

Jan

1992-93
ACADEMIC SENATE
California State University, Sacramento

AGENDA
Thursday, May 20, 1993
Forest Suite, University Union
2:30-4:30 p.m.

INFORMATION

1. University ARTP Committee Report on Implementation of CSUS Definition of Scholarship

TIME CERTAIN: 4:00 p.m.

William Dillon, Presiding Member, University ARTP Committee

2. Mark Your Calendars: Final Meeting, Thursday, May 27

REGULAR AGENDA

AS 93-43/Flr. MINUTES

Approval of the Minutes of the meeting of May 13 (#15), 1993.

NOT DISTRIBUTED -
POSTPONE

AS 93-44/ UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC PLAN

① The CSUS Academic Senate adopts the "Position Statement of the CSUS Academic Senate on a Proposed University Academic Plan" (Attachment [on BLUE]) on the proposed University Academic Plan distributed by the Vice President for Academic Affairs on April 15, 1993, and forwards the Position Statement and recommendations (listing appended to the Position Statement [on BEIGE]) regarding the specific content of the April 15, 1993, proposed University Academic Plan to the President for formal consideration.

OLD BUSINESS

AS 93-41



California State University, Sacramento

SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95819-6036

ACADEMIC SENATE



DATE: May 12, 1993

TO: ACADEMIC SENATE

FROM: SYLVIA NAVARI, Chair
Working Committee to review
the University Academic Plan (UAP)

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Sylvia Navari".

RE: REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION ON THE UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC PLAN

=====
The Working Committee was charged with evaluating the consistency of the UAP with the policy titled, Instructional Program Priorities: Guidelines for Academic Planning, Resource Allocation, and Enrollment Management (IPP), which was recommended by the CSUS Academic Senate (AS 91-16C), and approved and established as University policy by the President on July 1, 1991.

In accordance with our charge, the Working Committee respectfully submits its report to you in the form of a "Position Statement" with recommendations. It is of critical importance that the "Position Statement" and recommendations be read and understood in the context of the IPP, for it is the IPP which is the benchmark against which the UAP has been assessed.

The IPP, in general, calls for, among other things, a:

- *BALANCE AND MIX OF PROGRAMS ACROSS THE UNIVERSITY
- *BALANCE AND MIX OF ENROLLMENTS ACROSS SCHOOLS
- *BALANCE AND MIX OF ENROLLMENTS ACROSS LEVELS
- *BALANCE AND MIX OF PROGRAMS WITHIN LEVELS

In order to determine whether or not the UAP, if implemented, would achieve or be consistent with the various prescriptions of the IPP, the Working Committee proceeded as follows:

First, "Current Enrollment Patterns" of the university were ascertained using data from Institutional Studies, Fall, 1992.

Second, the "Probable Effects on Enrollments from Implementing the UAP" were determined by analyzing the UAP

itself and its proposals for adjustments to program enrollments--increases, decreases, and no-change.

Third, once the "Enrollment Analysis by Major" was completed the committee interpreted the data, compared the anticipated/projected balance and mix of programs, enrollments, etc., to the IPP, and drew its conclusions accordingly re: the fit between the IPP and the UAP, and the implications of the UAP for the resource allocation process.

The Working Committee acknowledges that its interpretation of the data and possible consequences to the balance and mix issues may be mistaken--that others might interpret the data differently--but what is not arguable are the criteria established in the IPP against which the University Plan has been evaluated. Further, because the "Position Statement" and recommendations hinge primarily on the interpretation of the data, the data are provided in the document entitled, "Enrollment Analysis by Major," attached immediately hereto.

The "Enrollment Analysis by Major" is followed by the "Position Statement of the CSU, Sacramento Academic Senate on a Proposed University Academic Plan." The "Position Statement" is divided into two parts: Part I--Content of the Proposed University Academic Plan and Its Relationship to IPP, and Part II--Implications of the Proposed University Academic Plan for the Faculty/Instructional Resource Allocation Process.

Following the "Position Statement" is a listing of the recommendations contained in the "Position Statement." This listing is provided for convenience only--the recommendations cannot be well understood out of context of the "Position Paper."

Lastly, the Committee cautions the faculty to look at the University Academic Plan and the effects of the changes the plan calls for through NEW EYES--a collective/educator eye, one that has a university rather than discipline specific perspective; and that should the faculty view the plan in terms of how we currently do business and how we currently relate to one another within and across schools the plan itself will not be operationally feasible with any integrity and, ultimately, our students and curriculum will suffer for lack of a curricular voice in the decision making process of CSUS.

The Committee recognizes that Academic Affairs, in its efforts to have the UAP accepted and implemented, has already attended to some of the recommendations made herein.

Attachments

ENROLLMENT ANALYSIS BY MAJOR

1. Current Enrollment Patterns.

The following enrollment data were taken from the Fall, 1992, report of the Office of Institutional Studies.

**Table 1: Percentage of Headcount Enrollment
by Major and by School**
(Percentage of FTES in parentheses)

| <u>School</u> | <u>% of Univ</u> | <u>% LD</u> | <u>% UD</u> | <u>% Grad</u> |
|-------------------|------------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|
| A&S | 37.6 (38.3) | 14 | 75 | 11 |
| Business | 21.6 (21.4) | 14 | 74 | 11 |
| Education | 5.4 (4.6) | 6 | 23 | 71 |
| E&CS | 10.9 (11.2) | 18 | 62 | 20 |
| H&HS | 14.3 (14.8) | 13 | 66 | 21 |
| Undeclared | 10.3 (9.6) | 33 | 20 | 47 |
| <u>University</u> | | 16 | 64 | 20 |

No obvious differential exists between headcount enrollment and FTES, so the rest of this analysis is based on headcount alone. Two obvious conclusions can be drawn from this data:

- (a) The University lower division percentage is only 16% of total enrollment (or 20% of undergraduate enrollment). This is far less than the IPP goal of 25% minimum of undergraduate enrollment.
- (b) Graduate enrollment barely meets the University total, of 20% minimum. Most of this enrollment is concentrated in three of the professional schools, with a surprisingly large number of undeclared graduate students (almost 25% of the graduate total).

A more detailed breakdown of undergraduate major headcount by program type is found in Tables 2-5 (apologies to programs which may feel misclassified):

Table 2: Humanities/Fine Arts (A&S)

| | <u># Prog</u> | <u># LD</u> | <u># UD</u> |
|--------------------|----------------|-------------|-------------|
| Fine Arts | 5 | 119 | 548 |
| Letters | 9 | 269 | 1615 |
| Foreign Languages | 3 ¹ | 25 | 113 |
| Other ² | <u>2</u> | <u>162</u> | <u>1024</u> |
| | 19 | 575 | 3300 |

¹Plus 6 minors, 2 course areas.

²Asian Studies, Liberal Studies.

Table 3: Math/Sciences (A&S)

| | <u># Prog</u> | <u># LD</u> | <u># UD</u> |
|-----------|---------------|-------------|-------------|
| Math/Stat | 3 | 26 | 147 |
| Sciences | <u>12</u> | <u>193</u> | <u>626</u> |
| | 15 | 219 | 773 |

Table 4: Social Sciences (A&S)

| | <u># Prog</u> | <u># LD</u> | <u># UD</u> |
|--------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|
| Traditional | 8 | 352 | 2012 |
| Other ¹ | <u>6</u> | <u>73</u> | <u>671</u> |
| | 14 | 425 | 2683 |

¹Home Economics, Speech Pathology, Social Science Waiver, Environmental Studies, Ethnic Studies, Gerontology

Table 5: Professional Schools

| | <u># Prog¹</u> | <u># LD</u> | <u># UD</u> |
|-------------|---------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| Business | 10 | 53 ² | 3592 ² |
| Education | 1 | 71 | 307 |
| Engineering | 7 | 22 ² | 1319 ² |
| H&HS | <u>18</u> | <u>448</u> | <u>2309</u> |
| | 27 | 594 | 7527 |

¹Includes concentrations as separate programs.

²Not including "pre-majors".

Clearly CSUS supports a wide variety of undergraduate program types in both the liberal arts and sciences and in the professional schools. Of those students clearly identified with major programs, about 15% of A&S undergraduates are in the lower division, as compared with about 7% in the professional schools.

A breakdown of graduate major headcount patterns by program type is found in Tables 6-9:

Table 6: Humanities/Fine Arts (A&S)

| | <u># Prog</u> | <u># Stud</u> |
|-------------------|---------------|---------------|
| Fine Arts | 3 | 87 |
| Letters | 3 | 273 |
| Foreign Languages | <u>3</u> | <u>51</u> |
| | 9 | 411 |

Table 7: Math/Sciences (A&S)

| | <u># Prog</u> | <u># Stud</u> |
|-----------|---------------|---------------|
| Math/Stat | 1 | 34 |
| Sciences | <u>4</u> | <u>86</u> |
| | 5 | 120 |

Table 8: Social Sciences (A&S)

| | <u># Prog</u> | <u># Stud</u> |
|--------------------|---------------|---------------|
| Traditional | 6 | 288 |
| Other ¹ | <u>3</u> | <u>135</u> |
| | 9 | 423 |

¹Speech Pathology, Public Policy Administration, Liberal Arts

Table 9: Professional Schools

| | <u># Prog</u> | <u># Stud</u> |
|-------------|---------------|---------------|
| Business | 4 | 591 |
| Education | 20 | 941 |
| Engineering | 5 | 531 |
| H&HS | <u>8</u> | <u>736</u> |
| | 37 | 2799 |

Again, there is a wide variety of graduate programs in both the liberal arts and sciences and in the professional schools. However, the A&S graduate enrollment is only about 25% of the total graduate population.

2. Probable Effect on Enrollments from Implementing University Academic Plan.

In the tables below all undergraduate academic programs identified in the University Academic Plan are categorized by priority (I-III) and size (A-D) category. Each cell contains numbers representing (# programs)/(# LD students)/(# UD students).

Table 1: Humanities/Fine Arts (A&S)

| | I | II | III |
|--------------------|-------------------------|-----------|-------|
| <i>inc</i> A | | 1/ 3/ 53 | 1/0/8 |
| <i>same</i> B | 5/123/598 | 4/117/523 | |
| <i>mod dec</i> C | 2/145/952 | 1/155/993 | 1/1/0 |
| <i>sub dec</i> D | | 3/ 23/148 | 1/0/2 |
| | | | |
| Total to increase: | 2/ 3/ 61 | | |
| Total no change: | 9/240/1121 | | |
| Total to decrease: | 9/324/2095 ¹ | | |

¹Of those programs recommended for decreased enrollment, Communication Studies (114/776), Interior Design (32/176) and Liberal Studies (155/993) account for most of this enrollment.

Table 2: Math/Sciences (A&S)

| | I | II | III |
|--------------------|-----------|---------|--------|
| A | | 1/ 8/33 | |
| B | 7/195/678 | | |
| C | | 4/12/31 | |
| D | | | 2/6/19 |
| Total to increase: | 1/ 8/ 33 | | |
| Total no change: | 7/195/678 | | |
| Total to decrease: | 6/ 18/ 50 | | |

Table 3: Social Sciences (A&S)

| | I | II | III |
|--------------------|-------------------------|-----------|--------|
| A | | 1/ 2/ 26 | 1/0/27 |
| B | 9/195/1396 | 1/ 22/138 | |
| C | 1/ 18/ 154 | 2/188/989 | |
| Total to increase: | 2/ 2/ 53 | | |
| Total no change: | 10/217/1534 | | |
| Total to decrease: | 3/206/1143 ¹ | | |

¹Psychology (167/888) accounts for most of this enrollment.

Table 4: Professional Schools

| | I | II | III |
|---|------------------------|------------|----------|
| A | 2/ 4/ 524 | | 1/ 0/ 80 |
| B | 8/94/2286 | 2/ 23/ 478 | 2/ 6/126 |
| C | 5/27/1762 ¹ | 4/250/1307 | |
| D | | 1/ 0/ 5 | 4/53/345 |

¹Plan anticipates this enrollment will shift into other Business Administration concentrations; not counted in total to decrease, below.

| | |
|--------------------|-------------------------|
| Total to increase: | 3/ 4/ 604 |
| Total no change: | 12/150/4652 |
| Total to decrease: | 9/313/1657 ² |

²Most of this total is in Criminal Justice (171/866) and Social Work (24/287).

Implementation of the plan would not seriously decrease the variety of programs, either in the liberal arts and sciences or in the professional schools. Most of the projected decrease in enrollment is concentrated over six large programs, as noted above. However, the total scheduled for decrease from A&S (17/548/3288) relative to that for the professional schools (9/313/1657) does seem to imply a shift in the historical pattern in which A&S has represented about 50% of University enrollment.

A similar priority grid for all graduate programs is found in Tables 5-8. (Each cell contains (# programs)/(# students).

Table 5: Humanities/Fine Arts (A&S)

| | I | II | III |
|---|-------|------|-----|
| A | 1/ 18 | | |
| B | 1/ 23 | 1/43 | |
| C | 2/255 | | |
| D | | 3/65 | 1/7 |

Total to increase: 1/ 18
 Total no change: 2/ 66
 Total to decrease: 6/327

Table 6: Math/Science (A&S)

| | I | II |
|---|------|------|
| B | 2/37 | |
| C | 1/26 | 2/57 |

Total no change: 2/37
 Total to decrease: 3/83

Table 7: Social Science (A&S)

| | I | II | III |
|---|-------|-------|------|
| A | 1/ 63 | | |
| B | 3/149 | | 1/13 |
| C | | 3/181 | |
| D | | 1/ 17 | |

Total to increase: 1/ 63
 Total no change: 4/162
 Total to decrease: 4/198

Table 8: Professional Schools

| | I | II |
|---|--------|-------|
| A | 6/ 416 | 1/ 38 |
| B | 8/1083 | 5/823 |
| C | | 3/119 |
| D | 1/ 23 | 5/ 35 |

Total to increase: 9/ 535
 Total no change: 21/2171
 Total to decrease: 22/ 785

Implementation of the plan would preserve a reasonable variety of graduate programs, both in the liberal arts and sciences and in the professional schools. However, when already small programs

Enrollment Analysis by Major

are slated for decreases they may, despite high program quality, fall under increasing pressure for discontinuation. Also, programs facing reduction constitute 64% of the current graduate enrollment in A&S, and only 7% of the current graduate enrollment in the professional schools. This pattern, if implemented, would further increase the current 3:1 ratio of professional school to A&S graduate enrollment.

5/13/93

POSITION STATEMENT OF THE
CSU, SACRAMENTO ACADEMIC SENATE
ON A PROPOSED UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC PLAN

The Academic Senate endorses the development and use of a University academic plan of the type distributed on April 15, 1993, by the Vice President for Academic Affairs (document titled The University Academic Plan: Reshaping the University's Academic Programs by Setting Instructional Program Priorities (document hereafter referred to as "University Academic Plan") as a mechanism for achieving the goals and implementing the policy provisions set forth in the policy titled Instructional Program Priorities: Guidelines for Academic Planning, Resource Allocation, and Enrollment Management (hereafter referred to as "IPP") which was recommended by the CSUS Academic Senate on March 21, 1991 (AS 91-16C), and approved (with minor revisions) by the President and established as University policy by the President in PM 91-12 (July 1, 1991).

Specifically, the Academic Senate endorses the development of a University academic plan of the type distributed by the Vice President for Academic Affairs on April 15, 1993, which attempts to achieve an agreed upon balance and mix of programs that conforms to the guidelines specified in IPP by identifying enrollment targets for the University's various academic programs and establishes enrollment priorities based on an application of criteria specified in the IPP.¹

Further, the Academic Senate endorses, with reservations and conditions to be specified, the primary objective of the proposed April 15, 1993 "University Academic Plan" as "a tool for decision making regarding the curricular offerings, faculty and other resource needs, and manage (sic) student enrollment in the University's various academic programs." However, the Academic Senate recommends against the use of any such plan as a basis for resource allocation in the short term (1993-94) unless there is a corresponding change in the current resource allocation process that takes into consideration and addresses the concerns raised in Section II of this position statement.²

The "University Academic Plan" distributed by Academic Affairs includes a section (Section II) entitled "Additional Actions for Curricular and Administrative Restructuring." While the Academic Senate acknowledges that there may be need to address the types of matters addressed in this section, the Academic Senate recommends that matters pertaining to administrative restructuring be addressed in a context other than the University Academic Plan. While the Academic Senate makes no comment on Section II of the University Plan, the Academic Senate urges Academic Affairs to pay keen attention to the curricular implication of any administrative restructuring, and recommends Academic Affairs use the same principles of curricular integrity

as the primary decision criterion when attempting to achieve administrative restructuring and efficiencies.³

While the Academic Senate is not in a position to conduct an independent assessment of individual programs in relation to the IPP criteria, and is, therefore, not in a position to endorse, reject, or redirect the placement of individual programs in the different enrollment categories specified in the proposed "University Academic Plan", the Academic Senate is in a position to evaluate whether the balance and mix of programs and variety of programs within program categories are appropriate and consistent with the IPP. The Academic Senate acknowledges that the proposed "University Academic Plan" was based on extensive review of data by school faculty groups, the Advisory Group on Instructional Program Priorities to Vice President Mary W. Burger, and the Office of Academic Affairs. However, while the Academic Senate is convinced that the process of program evaluation and determination of program priorities and program placement in specific enrollment categories was conducted in an unbiased manner and with great care and thoughtfulness, **the Academic Senate recommends that additional input provided by departmental faculty be given serious consideration in development of a revision of the proposed plan, particularly in cases of setting priorities among concentrations within the same degree program or priorities among different degree programs at the same level offered by a given department.⁴** That is, while the "University Academic Plan" proposed by Academic Affairs should specify total enrollment targets for the collection of academic programs of a given type within an academic department and direct department faculty to establish priorities among academic programs of the same type, the final University Academic Plan should reflect priorities among programs of the same type as recommended by department faculty in cases where departments provide curricular rationale and feasible plans for achieving total enrollment targets.

While the Academic Senate acknowledges that it cannot determine priorities among enrollment targets for specific academic programs within a program category (e.g., concentrations within the same degree program or specific majors within the liberal arts and sciences or professional schools), the Academic Senate is in a position to evaluate whether the balance and mix of programs and variety of programs within program categories are appropriate and consistent with the IPP. Further, the Academic Senate is also in a position to identify insufficient development or omissions of program categories in the proposed "University Academic Plan". Hence, the Academic Senate submits to the

President the following analysis, comments and recommendations on the proposed "University Academic Plan".

For clarity of purpose and effect, the remainder of this document is divided as follows:

- I. Content of the Proposed University Academic Plan and Its Relationship to IPP
- II. Implications of the Proposed University Academic Plan for the Faculty/Instructional Resource Allocation Process

- I. **Content of the Proposed University Academic Plan and Its Relationship to IPP**

- A. Balance and Mix (analysis based on "Enrollment Analysis by Major")

- 1. Mix of Students by Level

- a. Lower Division/Upper Division Enrollment Mix

The IPP specifies that "...CSUS shall, at a minimum, maintain a lower division enrollment of at least 25% of total undergraduate enrollment". However, since 1991 when IPP was adopted, lower division enrollment has fallen to 16% of total enrollment or 20% of undergraduate enrollment (Fall 1992 data). The proposed University Academic Plan fails to include strategies to reverse declining lower division enrollment, and, instead, may inadvertently produce a further decrease in lower division enrollment. Currently, undergraduate programs in Arts and Sciences collectively enroll a greater proportion of lower division students (15% of undergraduates) than degree programs in the professional schools (7% of undergraduates). Since, in the proposed plan, several large programs in Arts and Sciences are included in categories where student enrollment is targeted to decrease with no plan for redirection of students within Arts and Sciences, while enrollments in most of the professional school programs included in these categories are either small or there is a plan for redirection of enrollment to other programs within the same

department (Note: Criminal Justice and Social Work being exceptions), implementation may result in a significant decrease in the proportion of undergraduates majoring in programs in Arts and Sciences (currently approximately 50% of total undergraduates).

Therefore, the Academic Senate recommends that Academic Affairs develop a plan for student redirection that includes advising strategies that will facilitate the redirection of students throughout the University in an orderly manner from programs to be decreased to programs targeted to increase.⁵

Without a plan for reduction, there would likely be a further decrease in lower division enrollment since Arts and Sciences programs attract a greater proportion of lower division students than do professional school programs. Hence, the Academic Senate recommends that total headcount enrollment in undergraduate programs in Arts and Sciences and the professional schools be maintained at current proportions of total undergraduate headcount⁶ (i.e., 50/50). [Note: this may be accomplished by refinement of enrollment targets (e.g., allowing greater increases in Arts and Sciences programs in Category IA than in professional programs in Category IA), or moving some of the Arts and Sciences programs in Category IB to Category IA, or moving some of the professional school programs from Category IA to Category IB, or combinations of these strategies].

The proportion of lower division enrollment as a percentage of total University enrollment may also be further decreased as a result of a shift in the undergraduate/graduate enrollment ratio under the proposed plan (see section I.A.1.b.).

The highest proportion of lower division students (33%) are "undeclared." The Academic Senate is concerned that undeclared students may suffer a higher rate of attrition than declared students and that the high proportion of undeclared students creates enrollment distribution uncertainties. Therefore, the

Academic Senate recommends that the Vice President for Academic Affairs work with the Academic Policies Committee to either decrease the number of undeclared majors admitted as entering freshmen or develop strategies to insure adequate advising to mitigate against attrition.⁷

b. Undergraduate/Graduate enrollment mix

The IPP specifies that "...CSUS shall attempt to maintain graduate enrollments of at least 20% of total headcount enrollment". IPP further specifies that "The proportion of graduate enrollment may be increased above this level in response to regional needs and other factors...but shall not exceed 1/3 of total University headcount enrollment". Currently (Fall, 1992 data), graduate enrollment constitutes close to 20% of total headcount enrollment (it should be noted that approximately 25% of graduate enrollment consists of undeclared students not matriculated in a graduate degree program). Under the proposed plan, the proportion of graduate students is likely to increase unless particular attention is paid to the sum off enrollment adjustments to undergraduate programs relative to graduate programs. Under the proposed plan, several large undergraduate degree programs (in both Arts and Sciences and professional schools) are targeted for decreased enrollment, while graduate programs in the "decrease categories" are either small or enrollment redirection to other graduate programs is specified in the plan. Although the IPP allows that the proportion of graduate enrollment may be increased above 20%, the fact that CSUS is unlikely to be able to accommodate all eligible undergraduates who seek admission (because total University enrollment is to be further decreased), and that a decrease in the proportion of undergraduate would further exacerbate the decline in lower division enrollment argues against increasing the proportion of graduate enrollment. Therefore, the Academic Senate recommends that total headcount enrollment in graduate programs be

maintained at the current proportion (20%) of total headcount enrollment.⁸ [Note: It may therefore be necessary to postpone implementation of proposed increases in enrollment in graduate programs identified in IA.]

2. Program Variety and Balance

a. Undergraduate Programs

1) Variety of Undergraduate Programs

The IPP specifies that "The University has a commitment to offering a variety of undergraduate majors in the traditional liberal arts and sciences disciplines and selected majors in the professional fields of business, engineering, and health and human services" (Note: most programs in education are at the postbaccalaureate level). Implementation of the proposed plan would not decrease significantly the variety of undergraduate programs in Arts and sciences or in the professional schools. Although several concentrations within selected majors are likely to be discontinued (eventually) under the plan (identified in part ID of the plan), the proposed plan preserves at least one major program in each of the disciplines in which major programs are currently offered. It should be noted, however, that the proposed plan does identify one discipline degree program (German) for possible discontinuation (part) unless a plan for increasing enrollment in the major is developed and successful.

Although the Academic Senate does not consider the number of undergraduate programs identified for possible discontinuation under the proposed plan to be excessive, the Academic Senate reserves judgment of the question of which specific programs should be identified for possible discontinuation.⁹ In cases where it is no longer prudent for a department to offer all

concentrations within the same degree program or all degree programs currently offered by the department, the Academic Senate recommends that departmental faculty be provided the opportunity to identify which of its programs should be discontinued.¹⁰

2) Balance of Undergraduate Programs

Since enrollment decreases in the proposed plan are likely to be concentrated in five very large programs (three in Arts and Sciences and two in professional schools), implementation of the plan is likely to achieve a better balance in enrollment distribution among programs if students redirect into smaller programs targeted for increases. Within the School of Arts and Sciences, the planned enrollment adjustments could bring enrollments within and between programs in Humanities/Fine Arts and Social/Behavioral Sciences [Note: the Math/Science proportion of the total and internal distribution within the division is likely to remain constant under the plan.] Similarly, in the professional schools, if enrollment in the two large programs targeted for decreases are redirected to other programs in the professional schools, a more appropriate enrollment balance among programs may be achieved. However, as noted previously (section I.A.1.a.), attention should be given to maintaining the current relative proportion of enrollment in Arts and Sciences and professional schools.

While the Academic Senate makes no recommendation on which specific undergraduate programs should be targeted for enrollment increases, decreases, or maintenance, the Academic Senate supports the effort in the plan to achieve an enrollment balance among programs.¹¹

b. Graduate Programs

While the University currently offers a wide variety of graduate programs, total enrollment in graduate programs in Arts and Sciences constitutes only 25% of total graduate enrollment, and, with the exception of Psychology and English, the programs are relatively small. As in the case of undergraduate programs, the Academic Senate does not consider the number of graduate programs identified for possible discontinuation to be excessive, but makes no recommendation on which specific programs should be identified for possible program discontinuation.¹² However, the Academic Senate believes that implementation of the proposed plan could result in a further undesirable decrease in the proportion of graduate enrollment in Arts and Sciences unless a plan includes strategies to strengthen graduate programs in Arts and Sciences and increase enrollments in Arts and Sciences. The IPP specifies that "The University is committed to offering graduate programs in selected disciplines to prepare students to pursue doctoral studies and to enter advanced professional training programs and career fields". Among the types of graduate programs identified in the IPP as priorities are "Master's degree programs, in a variety of disciplines, that prepare students for doctoral studies and/or advancement in an occupation or profession, including careers in community college teaching. Since graduate programs in arts and sciences are central to the achievement of these specified goals, the Academic Senate recommends that Academic Affairs monitor the strength of graduate programs in Arts and Sciences, and, if necessary, develop strategies to increase enrollments in a variety of graduate programs in Arts and Sciences in order to meet the goal of preparing students, particularly students from underrepresented groups, for doctoral studies, and careers in community college teaching."¹³

B. Insufficient Development/Omissions in the Proposed Plan

1. General Education

The IPP devotes considerable attention to the relationship between undergraduate enrollment and resource support for the General Education program and the identification of priorities within the General Education program (IPP section IV F). Specifically, IPP provides that "Resource support for the G.E. program shall be sufficient to allow students to complete G.E. requirements in a sequential and timely manner", and identifies priority categories within the G.E. program. The IPP further notes the relationship between proportion of lower division students admitted to the University and need for resources to support the G.E. Program. The effect of changes in the enrollment mix among priority program categories and changes in the mix of programs within the undergraduate program on FTES distribution and G.E. resource needs are discussed in section II of this document. The proposed plan specifies that the G.E. program "needs to maintain" its current proportion of our overall headcount enrollment and fails to relate enrollment in G.E. to effects of the plan on lower division/upper division student enrollment mix and undergraduate/graduate enrollment mix. The proposed plan notes that "The Dean for General Education is asked to develop recommendations on the size and scope of general education program offerings by discipline". The Academic Senate considers this step critical to ensuring that departments are not inadvertently saddled with a G.E. responsibility for which resources have not been allocated, leaving them unable to support increased enrollment in major programs as recommended in the plan or suffer even greater decreases in major enrollment than recommended in the proposed plan. Therefore, the Academic Senate urges Academic Affairs to insure that allocation decisions based primarily on planned enrollment targets for major/minor programs offered by departments not be made until the size and scope of General Education offerings by discipline is determined and disseminated throughout the faculty community (see page 13, II.B.1 for elaboration).¹⁴

2. Service Courses

Like G.E., the need for service courses is related to the balance and mix of programs. The IPP specifies that "The University is committed to offering a sufficient number of service courses to insure completion of approved programs and notes that "In some cases, the course work taken outside the major discipline is substantial". The proposed plan makes only brief note of service courses while the implications of changes in program mix, particularly at the undergraduate level, may be extensive. Therefore, the Academic Senate urges Academic Affairs to insure that allocation decisions based primarily on planned enrollment targets for major/minor programs offered by departments not be made until the size and scope of service course offerings related to changes in enrollment targets for other departments can be determined (see page 11, II.A and page 16, II.B.4 for elaboration).¹⁵

3. Intercollegiate Athletics

Since Intercollegiate Athletics consists of enrollment generating courses, under a separate HEGIS code, with enrollment targets and instructional resources, planning for Intercollegiate Athletics should be included in a comprehensive University Academic Plan. Its absence from the Plan is of particular concern to the Academic Senate since the program is identified as a low priority in the IPP. The IPP specifies that "Intercollegiate Athletics is evaluated for priority relative to academic programs, as it is a program that offers courses, employs faculty, and otherwise derives resources from the academic budget". The IPP further specifies that "Intercollegiate Athletics be supported contingent upon the availability of resources, following adequate support for academic programs. Since it is clear that adequate support for academic programs is not available, the Academic Senate recommends that the University Academic Plan include a recommendation that a plan be developed to maintain the current proportion of enrollment in Intercollegiate Athletics, increase non-University funding for Intercollegiate Athletics, and decrease the number of Intercollegiate Athletics courses supported by the General Fund."¹⁶

II. Implications of the Proposed University Academic Plan for the Faculty/Instructional Resource Allocation Process

"The University Academic Plan represents an important step in the implementation of PM 91-12...[and] "will be used at the university level to determine faculty allocations, instructional support, and appropriate enrollment." (University Academic Plan, p. 1-2).

The University Academic Plan clearly and appropriately has implications for curricular/faculty allocations and the quality of our academic programs. How does it affect the instructional resource allocation process and what are the resource implications of this plan vis-a-vis the IPP and faculty. The Academic Senate would be remiss in its curricular responsibilities if it did not attempt to answer these questions and, analyze, in general, the relationship between this University Plan and the Faculty/Curricular Resource Allocation Process.

A. Relationship of the Plan to the Resource Allocation Process

The University Academic Plan is the pole which, finally, vaults us onto the "budget follows program" road set by the President and the Academic Senate in 1991.

It is, by virtue of its structure, the type of resource allocation document that places curriculum as the decision criterion for resource allocation rather than having curricular offerings being determined by student "demand", too many or too few faculty, whims of the legislature, and so on. This plan, with the cooperation of the Deans, could allow the faculty to exercise its proper role and responsibility within the university--as purveyors of the academic program.

The University Academic Plan, through its structure--and not what is in the boxes--provides the framework for allocating faculty resources and ensuring the integrity of curricular resource allocations across school, across category, and across program. Curricular resource integrity means, simply, that the interactional effects of enrollment adjustments in majors are accounted for in service courses, that enrollment adjustments within or across programs are, as best as is possible, understood and accounted for either in terms of student redistribution within/across schools or a complete loss

of student enrollment to the university, and, lastly, that adjustments in entering freshmen, transfer students, or other identifiable student cohorts are accounted for in allocations to the respective departments/universitywide curricular offerings that directly pertain to the cohort in question (i.e. an increase in freshmen will require an increase in General Education while an increase in first generation university students may require an increase in educational equity, and so on). Without the vigilance of Academic Affairs to curricular integrity, the University will not succeed in its efforts to have "budget follow program" and the implementation of a university plan of this type will fail. Therefore, the Academic Senate recommends that Academic Affairs assume operational responsibility for ensuring the congruence of resource allocations to departments with the University Academic Plan, and that this responsibility not be delegated downwards because schools do not and cannot account for across school interactions nor can schools take fully into consideration interactions across programs, G.E./service needs, and enrollment redirection.¹⁷ (Note: This recommendation addresses a structural problem of all organizations and is in no way meant to impugn anyone.)

In order for the University Plan to be implemented as closely to its intent as possible, the University's old way of allocating resources, particularly faculty allocations, must give way to a new way of doing business. Again, the Plan, if it is to be implemented with any integrity, forces us to move from using formulaic decision-criteria to allocate faculty resources (FTES and dollars) to using curriculum as the primary decision criterion with enrollment management as primarily a secondary criterion (even in light of a "no-lay off policy--see Section C).

The Academic Senate recommends substantive changes in the resource allocation process from the current model in which there is no University level consideration of departmental enrollments and resource needs to one in which enrollments for departments are set at the University level (by Academic Affairs), and resources are allocated to schools based on identified departmental curricular needs.¹⁸

The Academic Senate endorses the setting of academic priorities at the University level and recommends that resource allocations be made (from the University level) to schools (not by schools) based on department determined minimum curriculum for quality program coupled with the across school, across category enrollment interactions and G.E. that can only be articulated at the University level (by Academic Affairs).¹⁹

B. Implications of the Plan for Resource Allocation

Resources, under the new way of doing business, are the last piece of the University's Academic Program puzzle that ought to be considered (not, as in the past, the first piece of the puzzle). The two most important areas to analyze for resource implications are enrollment patterns and program quality (the no faculty lay-off "policy" is addressed in Section C). The relative position of programs within categories has little to no effect on resource allocation. The categories of program have much less effect on resource allocation by program than increases/decreases in enrollments, requisites for maintaining and ensuring program quality, and across school/category interactions.

The Academic Senate urges Academic Affairs to be attentive to the fact that departmental resource needs are multifaceted, and further urges Academic Affairs to insure that placement of a departmental program in a particular category of the University Academic Plan not be used as the primary basis for allocating resources to the Department.²⁰

The resource implications are identified below by area (Note: The comments are based on the "Enrollment Analysis by Majors.")

Enrollment Patterns

1. As Concerns the Entire University

- a. The University Plan provides for a lower division enrollment pattern of approximately 16%. This is a very small portion for the university, particularly in light of the IPP, with calls for upwards to 25%.

***Resource Implication:** It is assumed, in light of the IPP, that Academic Affairs will make every effort in the near future to increase the proportion of entering freshmen and will, consistent with the IPP, uphold the policies relative to transfer students. These efforts should result in an increase in lower division students which, in turn, will impact resource distribution.

Therefore, the Academic Senate recommends that the relationship of G.E. resource needs to lower division enrollment be given greater attention and that the relative importance of G.E. to the whole of the University be consistent with the assumption made regarding efforts to increase lower division headcount enrollments.²¹

- b. The University Plan has identified a large number of undeclared graduate students.

***Resource Implication:** Undeclared majors, whether undergraduate or graduate, place a resource burden on all programs since undeclared majors cannot be planned for. Particularly in graduate programs, where student/faculty ratios are supposed to be low (and costs are relatively higher than undergraduate programs) having undeclared majors floating around is assumed to be an inefficient use of resources. Also, undeclared majors raise questions about academic integrity since, it is assumed, no resources are given for advising undeclared graduates.

The Academic Senate is concerned that the significant number of undeclared graduate students may be straining the resources of graduate programs and therefore recommends that the number of undeclared graduate students (credential candidates excepted) admitted to the University be decreased or that strategies be developed to lessen the perceived resource strain.²²

2. As Concerns Undergraduate Enrollment

- a. Under the University Plan only 15% of Arts and Sciences undergraduates are lower division and only 7% of the Professional Schools' enrollment is lower division.

***Resource Implication:** The resource implication here is simply a word of caution and a request to monitor the situation--typically when programs occupy very small portions of total programs, insufficient attention and resources accrue to them. Therefore, the Academic Senate expresses concern that the small proportion of total lower division enrollment to upper division and graduate enrollments may result in insufficient attention and resource allocation to lower division instruction. Therefore, the Academic Senate recommends that strategies be developed to insure that lower division instruction is supported adequately.²³

3. As Concerns Graduate Enrollment

- a. Under the University Plan the graduate enrollment of Arts and Sciences is 20% of the total graduate population.

***Resource Implication:** The tendency, from old patterns, is to identify resource allocations based on formulae and percentage of population. This type of resource allocation must be avoided at all costs--type of program dictates dollars needed (for example, the per student cost of a graduate chemistry program may be more than the per student cost of a graduate business program, thus actual costs rather than proportional formula need to be included in the decision matrix).

The Academic Senate recommends that actual program costs (to be determined using standard methods across the University by departments) be used as decision criteria for allocating resources across and among programs rather than basing department or school allocations on formulae (percentage student population or FTES).²⁴

4. As Concerns Effect on FTES Distribution and Resource Needs Across Departments/Schools
 - a. Under the University Plan, FTES distribution will change from current patterns.

*Resource Implication: The immediate, but fallacious, assumption is that fewer resources will be required by programs targeted for program enrollment decrease. To the contrary, particularly in the Arts and Sciences, it is likely that students will redistribute themselves among other programs within the school, thus while Communication Studies may eventually experience a decline in enrollments, other Arts and Sciences programs (Theatre Arts, Ethnic Studies, etc.) may experience an increase in enrollments because they have room for the students who would otherwise have gone into Communication Studies. Thus, it is important not to automatically remove resources simply because enrollments are targeted for decrease. Also, it is important to pay attention to redistribution across schools. For example, students could redistribute from Health and Human Services--it has some Arts and Sciences type programs slated for undergraduate decreases--to Arts and Sciences and vice versa: organization communication students might go into the Organizational Behavior and Environment program in the School of Business Administration. In addition, whereas some programs are targeted for increases in enrollments, their corresponding service courses/programs have been targeted for enrollment maintenance in the major or decreases. An example of this is the B.A. in Nursing which is targeted for an increase in enrollment but its service courses, Biology/Chemistry, etc., are not slated for increases in enrollment. Therefore, the Academic Senate urges Academic Affairs to be attentive to the fact that departmental resource needs are multifaceted, and further urges Academic Affairs to insure that placement of a departmental program in a particular category of the University Academic Plan not be used as the

primary basis for allocating resources to the Department.²⁰

- b. The relative balance and mix of undergraduate enrollments between schools is slated to change.

***Resource Implication:** Again, because enrollments change we cannot automatically assume a corresponding change in resources. Enrollment levels do not affect program quality. This is to say that program quality is not a function of enrollments and therefore programs, if they are to be maintained at all, must be given a reasonable amount of resources to maintain program quality in spite of low enrollments.

The Academic Senate acknowledges that program quality is not a function of enrollments and therefore recommends that programs, if they are to be maintained at all, must be given a reasonable level of resources to maintain quality in spite of enrollment.²⁵

- c. Under the University Plan the relative size of Arts and Sciences enrollments to that of the Professional schools may decline.

***Resource Implication:** Does the University wish to support more students in what are ostensibly more expensive programs, on the whole, by increasing the relative size of professional enrollments (Note: Health and Human Services is not composed solely of professional programs so the curricular implication of Liberal Arts vs. Professional are somewhat murky).

The Academic Senate recommends that resource allocations among/between the typically less expensive liberal arts programs and the typically more expensive professional programs be closely monitored so that educational costs/benefits can be optimized.²⁶

5. As Concerns Specific Enrollment Increases/Decreases in Graduate Programs Across Schools
 - a. Under the University Plan Arts and Sciences may suffer proportionately a much larger reduction in its graduate enrollment than the Professional Schools (note: the majority of the enrollment in Professional Schools is Graduate therefore this proportional divergence is not entirely out of order).

*Resource Implication: The sizeable reduction in graduate enrollments in Arts and Sciences may result in the "marginalization" of graduate programs in Arts and Sciences. Careful attention must be paid to any resource reduction in such small programs. Further, because graduate and undergraduate resources are not specified in either the allocation or financing plans, reductions in resources ostensibly to one program may result in reductions to the other because, as has often been the case, graduate and undergraduate programs have robbed Peter to pay Paul. Because no separate accounting mechanism has been in place for either graduate or undergraduate programs, if enrollment reductions are to have corresponding resource reductions, then we must be sure that reductions occur only from the level which is to experience a reduction in enrollment. Lastly, because the per student cost of accredited programs (many of the professional schools house accredited programs) is higher than the per student cost of non-accredited programs, the cost/benefit of resource utilization should be closely monitored (note: it may be more beneficial to provide more resources to non-accredited programs than to accredited ones simply on the basis of life cycle costs/benefits. In the same vein, when comparing and contrasting graduate science programs (more expensive) with non-science programs the University must be cautioned to monitor the cost/benefit of resource utilization in light of regional need.

Given the scope and complexity of the University Academic Plan it may be beneficial for the University to separate graduate and

undergraduate resource allocations and budgets so that the integrity of each level may be maintained.

The Academic Senate recommends that graduate and undergraduate programs be costed out so that resource allocations and budgets more closely align with enrollment patterns and program quality.²⁷

C. Program Driven Resource Allocation Guidelines for Implementation of the University Academic Plan

As noted previously, the University Academic Plan, as it has been developed, is a critical step in the University's efforts to provide educationally sound programs efficiently and effectively. The University Plan comes, however, at a time of declining resources. Thus unfortunate timing makes its implementation more complex. Further complicating its implementation is the threat of faculty lay-offs. This complex set of factors--curriculum driven decision making, declining resources, and avoidance of faculty layoffs--requires a resource allocation plan that integrates all factors, including faculty reassignment to avoid layoffs. Thus, the Academic Senate recommends that faculty allocations to schools be based on class schedules developed by departments that identify the minimum number of courses necessary to support a quality program for the targeted program enrollment and the number of G.E. and service courses expected of the department, rather than first allocating positions to a department (on the basis of formulae or other factors, e.g., number of tenure track faculty present or part-time faculty utilized in the past) and then asking departments to develop schedules to fit within this allocation.²⁸

Listing of Recommendations

OVERVIEW

Recommendations 1-5:

These pertain to the University Academic Plan, in and of itself, as a type of decision tool and identifies academic policy type concerns that may arise as a result of implementing the UAP. These recommendations endorse the UAP with reservations and conditions.

Recommendations 6-16:

These pertain to the congruence between the IPP and UAP regarding the balance and mix of programs and enrollments across and within schools and among levels. These recommendations identify, based on the Committee's interpretation of the data, possible and probable inconsistencies between the IPP and UAP and urge Academic Affairs to insure the integrity of the IPP by closely monitoring the enrollment patterns throughout the University as the UAP is implemented.

Recommendations 17-28:

These pertain to the implications of the UAP for our resource allocation process. These recommendations essentially say that the UAP cannot be implemented with much integrity unless we, the entire University community, change our way of doing business--from enrollments and budgets driving program to program/curriculum and enrollment management driving allocations and budgets. This change in the way we do business, requested of us by President Gerth in 1991, calls for us, the faculty, and administrators and staff, to change our decision-making paradigm from one that is discipline and school specific to one which is grounded in the concept of educational community and university.

LISTING OF RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Academic Senate endorses the development of a University academic plan of the type distributed by the Vice President for Academic Affairs on April 15, 1993, which attempts to achieve an agreed upon balance and mix of programs that conforms to the guidelines specified in the policy on Instructional Program Priorities (PM 91-12) by identifying enrollment targets for the University's various academic programs and establishing enrollment priorities based on an application of criteria specified in the policy on Instructional Program Priorities (IPP). [Position Statement, p. 1]
2. The Academic Senate endorses, with reservations and conditions to be specified (Section II of the Academic Senate position paper), the primary objective of the proposed April 15, 1993, "University Academic Plan" as "a tool for decision making regarding the curricular offerings, faculty and other resource needs, and manage (sic) student enrollment in the University's various academic programs". However, the Academic Senate recommends against the use of any such plan as a basis for resource allocation in the short term (1993-94) unless there is a corresponding change in the current resource allocation process that takes into consideration and addresses the concerns raised in Section II of this position statement. [Position Statement, p. 1]
3. The Academic Senate recommends that matters pertaining to administrative restructuring be addressed in a context other than the University Academic Plan. While the Academic Senate makes no comment on Section II of the University Plan, the Academic Senate urges Academic Affairs to pay keen attention to the curricular implication of any administrative restructuring, and recommends Academic Affairs use the same principles of curricular integrity as the primary decision criterion when attempting to achieve administrative restructuring and efficiencies. [Position Statement, p. 2]
4. The Academic Senate recommends that additional input provided by departmental faculty be given serious consideration in development of a revision of the proposed plan, particularly in cases of setting priorities among concentrations within the same degree program or priorities among different degree programs at the same level offered by a given department. [Position Statement, p. 2]

5. The Academic Senate recommends that Academic Affairs develop a plan for student redirection that includes advising strategies that will facilitate the redirection of students throughout the University in an orderly manner from programs to be decreased to programs targeted to increase. [Position Statement, p. 4]
6. The Academic Senate recommends that total headcount enrollment in undergraduate programs in Arts and Sciences and the professional schools be maintained at current proportions of total undergraduate head count (i.e., 50/50). [Position Statement, p. 4]
7. The highest proportion of lower division students (33%) are "undeclared." The Academic Senate is concerned that undeclared students may suffer a higher rate of attrition than declared students and that the high proportion of undeclared students creates enrollment distribution uncertainties. Therefore, the Academic Senate recommends that the Vice President for Academic Affairs work with the Academic Policies Committee to either decrease the number of undeclared majors admitted as entering freshmen or develop strategies to insure adequate advising to mitigate against attrition. [Position Statement, p. 5]
8. The Academic Senate recommends that total headcount enrollment in graduate programs be maintained at the current proportion (20%) of total headcount enrollment. [Position Statement, p. 6]
9. The Academic Senate does not consider the number of undergraduate programs identified for possible discontinuation under the proposed plan to be excessive, but reserves judgment of the question on which specific programs should be identified for possible discontinuation. [Position Statement, p. 6]
10. In cases where it is no longer prudent for a department to offer all concentrations within the same degree program or all degree programs at the same level currently offered by the department, the Academic Senate recommends that departmental faculty be provided the opportunity to identify which of its programs should be discontinued. [Position Statement, p. 7]

11. While the Academic Senate makes no recommendation on which specific undergraduate programs should be targeted for enrollment increases, decreases, or maintenance, the Academic Senate supports the effort in the plan to achieve a enrollment balance among programs. [Position Statement, p. 7]
12. The Academic Senate does not consider the number of graduate programs identified for possible discontinuation to be excessive, but makes no recommendation on which specific programs should be identified for possible program discontinuation. [Position Statement, p. 8]
13. The Academic Senate recommends that Academic Affairs monitor the strength of graduate programs in Arts and Sciences, and, if necessary, develop strategies to increase enrollments in a variety of graduate programs in Arts and Sciences in order to meet the goal of preparing students, particularly students from underrepresented groups, for doctoral studies, and careers in community college teaching. [Position Statement, p. 8]
14. The Academic Senate urges Academic Affairs to insure that allocation decisions based primarily on planned enrollment targets for major/minor programs offered by departments not be made until the size and scope of General Education offerings by discipline is determined and disseminated throughout the faculty community (see page 13, II.B.1 for elaboration). [Position Statement, p. 9]
15. The Academic Senate urges Academic Affairs to insure that allocation decisions based primarily on planned enrollment targets for major/minor programs offered by departments not be made until the size and scope of service course offerings related to changes in enrollment targets for other departments can be determined (see page 11, II.A and page 16, II.B.4 for elaboration). [Position Statement, p. 10]
16. Since it is clear that adequate support for academic programs is not available, the Academic Senate recommends that the University Academic Plan include a recommendation that a plan be developed to maintain the current proportion of enrollment in Intercollegiate Athletics, increase non-University funding for Intercollegiate Athletics, and decrease the number of Intercollegiate Athletics courses supported by the General Fund. [Position Statement, p. 10]

17. The Academic Senate recommends that Academic Affairs assume operational responsibility for ensuring the congruence of resource allocations to departments with the University Academic Plan, and that this responsibility not be delegated downwards because schools do not and cannot account for across school interactions nor can schools take fully into consideration interactions across programs, G.E./service needs, and enrollment redirection. [Position Statement, p. 12]
18. The Academic Senate recommends substantive changes in the resource allocation process from the current model in which there is no University level consideration of departmental enrollments and resource needs to one in which enrollments for departments are set at the University level (by Academic Affairs), and resources are allocated to schools based on identified departmental curricular needs. [Position Statement, p. 12]
19. The Academic Senate endorses the setting of academic priorities at the University level and recommends that resource allocations be made (from the University level) to schools (not by schools) based on department determined minimum curriculum for quality program coupled with the across school, across category enrollment interactions and G.E. that can only be articulated at the University level (by Academic Affairs). [Position Statement, p. 13]
20. The Academic Senate urges ~~the Deans and~~ Academic Affairs to be attentive to the fact that departmental resource needs are multifaceted, and further urges Academic Affairs to insure that placement of a departmental program in a particular category of the University Academic Plan not be used as the primary basis for allocating resources to the Department. [Position Statement, p. 13]
21. The Academic Senate recommends that the relationship of G.E. resource needs to lower division enrollment be given greater attention and that the relative importance of G.E. to the whole of the University be consistent with the assumption made regarding efforts to increase lower division headcount enrollments. [Position Statement, p. 14]
22. The Academic Senate is concerned that the significant number of undeclared graduate students may be straining the resources of graduate programs and therefore recommends that the number of undeclared graduate students (credential candidates excepted) admitted to the

University be decreased or that strategies be developed to lessen the perceived resource strain. [Position Statement, p. 14]

23. The Academic Senate expresses concern that the small proportion of total lower division enrollment to upper division and graduate enrollments may result in insufficient attention and resource allocation to lower division instruction. Therefore, the Academic Senate recommends that strategies be developed to insure that lower division instruction is supported adequately. [Position Statement, p. 15]
24. The Academic Senate recommends that actual program costs (to be determined using standard methods across the University by departments) be used as decision criteria for allocating resources across and among programs rather than basing department or school allocations on formulae (percentage student population or FTES). [Position Statement, p. 15]
25. The Academic Senate acknowledges that program quality is not a function of enrollments and therefore recommends that programs, if they are to be maintained at all, must be given a reasonable level of resources to maintain quality in spite of enrollment. [Position Statement, p. 17]
26. The Academic Senate recommends that resource allocations among/between the typically less expensive liberal arts programs and the typically more expensive professional programs be closely monitored so that educational costs/benefits can be optimized. [Position Statement, p. 17]
27. The Academic Senate recommends that graduate and undergraduate programs be costed out so that resource allocations and budgets more closely align with enrollment patterns and program quality. [Position Statement, p. 19]
28. The Academic Senate recommends that faculty allocations to schools be based on class schedules developed by departments that identify the minimum number of courses necessary to support a quality program for the targeted program enrollment and the number of G.E. and service courses expected of the department, rather than first allocating positions to a department (on the basis of formulae or other factors, e.g., number of tenure track faculty present or part-time faculty utilized in the past) and then asking departments to develop schedules to fit within this allocation. [Position Statement, p. 19]

5/20/93

AS 93-44A UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC PLAN

The CSUS Academic Senate adopts the "Position Statement of the CSUS Academic Senate on a Proposed University Academic Plan."

AS 93-44B UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC PLAN

The CSUS Academic Senate adopts the following statements of position and recommendations related to the University Academic Plan and forwards them to the President for formal consideration:

AS 93-44B.1 Endorsement or Rejection of a Plan of This Type

AS 93-44B.2 University Academic Plan and the Resource Allocation Recommendations

AS 93-44B.3 (a-j) Recommendations on University Academic Plan Content

AS 93-44B.4 (a-d) Independent Policy Recommendations

AS 93-44B.5 (a-c) Independent Cost Accounting Recommendations

AS 93-44B.1 ENDORSEMENT OR REJECTION OF A PLAN OF THIS TYPE

The Academic Senate endorses, with reservations and conditions to be specified (Section II of the Academic Senate position paper), the primary objective of the proposed April 15, 1993, "University Academic Plan" as "a tool for decision making regarding the curricular offerings, faculty and other resource needs, and manage (sic) student enrollment in the University's various academic programs." However, the Academic Senate recommends against the use of any such plan as a basis for resource allocation in the short term (1993-94) unless there is a corresponding change in the current resource allocation process that takes into consideration and addresses the concerns raised in Section II of this position statement.

[Recommendation 2]

The Academic Senate endorses the development of a University academic plan of the type distributed by the Vice President for Academic Affairs on April 15, 1993, which attempts to achieve an agreed upon balance and mix of programs that conforms to the guidelines specified in IPP by identifying enrollment targets for the University's various academic programs and establishes enrollment priorities based on an application of criteria specified in the IPP. [Recommendation 1]

AS 93-44B.2 (F/R) UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC PLAN AND THE RESOURCE ALLOCATION RECOMMENDATIONS

The Academic Senate recommends that faculty allocations to schools be based on class schedules developed by departments that identify the ~~minimum~~ number of courses necessary to support a quality program for the targeted program enrollment and the number of G.E. and service courses, expected of the department, rather than first allocating positions to a department (on the basis of formulae or other factors, e.g., number of tenure track faculty present or part-time faculty utilized in the past) and then asking departments to develop schedules to fit within this allocation. [Recommendation 28]

The Academic Senate urges Academic Affairs to insure that allocation decisions based primarily on planned enrollment targets for major/minor programs offered by departments not be made until the size and scope of General Education offerings by discipline is determined and disseminated throughout the faculty community (see page 13, II.B.1 for elaboration). [Recommendation 14]

The Academic Senate urges Academic Affairs to insure that allocation decisions based primarily on planned enrollment targets for major/minor programs offered by departments not be made until the size and scope of service course offerings related to changes in enrollment targets for other departments can be determined (see page 11, II.A and page 16, II.B.4 for elaboration). [Recommendation 15]

The Academic Senate recommends that Academic Affairs assume operational responsibility for ensuring the congruence of resource allocations to departments with the University Academic Plan, and that this responsibility not be delegated downwards because schools do not and cannot account for across school interactions nor can schools take fully into consideration interactions across programs, G.E./service needs, and enrollment redirection. [Recommendation 17]

The Academic Senate recommends substantive changes in the resource allocation process from the current model in which there is no University level consideration of departmental enrollments and resource needs to one in which enrollments for departments are set at the University level (by Academic Affairs), and resources are allocated to schools based on identified departmental curricular needs. [Recommendation 18]

The Academic Senate endorses the setting of academic priorities at the University level and recommends that resource allocations be made (from the University level) to schools (not by schools) based on department determined minimum curriculum for quality program coupled with the across school, across category enrollment interactions and G.E. that can only be articulated at the University level (by Academic Affairs). [Recommendation 19]

The Academic Senate urges Academic Affairs to be attentive to the fact that departmental resource needs are multifaceted, and further urges Academic Affairs to insure that placement of a departmental program in a particular category of the University Academic Plan not be used as the primary basis for allocating resources to the Department. [Recommendation 20]

The Academic Senate recommends that the relationship of G.E. resource needs to lower division enrollment be given greater attention and that the relative importance of G.E. to the whole of the University be consistent with the assumption made regarding efforts to increase lower division headcount enrollments. [Recommendation 21]

The Academic Senate acknowledges that program quality is not a function of enrollments and therefore recommends that programs, if they are to be maintained at all, must be given a reasonable level of resources to maintain quality in spite of enrollment. [Recommendation 25]

AS 93-44B.3 RECOMMENDATIONS ON UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC PLAN CONTENT

- a. The Academic Senate recommends that matters pertaining to administrative restructuring be addressed in a context other than the University Academic Plan. While the Academic Senate makes no comment on Section II of the University Plan, the Academic Senate urges Academic Affairs to pay keen attention to the curricular implication of any administrative restructuring, and recommends Academic Affairs use the same principles of curricular integrity as the primary decision criterion when attempting to achieve administrative restructuring and efficiencies. [Recommendation 3]
- b. The Academic Senate recommends that additional input provided by departmental faculty be given serious consideration in development of a revision of the proposed plan, particularly in cases of setting priorities among concentrations within the same degree program or priorities among different degree programs at the same level offered by a given department. [Recommendation 4]
- c. The Academic Senate recommends that total headcount enrollment in undergraduate programs in Arts and Sciences and the professional schools be maintained at current proportions of total undergraduate headcount (i.e., 50/50). [Recommendation 6]
- d. The Academic Senate recommends that total headcount enrollment in graduate programs be maintained at the current proportion (20%) of total headcount enrollment. [Recommendation 8]
- e. Although the Academic Senate does not consider the number of undergraduate programs identified for possible discontinuation under the proposed plan to be excessive, the Academic Senate reserves judgment of the question of which specific programs should be identified for possible discontinuation. [Recommendation 9]
- f. In cases where it is no longer prudent for a department to offer all concentrations within the same degree program or all degree programs currently offered by the department, the Academic Senate recommends that departmental faculty be provided the opportunity to identify which of its programs should be discontinued. [Recommendation 10]
- g. While the Academic Senate makes no recommendation on which specific undergraduate programs should be targeted for enrollment increases, decreases, or maintenance, the Academic Senate supports the effort in the plan to achieve an enrollment balance among programs. [Recommendation 11]

AS 93-44B.3 - continued

- h. The Academic Senate does not consider the number of graduate programs identified for possible discontinuation to be excessive, but makes no recommendation on which specific programs should be identified for possible program discontinuation. [Recommendation 12]
- i. The Academic Senate recommends that Academic Affairs monitor the strength of graduate programs in Arts and Sciences, and, if necessary, develop strategies to increase enrollments in a variety of graduate programs in Arts and Sciences in order to meet the goal of preparing students, particularly students from underrepresented groups, for doctoral studies, and careers in community college teaching. [Recommendation 13]
- j. Since it is clear that adequate support for academic programs is not available, the Academic Senate recommends that the University Academic Plan include a recommendation that a plan be developed to maintain the current proportion of enrollment in Intercollegiate Athletics, increase non-University funding for Intercollegiate Athletics, and decrease the number of Intercollegiate Athletics courses supported by the General Fund. [Recommendation 16]

- a. The Academic Senate recommends that Academic Affairs develop a plan for student redirection that includes advising strategies that will facilitate the redirection of students throughout the University in an orderly manner from programs to be decreased to programs targeted to increase. [Recommendation 5]
- b. The highest proportion of lower division students (33%) are "undeclared." The Academic Senate is concerned that undeclared students may suffer a higher rate of attrition than declared students and that the high proportion of undeclared students creates enrollment distribution uncertainties. Therefore, the Academic Senate recommends that the Vice President for Academic Affairs work with the Academic Policies Committee to either decrease the number of undeclared majors admitted as entering freshmen or develop strategies to insure adequate advising to mitigate against attrition. [Recommendation 7]
- c. The Academic Senate is concerned that the significant number of undeclared graduate students may be straining the resources of graduate programs and therefore recommends that the number of undeclared graduate students (credential candidates excepted) admitted to the University be decreased or that strategies be developed to lessen the perceived resource strain. [Recommendation 22]
- d. The Academic Senate expresses concern that the small proportion of total lower division enrollment to upper division and graduate enrollments may result in insufficient attention and resource allocation to lower division instruction. Therefore, the Academic Senate recommends that strategies be developed to insure that lower division instruction is supported adequately. [Recommendation 23]

- a. The Academic Senate recommends that actual program costs (to be determined using standard methods across the University by departments) be used as decision criteria for allocating resources across and among programs rather than basing department or school allocations on formulae (percentage student population or FTES). [Recommendation 24]
- b. The Academic Senate recommends that resource allocations among/between the typically less expensive liberal arts programs and the typically more expensive professional programs be closely monitored so that educational costs/benefits can be optimized. [Recommendation 26]
- c. The Academic Senate recommends that graduate and undergraduate programs be costed out so that resource allocations and budgets more closely align with enrollment patterns and program quality. [Recommendation 27]

ENDORSEMENT OR REJECTION
OF
A PLAN OF THIS TYPE A UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC PLAN

*Passer / Sectt
Substituted for
B.1 carried*

Although the Academic Senate endorses, with reservations and conditions to be specified (Section II of the Academic Senate position paper), the primary objective of the proposed April 15, 1993, "University Academic Plan" as "a tool for decision making regarding the curricular offerings, faculty and other resource needs, and manage (sic) student enrollment in the University's various academic programs",. However, the Academic Senate recommends against the use of ~~any such plan~~ the proposed plan (or any revisions) as a basis for resource allocation in the short term (1993-94), ~~unless there is a corresponding change in the current resource allocation process that takes into consideration and addresses the concerns raised in Section II of this position statement.~~ (Recommendation 2)

The Academic Senate endorses the concept and development of a University academic plan which attempts to achieve an agreed upon balance and mix of programs that conforms to the guidelines specified in the policy on Instructional Program Priorities (PM 91-12) by identifying enrollment targets for the University's various academic programs and establishing enrollment priorities based on an application of criteria specified in the policy on Instructional Program Priorities (IPP). (Recommendation 1.A)

However, although the April 15, 1993 University Academic Plan distributed by Academic Affairs is a plan of this type, the Academic Senate has reservations and concerns regarding the specific content of the April 15, 1993 "University Academic Plan" as it relates to the 1991 IPP (Section II of Academic Senate position paper). (Recommendation 1.B)

In addition, the Academic Senate recommends that the IPP Policy Statement itself be revisited in 1993-94 to consider whether the priorities as well as the balance and mix of programs specified in the 1991 IPP Policy Statement should be retained or revised to guide the development of future University Academic Plans. (Recommendation 1.C)

ENROLLMENT ANALYSIS BY MAJOR

1. Current Enrollment Patterns.

The following enrollment data were taken from the Fall, 1992, report of the Office of Institutional Studies.

Table 1: Percentage of Headcount Enrollment by Major and by School
(Percentage of FTES in parentheses)

| <u>School</u> | <u>% of Univ</u> | <u>% LD</u> | <u>% UD</u> | <u>% Grad</u> |
|-------------------|------------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|
| A&S | 37.6 (38.3) | 14 | 75 | 11 |
| Business | 21.6 (21.4) | 14 | 74 | 11 |
| Education | 5.4 (4.6) | 6 | 23 | 71 |
| E&CS | 10.9 (11.2) | 18 | 62 | 20 |
| H&HS | 14.3 (14.8) | 13 | 66 | 21 |
| Undeclared | 10.3 (9.6) | 33 | 20 | 47 |
| <u>University</u> | | 16 | 64 | 20 |

No obvious differential exists between headcount enrollment and FTES, so the rest of this analysis is based on headcount alone. Two obvious conclusions can be drawn from this data:

- (a) The University lower division percentage is only 16% of total enrollment (or 20% of undergraduate enrollment). This is far less than the IPP goal of 25% minimum of undergraduate enrollment.
- (b) Graduate enrollment barely meets the University total of 20% minimum. Most of this enrollment is concentrated in three of the professional schools, with a surprisingly large number of undeclared graduate students (almost 25% of the graduate total).

A more detailed breakdown of undergraduate major headcount by program type is found in Tables 2-5 (apologies to programs which may feel misclassified):

Table 2: Humanities/Fine Arts (A&S)

| | <u># Prog</u> | <u># LD</u> | <u># UD</u> |
|--------------------|----------------|-------------|-------------|
| Fine Arts | 5 | 119 | 548 |
| Letters | 9 | 269 | 1615 |
| Foreign Languages | 3 ¹ | 25 | 113 |
| Other ² | <u>2</u> | <u>162</u> | <u>1024</u> |
| | 19 | 575 | 3300 |

¹Plus 6 minors, 2 course areas.

²Asian Studies, Liberal Studies.

Table 3: Math/Sciences (A&S)

| | <u># Prog</u> | <u># LD</u> | <u># UD</u> |
|-----------|---------------|-------------|-------------|
| Math/Stat | 3 | 26 | 147 |
| Sciences | <u>12</u> | <u>193</u> | <u>626</u> |
| | 15 | 219 | 773 |

Table 4: Social Sciences (A&S)

| | <u># Prog</u> | <u># LD</u> | <u># UD</u> |
|--------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|
| Traditional | 8 | 352 | 2012 |
| Other ¹ | <u>6</u> | <u>73</u> | <u>671</u> |
| | 14 | 425 | 2683 |

¹Home Economics, Speech Pathology, Social Science Waiver, Environmental Studies, Ethnic Studies, Gerontology

Table 5: Professional Schools

| | <u># Prog</u> ¹ | <u># LD</u> | <u># UD</u> |
|-------------|----------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| Business | 10 | 53 ² | 3592 ² |
| Education | 1 | 71 | 307 |
| Engineering | 7 | 22 ² | 1319 ² |
| H&HS | <u>18</u> | <u>448</u> | <u>2309</u> |
| | 27 | 594 | 7527 |

¹Includes concentrations as separate programs.

²Not including "pre-majors".

Clearly CSUS supports a wide variety of undergraduate program types in both the liberal arts and sciences and in the professional schools. Of those students clearly identified with major programs, about 15% of A&S undergraduates are in the lower division, as compared with about 7% in the professional schools.

A breakdown of graduate major headcount patterns by program type is found in Tables 6-9:

Table 6: Humanities/Fine Arts (A&S)

| | <u># Prog</u> | <u># Stud</u> |
|-------------------|---------------|---------------|
| Fine Arts | 3 | 87 |
| Letters | 3 | 273 |
| Foreign Languages | <u>3</u> | <u>51</u> |
| | 9 | 411 |

Table 7: Math/Sciences (A&S)

| | <u># Prog</u> | <u># Stud</u> |
|-----------|---------------|---------------|
| Math/Stat | 1 | 34 |
| Sciences | <u>4</u> | <u>86</u> |
| | 5 | 120 |

Table 8: Social Sciences (A&S)

| | <u># Prog</u> | <u># Stud</u> |
|--------------------|---------------|---------------|
| Traditional | 6 | 288 |
| Other ¹ | <u>3</u> | <u>135</u> |
| | 9 | 423 |

¹Speech Pathology, Public Policy Administration, Liberal Arts

Table 9: Professional Schools

| | <u># Prog</u> | <u># Stud</u> |
|-------------|---------------|---------------|
| Business | 4 | 591 |
| Education | 20 | 941 |
| Engineering | 5 | 531 |
| H&HS | <u>8</u> | <u>736</u> |
| | 37 | 2799 |

Again, there is a wide variety of graduate programs in both the liberal arts and sciences and in the professional schools. However, the A&S graduate enrollment is only about 25% of the total graduate population.

2. Probable Effect on Enrollments from Implementing University Academic Plan.

In the tables below all undergraduate academic programs identified in the University Academic Plan are categorized by priority (I-III) and size (A-D) category. Each cell contains numbers representing (# programs)/(# LD students)/(# UD students).

Table 1: Humanities/Fine Arts (A&S)

| | I | II | III |
|---|-----------|-----------|-------|
| A | | 1/ 3/ 53 | 1/0/8 |
| B | 5/123/598 | 4/117/523 | |
| C | 2/145/952 | 1/155/993 | 1/1/0 |
| D | | 3/ 23/148 | 1/0/2 |

Total to increase: 2/ 3/ 61
Total no change: 9/240/1121
Total to decrease: 9/324/2095¹

¹Of those programs recommended for decreased enrollment, Communication Studies (114/776), Interior Design (32/176) and Liberal Studies (155/993) account for most of this enrollment.

Table 2: Math/Sciences (A&S)

| | I | II | III |
|--------------------|-----------|---------|--------|
| A | | 1/ 8/33 | |
| B | 7/195/678 | | |
| C | | 4/12/31 | |
| D | | | 2/6/19 |
| Total to increase: | 1/ 8/ 33 | | |
| Total no change: | 7/195/678 | | |
| Total to decrease: | 6/ 18/ 50 | | |

Table 3: Social Sciences (A&S)

| | I | II | III |
|--------------------|-------------------------|-----------|--------|
| A | | 1/ 2/ 26 | 1/0/27 |
| B | 9/195/1396 | 1/ 22/138 | |
| C | 1/ 18/ 154 | 2/188/989 | |
| Total to increase: | 2/ 2/ 53 | | |
| Total no change: | 10/217/1534 | | |
| Total to decrease: | 3/206/1143 ¹ | | |

¹Psychology (167/888) accounts for most of this enrollment.

Table 4: Professional Schools

| | I | II | III |
|---|------------------------|------------|----------|
| A | 2/ 4/ 524 | | 1/ 0/ 80 |
| B | 8/94/2286 | 2/ 23/ 478 | 2/ 6/126 |
| C | 5/27/1762 ¹ | 4/250/1307 | |
| D | | 1/ 0/ 5 | 4/53/345 |

¹Plan anticipates this enrollment will shift into other Business Administration concentrations; not counted in total to decrease, below.

| | |
|--------------------|-------------------------|
| Total to increase: | 3/ 4/ 604 |
| Total no change: | 12/150/4652 |
| Total to decrease: | 9/313/1657 ² |

²Most of this total is in Criminal Justice (171/866) and Social Work (24/287).

Implementation of the plan would not seriously decrease the variety of programs, either in the liberal arts and sciences or in the professional schools. Most of the projected decrease in enrollment is concentrated over six large programs, as noted above. However, the total scheduled for decrease from A&S (17/548/3288) relative to that for the professional schools (9/313/1657) does seem to imply a shift in the historical pattern in which A&S has represented about 50% of University enrollment.

A similar priority grid for all graduate programs is found in Tables 5-8. (Each cell contains (# programs)/(# students).

Table 5: Humanities/Fine Arts (A&S)

| | I | II | III |
|---|-------|------|-----|
| A | 1/ 18 | | |
| B | 1/ 23 | 1/43 | |
| C | 2/255 | | |
| D | | 3/65 | 1/7 |

Total to increase: 1/ 18
 Total no change: 2/ 66
 Total to decrease: 6/327

Table 6: Math/Science (A&S)

| | I | II |
|---|------|------|
| B | 2/37 | |
| C | 1/26 | 2/57 |

Total no change: 2/37
 Total to decrease: 3/83

Table 7: Social Science (A&S)

| | I | II | III |
|---|-------|-------|------|
| A | 1/ 63 | | |
| B | 3/149 | | 1/13 |
| C | | 3/181 | |
| D | | 1/ 17 | |

Total to increase: 1/ 63
 Total no change: 4/162
 Total to decrease: 4/198

Table 8: Professional Schools

| | I | II |
|---|--------|-------|
| A | 6/ 416 | 1/ 38 |
| B | 8/1083 | 5/823 |
| C | | 3/119 |
| D | 1/ 23 | 5/ 35 |

Total to increase: 9/ 535
 Total no change: 21/2171
 Total to decrease: 22/ 785

IPP POLICIES AND GUIDELINES

1. IPP = "framework for academic planning and a guide for both short-term and long-term resource allocation and enrollment management decisions."
2. IPP sets forth current instructional priorities as they relate to the central purpose of the institution, extant obligations to programs and students, and the desired balance and mix of programs.
3. At CSUS, courses and programs that directly support and lead to the baccalaureate or master's degree in the liberal arts and sciences and professional fields, or the post-baccalaureate credential in fields of education shall have funding priority over courses and programs that are peripheral to these purposes.

4. CSUS is equally responsible for offering undergraduate and graduate instruction.
5. Since total undergraduate enrollment may be limited, priorities must be established within the undergraduate major program category to insure an appropriate balance and mix of major programs.
6. While all graduate programs add to the collective strength of CSUS, not all current or potential graduate programs can receive equal levels of support.
7. Based upon criteria specified in this (IPP) policy, schools and their academic departments shall establish priorities among programs and shall identify how the programs contribute to the balance and mix of University programs.

8. The University has a commitment to offering a variety of undergraduate majors in the traditional liberal arts and sciences disciplines and selected majors in the professional fields of business, engineering, and health and human services.
9. Within undergraduate major and graduate degree/credential program categories, priorities shall be established...
10. CSUS shall, at a minimum, maintain a lower division headcount enrollment of at least 25% of total undergraduate enrollment.
11. The University is committed to offering graduate programs leading to the master's degree or post-baccalaureate credential in selected disciplines to prepare students to pursue doctoral studies and to enter advanced professional training programs and career fields.

12. CSUS shall attempt to maintain graduate enrollments of at least 20% of total headcount enrollment. The proportion of graduate enrollment may be increased above this level in response to regional needs for graduate education and other factors, but shall not exceed 1/3 of total University headcount enrollment.
13. Resource support for the G.E. program shall be sufficient to allow students to complete G.E. requirements in a sequential and timely manner.
14. Low priority programs: Courses in this category include minors, certificate programs, elective courses, centers and institutes and intercollegiate athletics.

AS 93-44A UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC PLAN

The CSUS Academic Senate adopts the "Position Statement of the CSUS Academic Senate on a Proposed University Academic Plan."

AS 93-44B UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC PLAN

The CSUS Academic Senate adopts the following statements of position and recommendations related to the University Academic Plan and forwards them to the President for formal consideration:

AS 93-44B.1 Endorsement or Rejection of a Plan of This Type

AS 93-44B.2 University Academic Plan and the Resource Allocation Recommendations

AS 93-44B.3 (a-j) Recommendations on University Academic Plan Content

AS 93-44B.4 (a-d) Independent Policy Recommendations

AS 93-44B.5 (a-c) Independent Cost Accounting Recommendations

SPECIFIC QUESTIONS FOR SENATE ACTION

B.1 Endorsement or Rejection of a Plan of This Type

Shall the Academic Senate endorse or reject a plan of this type--one that sets academic program priorities and the scope and size of all academic programs (the structure, not the contents of, the UAP--see AS 93-44B.1 recommendations). Note: Conditions are to be specified in AS 93-44B.2 and AS 93-44B.3.

Recommendations #2 and #1.

B.2 University Academic Plan and the Resource Allocation Recommendations

If the Academic Senate endorses the UAP, shall the Senate recommend a fundamental change in the resource allocation process of the type called for in Recommendation #28? (See AS 93-44B.2)

Recommendations subset below #28 are either restatements of the principles in, further explanation of, or recommendations pertaining to implementation of #28.

Subset includes recommendations #14, #15, #17, #18, #19, #20, #21, #25.

B.3 Recommendations on University Academic Plan Content

If the Academic Senate endorses the UAP, which, if any, of the Content Recommendations shall the Senate send forward for consideration by the President? (See AS 93-44B.3)

Recommendations:

- #3: removes questions of administrative reorganization from the UAP
- #4: emphasizes use of departmental expertise in the setting of priorities among concentrations and programs within the same department
- #6: balance and mix of undergraduate programs and prevention of further erosion of lower division
- #8: balance and mix of levels and prevention of further erosion of lower division
- #9: balance and mix of undergraduate programs
- #10: balance and mix of programs and the wisdom of departments
- #11: balance and mix of enrollments among undergraduate programs
- #12: balance and mix of graduate programs
- #13: balance and mix of graduate programs
- #16: inclusion of Intercollegiate Athletics in the UAP

B.4 Independent Policy Recommendations

These are a set of policy questions that resulted from the content analysis of the UAP, but are independent of the Main Question. Which, if any, of these policy recommendations shall the Academic Senate endorse?
(see AS 93-44B.4 recommendations)

Includes recommendations #5, #7, #22, #23.

B.5 Independent Cost Accounting Recommendations

These are a set of cost accounting recommendations that resulted from the resource analysis, but can be independent of the endorsement of the UAP. Which, if any, of these cost accounting recommendations shall the Academic Senate endorse? (see AS 93-44B.5 recommendations)

Includes recommendations #24, #26, and #27.