B below) and considering the deans' comments concerning the merits of the proposed projects, the

\*At its first meeting, the 1984-85 PLC will determine by lot three members to serve three-year terms, three members to serve two-year terms, and three members to serve one-year terms.

Professional Leave Committee shall sort the proposed projects into no more than three categories as follows:

- a) Those that are judged by the Professional Leave Committee to be not acceptable;
- b) Those that are judged by the Professional Leave Committee to be meritorious;
- c) Those that are judged by the Professional Leave Committee to be outstanding and exceptional.

Of the three categories, it is the intention of this policy that the third category, those projects judged to be outstanding and exceptional, be reserved for those projects which, by virtue of some feature or features of extraordinary value or promise, warrant that the proposals be approved for funding regardless of equity, defined as accrued service since the establishment of initial eligibility for sabbatical leave.

The Committee shall recommend to the President that all proposals for projects placed in the second category, those judged to be meritorious, be ranked in order of accrued service and forwarded to the President with a recommendation that they be funded.

The Professional Leave Committee shall provide the President with a written statement of the reasons for recommending or not recommending funding of each proposal, including, when appropriate, a justification for recommending outstanding and exceptional projects for funding irrespective of accrued service. In conveying its recommendations to the President, the Professional Leave Committee shall include the departmental statements and the deans' comments.

EVALUATION OF APPLICATIONS

A. Dimensions of Evaluation

The Committee shall assess the appropriateness of the substance of each proposal, the benefits which would ensue from its being undertaken, and its practicability.

B. Criteria

- 1. Appropriateness. Appropriate sabbatical leave activities may include the following; this list implies no ranking of relative worth among the categories. The PLC will evaluate each proposal on the basis of standards relevant to its character.

- a. A course of study leading to increased mastery of the applicant's own field, or the development of an additional area of specialization within his/her field, or the development of a new field of specialization;
- b. A plan for professionally beneficial travel, which will enable the applicant further to develop his/her knowledge, skill, or expertise in a discipline or area of specialization within a discipline;
- c. Professional development of a scope or nature not possible through normal workload assignment;
- d. Pursuit of a scholarly, research, or creative project of a scope or nature not permitted through normal workload assignment;
- e. Study or experience designed to improve teaching effectiveness;
- f. Study or experience designed to improve professional practice.

2. Benefit. Sabbatical leave projects should demonstrate clear promise of producing results beneficial to students, to the development of the profession or a discipline within the profession, to the university, and/or to the faculty member as a teacher, scholar, or professional practitioner.

3. Practicability. The PLC shall determine whether the proposed project is clearly defined and articulated, and conforms to the requirements of Contract Article 27.3, and the stated objectives of the proposal are realistically attainable.

DIFFERENCE IN PAY APPLICATIONS

Faculty members eligible for Difference in Pay leaves shall submit applications to the PLC on the forms provided. Deans and departments will submit to the PLC assessments of the impact of proposed leaves on curriculum and programs. The PLC will forward to the Provost all Difference in Pay proposals which meet minimal quality standards. Deadlines for Difference in Pay applications shall be flexible; it shall be campus practice to grant Difference in Pay leaves whenever possible in the interests of faculty members, departments and schools. Sabbatical leave applications that have been recommended by the PLC shall also be considered to have been recommended for Difference in Pay leaves if requested.

After reviewing thoroughly the attached Academic Program Review Report for the Division of Social Work, prepared by the Review Team jointly appointed by our respective groups, the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee and the Graduate Policies and Programs Committee make the following responses in terms of commendations and recommendations, and directs these to the indicated units and administrative heads. (Page references refer to the documentation for the response in the Review Report.)

Commendations to the Division of Social Work

The Division of Social Work is commended for its

1. well-trained and talented faculty.
2. generally strong course syllabi.
3. success in reversing enrollment declines.
4. success in gaining recent reaccreditation for its undergraduate program.
5. student honor society chapter.
6. conscientious efforts in complying with the majority of the curricular recommendations in its last program review.
7. external degree programs in Ukiah and Redding.
8. well-defined and effective undergraduate academic advising.
9. well-defined and effective graduate career advising.
10. well-written and thorough self study document.
11. current administrative leadership.
12. successful involvement of students on standing committees of the division.

Recommendations to the Division of Social Work

It is recommended that

1. consideration be given to providing assigned time units for a graduate coordinator who is a person other than the division director. (p. 8)
2. the division faculty as a whole give serious consideration to establishing more substantive linkage between: (a) the undergraduate program and the graduate foundation semester; (b) the graduate concentrations; and (c) the graduate concentrations and field instruction. (p. 10)
3. consideration be given to teaching common subject areas across graduate concentrations in one or a few courses as a means of reducing the number of needed specialized courses in the graduate program. (p. 11)

4. the content of courses SW 215, 140A/B, 235, 125A/B, 295A, and 195A/B be reevaluated to consider ways of avoiding duplication and to more clearly delineate differences between the undergraduate and graduate courses. (p. 12)
5. consideration be given to reevaluating the graduate core challenge exams and, where appropriate, redesigning them to more effectively assess students' competencies. (p. 12)
6. SW 219A, 227, 242, 259, 267, 271, 273, and 276 be offered regularly within two-year intervals or eliminated from the 1988-90 Catalog. (p. 13)
7. admission standards for the graduate program be upheld. (p. 15)
8. the issue of grade inflation be addressed and ways be found to distinguish effectively between varying levels of student achievement. (p. 17)
9. consideration be given to placing at the top of its priority list for faculty hiring a person who would teach in the undergraduate practice area. (p. 18)
10. for the next program review, all faculty resumes be updated to reflect current professional involvements. (p. 19)
11. in future hiring, every effort be made to recruit qualified women and ethnic minorities. (p. 19)
12. the division's affirmative action guidelines be updated and submitted to the Affirmative Action Office. (p. 19)
13. the division director meet with the Executive Vice President, the Dean of the School of Health and Human Services and the Director of University Media Services to explore strategies for obtaining a closed-circuit TV studio for teaching social work practice skills. (p. 20)
14. the full division participate in developing an educational equity plan, including student recruitment strategies, that it will support. (p. 22)
15. educational equity mentors be recruited openly from faculty volunteers. (p. 22)
16. more effective utilization be made of assigned time units for recruitment of graduate-level ethnic minority students. (p. 22)
17. educational equity activities be addressed in ARTP deliberations. (p. 22)
18. its graduate program advising be coordinated to uphold program requirements and ensure consistent types and amounts of work from all students in the degree program. (p. 23)
19. the division director meet with the Director of the Career Development and Placement Center to develop a career advising program for the undergraduate program and to arrange for continued use of the placement fileservice for M.S.W. graduates. (p. 23)

20. the division director meet with the Executive Vice President and the Dean of the School of Health and Human Services to consider ways of obtaining more office space for part-time faculty. (p. 24)
21. the division director meet with the Dean of the School of Health and Human Services to consider ways of augmenting or redistributing the budgetary allocation for the Division of Social Work to permit purchase of the computer needs listed in section III-H-1-3 of this report, and to cover the expenses listed in section III-I. (p. 24)
22. the division director submit to the School of Health and Human Services annual budgetary requests based upon actual faculty workloads and programmatic needs. (p. 25)

#### Recommendations to the Dean of the School of Health and Human Services

It is recommended that

1. faculty in the Division of Social Work be adequately compensated for their supervisory work. (p. 2)
2. consideration be given to providing funds to hire a consultant or facilitator to meet with the full faculty of the Division of Social Work to help them develop strategies for working with the school administration and with one another. Such strategies should include ground rules for constructive interaction and academic planning. (p. 10)
3. a meeting be held with the Executive Vice President, the Director of the Division of Social Work and the Director of University Media Services to explore strategies for obtaining a closed-circuit TV studio for teaching social work practice skills. (p. 20)
4. consideration be given to establishing an instructional computer laboratory in the School of Health and Human Services for use by all human service students and faculty. (p. 21)
5. a meeting be held with the Executive Vice President and the Director of the Division of Social Work to consider ways of obtaining more office space for part-time faculty. (p. 24)
6. a meeting be held with the Director of the Division of Social Work to consider ways of augmenting or redistributing the budgetary allocation for the Division of Social Work to permit purchase of the computer needs listed in Section III-H-1-3 of this report, and to cover the expenses listed in section III-I. (p. 24)

#### Recommendation to the Director of University Media Services

It is recommended that a meeting be held with the Executive Vice President, the Dean of the School of Health and Human Services, and Director of the Division of Social Work to explore strategies for obtaining a closed-circuit TV studio for teaching social work practice skills. (p. 20)

Recommendation to the Director of the Career Development and Placement Center

It is recommended that a meeting be held with the Director of the Division of Social Work to develop a career advising program for the undergraduate program in social work, and to arrange for continued use of the placement file service for M.S.W. graduates. (p. 23)

Recommendations to the Executive Vice President

It is recommended that

1. a meeting be held with the Dean of the School of Health and Human Services, the Director of University Media Services, and the Director of the Division of Social Work to explore strategies for obtaining a closed-circuit TV studio for teaching social work practice skills. (p. 20)
2. a meeting be held with the Dean of the School of Health and Human Services and the Director of the Division of Social Work to consider ways of obtaining more office space for part-time faculty in the Division of Social Work. (p. 24)

Recommendations for Academic Senate Action

It is recommended that

1. the Master of Social Work degree program be approved for another five years or until the next program review.
2. the Bachelor of Arts degree program in Social Work be approved for another five years or until the next program review.
3. the Minor in Social Work be approved for another five years or until the next program review.