

5

1996-97  
ACADEMIC SENATE  
California State University, Sacramento

AGENDA

Thursday, May 15, 1997  
Forest Suite, University Union  
**3:00-4:00 p.m.\***

**INFORMATION**

1. \*4:00-5:30 p.m. -- Reception honoring Outstanding Teacher Award Recipients, Library South Reading Room
2. Report on May 8-9, 1997, CSU Academic Senate Meeting -- Statewide Senator

**CONSENT CALENDAR**

AS 97-39/Ex. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS - University

Persons with Disabilities, Committee for:  
RALPH POPE, SBA, 1999

AS 97-40/CPC, Ex. CURRICULUM REVIEW--DEPARTMENT OF COMPUTER SCIENCE

The Academic Senate receives the commendations and recommendations of the Curriculum Policies Committee on the program review of the Department of Computer Science (Attachment A) and recommends approval of the Bachelor of Science, Masters of Science, and Minor degree programs for six years or until the next program review.

AS 97-41/CPC, Ex. PROGRAM CHANGE PROPOSALS

The Academic Senate recommends approval of the following program change proposals:

1. Health and Safety Studies Program: To delineate Part C. Electives of the Health and Safety Studies Program into four concentrations: Community Health Education, Health Science Single Subject Waiver Program, Health Care Administration, and Occupational Health and Safety.

- 2. Social Work, Off-Campus Intensive Semester Program: Implementation of Social Work's sixth alternative three-year course of study in Napa, California, which would lead to the Master of Social Work degree.

AS 97-42/CPC, Ex. GRAPHIC DESIGN, B.A. IN (Supersedes AS 94-107)

The Academic Senate recommends approval of the B.A. in Graphic Design (Attachment B). [Note: Resubmission of degree program incorporating issues raised by Chancellor's Office.]

AS 97-43/Ex. WRITING PROFICIENCY EXAMINATION COORDINATOR

Upon the recommendation of the English Department's Writing Programs Committee, the Academic Senate confirms the appointment of Jonathan Price, Professor of English, as Writing Proficiency Examination Coordinator.

**REGULAR AGENDA**

AS 97-50/Fr. COMMENDATION - L. DAVID ROONEY

AS 97-38/Fr. MINUTES - POSTPONED

AS 97-51/Fr. COMMENDATION - MICHAEL J. FITZGERALD

Approval of the Minutes of the meeting of May 8 (#14), 1997.

AS 97-52/Fr. U GRADE DISCUSSION to APC

AS 97-44/APC, Ex. U GRADE--DELETION POLICY

The Academic Senate recommends the following U Grade Deletion Policy:

CSUS requires that students process an official drop by telephone or by petition in order to drop a course. Failure to withdraw properly from a course may result in assignment of a "U" grade(s) in the course(s). Since some students may not be familiar with the drop policy until after they receive their first "U" grade, the first semester in which a student receives one or more "U" grade(s) at CSUS, he/she may petition to have the grade(s) deleted. To petition, the student must obtain a Grade Deletion form from the Admissions and Records Office or the Academic Advising Center and meet with an advisor. The petition process must be completed within six months following the end of the semester in which the "U" grade(s) was assigned. This policy applies for the one semester only in which the student receives the first "U" grade.

With adoption of the preceding policy, the Academic Senate recommends that:

All continuing students will be notified of the change in the policy and informed that they may petition for removal of "U" grade(s), even if the six-month period has lapsed, but that they MUST petition within six months of the date of a notification letter.

AS 97-45/CPC, Ex. ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEWS, PROCEDURES FOR

[*Note: Refer to Attachments C-1 and C-2 for Curriculum Policies Committee documents: 1) A summary of changes made or proposed in the program review process over the past three years, and 2) a statement of new recommendations for substantive changes in the program review process proposed by the 1996-97 Curriculum Policies Committee.*]

The Academic Senate recommends revision of the interim "Procedures for Academic Program Reviews," Section IX of the Fall, 1996, CSUS "Policies and Procedures for Initiation, Modification, Review and Approval of Courses and Academic Programs" as shown in Attachment C (strikeover=deletion; underscore=addition).

AS 97-46/CPC, Ex. ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEWS--SELF-STUDY GUIDELINES

The Academic Senate recommends adoption of the "Program Review Self Study Guidelines" as shown in Attachment D (replaces Form I and Appendix A of CSUS "Policies and Procedures for Initiation, Modification, Review and Approval of Courses and Academic Programs").

AS 97-47/CPC, Ex. NEW COURSE PROPOSAL POLICY

[*Note: Refer to Attachment E-1 for Curriculum Policies Committee transmittal memoranda.*]

The Academic Senate recommends incorporation of the "New Course Proposal Policy" presented in Attachment E into Section II, "Course Change Proposals," of the CSUS "Policies and Procedures for Initiation, Modification, Review and Approval of Courses and Academic Programs."

AS 97-48/CPC, Ex. COURSE CHANGE PROPOSALS, POLICIES PERTAINING TO SUBSTANTIVE

Section II, "Course Change Proposals," of the CSUS "Policies and Procedures for Initiation, Modification, Review and Approval of Courses and Academic Programs" does not specify the procedures for substantive course change proposals. The Academic Senate recommends adoption of the following to address substantive course change proposals:

1. All substantive course change proposals shall require department, school, and university approval. The members of the Curriculum Policies Committee's Curriculum Subcommittee are specifically charged with reviewing substantive course change proposals for both undergraduate and graduate courses offered on campus through distance learning (PM 95-01) as well as credit and noncredit courses offered through Regional and Continuing Education. Substantive course change proposals require the use of the "New Course Proposal Policy" and procedures.

2. Substantive course changes include one or more the following:

- A. a significant departure from existing catalog description;
- B. a change in the number of units granted for a course;
- C. moving a course from one classification (e.g., lower division undergraduate, upper division undergraduate, both graduate and undergraduate) to another.

AS 97-49/FPC, Flr. PERFORMANCE SALARY STEP INCREASE (PSSI) POLICY,  
INTERPRETATION OF SECTION 3.2

The Academic Senate recommends adoption of the following interpretation of paragraph 3.2 of the PSSI policy:

*"3.2 The period of consideration shall be based on the lesser of: up to three (3) years immediately preceding the year in which the application or nomination is made; time since the applicant or nominee received his/her last PSI award; or time since the applicant's or nominee's appointment to CSUS."*

For faculty who have never applied, OR who have received an award after applying in TWO areas beyond teaching (i.e., service and professional accomplishments), the period of consideration shall be based on the lesser of up to three years immediately preceding the year in which the application of nomination is made; time since the applicant or nominee received his/her last PSSI award; or time since the applicant's or nominee's appointment to CSUS.

For faculty who have received an award after applying in ONE area beyond teaching (i.e., either service or professional accomplishments), the period of consideration shall be EITHER the time since receipt of the last award (if applying in the same area, OR the three years immediately preceding the year in which the application or nomination is made (if applying in the other area). In the latter instance consideration of teaching would be from the time of the last award.

COMMENDATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE REVIEW TEAM FOR THE  
DEPARTMENT OF COMPUTER SCIENCE

COMMENDATIONS TO THE DEPARTMENT OF COMPUTER SCIENCE

The Academic Senate should commend the Department of Computer Science for its

- excellent BS, Minor and MS curriculums and instruction;
- effective leadership, valuable cooperation with the School of Engineering and Computer Science, and with the Computer Engineering Program;
- essential contributions to the GE program and to campus computer literacy;
- the many departmental, school and University service contributions of its faculty;
- the faculty's student recruitment and educational equity efforts;
- the faculty's scholarly and professional activities;
- the department's frank and professional cooperation with the Program Review Team.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE DEPARTMENT OF COMPUTER SCIENCE

1. The Dean, the Department of Computer Science and the Computer Engineering Program should also institute regular informal discussions with local industries in order to exchange information and to facilitate curricular adjustments in response to developments in the computer industry. (p. 6)
2. The Dean, the Department of Computer Science and the Computer Engineering Program should regularly consult regarding short and long-term curricular adjustments to changes in the computer industry. (p. 6)
3. The Department should annually poll both undergraduate seniors and graduate majors to assist in the identification of curricular and advising problems. (p. 7)
4. The Department of Computer Science should consider a redistribution of administrative duties by such measures as reactivating the Program Planning Committee to (1) assist the Chair in the day-to-day administration of the Department, and (2) to assume the responsibilities of some of the current committees. (p. 8)

5. The Department should consider establishing an assigned-time pool to compensate faculty who do a disproportionate share of departmental and other service work, or whose extraordinary scholarly activities warrant assigned time. (p. 8)
6. Computer Science should consult with the Department of Mathematics regarding the special needs of Computer Science students in MATH 101 and their opinions about the instructors in the course. (p. 11)
7. The Department should regularly poll students receiving their BS degree to determine their opinions of the program and especially of the curriculum. (p. 15)
8. The Department should consider a greater use of graduate assistants and teaching associates in order to give graduate students valuable laboratory supervision experience and to free faculty from some laboratory supervision responsibilities. (p. 22)

#### RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING AND COMPUTER SCIENCE

1. The School should add at least two representatives from the software/program industry to the School's Industry Advisory Board. (p. 6)
2. The Dean, the Department of Computer Science and the Computer Engineering Program should also institute regular informal discussions with local industries in order to exchange information and to facilitate curricular adjustments in response to developments in the computer industry. (p. 6)
3. The Dean, the Department of Computer Science and the Computer Engineering Program should regularly consult regarding short and long-term curricular adjustments to changes in the computer industry. (p. 6)
4. The Dean of the School of Engineering and Computer Science should consider means of reducing the number of class preparations required of Computer Science Faculty. (p. 22)
5. The School should assign the Department of Computer Science an additional generic laboratory, either from School facilities or, by consent of Academic Affairs, elsewhere in the University. (p. 26)

#### RECOMMENDATION TO THE DEAN OF FACULTY AND STAFF AFFAIRS

1. The Dean of Faculty and Staff Affairs should explore the possibility of granting credit toward a succeeding sabbatical for years in which faculty delay a sabbatical at the request

of their departments. The Dean should report the results of his analysis to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and to the Academic Senate. (p. 21)

#### RECOMMENDATION TO THE UNIVERSITY

The University should review its computer purchasing procedures. The review should specifically consider allowing the Computer Science Department and the Computer Engineering Program to negotiate purchases without going through the Computer Center. (p. 25)

#### RECOMMENDATION TO THE ACADEMIC SENATE

The Academic Senate should recommend approval of the Department of Computer Science BS, MS and Minor degree programs for six years or until the next program review.

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO  
PROGRAM CHANGE PROPOSAL

Academic Unit: Program of Design Date of Submission  
to School Dean: \_\_\_\_\_

Requested Effective Fall X Spring \_\_\_\_\_, 19 98

Name of Faculty Contact Person, if not Department Chair: Professor Gwen Amos

Type of Program Change: \_\_\_\_\_ Required Forms Attached: \_\_\_\_\_

- Modification in Existing Program
  - Substantive Change \_\_\_\_\_ Form C
  - Non-substantive Change \_\_\_\_\_ Form B
- Deletion of Existing Program \_\_\_\_\_ Form D
- Initiation (Projection of New Program  
onto Master Plan \_\_\_\_\_ Form E
- New Degree Programs \_\_\_\_\_ Form F
- Addition of New Minor, Concentration,  
Option, Specialization, Emphasis \_\_\_\_\_ Form G
- Addition of New Certificate Program \_\_\_\_\_ Form H

Briefly describe the change requested and provide a justification for the change:

**Bachelor of Arts in Graphic Design:**

This program combines both visual and textual modes of communication, mediated by a high level of computer/ technological skills. It provides students with the capabilities in the areas of information design and dissemination. It is distinguished from traditional Journalism with an emphasis on the written word, and from Communications Studies which focuses on oral language and critical theory. Graphic Design interprets aspects of both verbal and visual data to summarize, illustrate and focus information. The new major also responds to a strong and growing job market for students in this field. The proposed program has existed at CSUS for nine (9) years as a special major. Please note that this Program Proposal follows CSU system guidelines. However, it is also designed to accommodate all required curricula and criteria established by the National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD), to whom the proposal will also be submitted for review and accreditation.

Approvals: \_\_\_\_\_

Department Chair: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

School Dean: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

University Committee: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_



Summary Sheet

Graphic Design Major

**A. Required Lower Division Courses (24 units)**

A minimum grade of "C" is required in prerequisite courses.

- (3) ART 1A Stone Age to End of Middle Ages
- (3) ART 1B Renaissance to Present
- (3) INTD 20 Design
  
- (3) ART 20A Beginning Drawing
- (3) ART 20B Intermediate Drawing (Prerequisite: 20A or equivalent.)
- (3) ART 60 2D Composition
- (3) COMS 50 Mass Communication
- (3) PHOT 40 Basic Techniques of Photography

**B. Required Upper Division Courses (33 units)**

- (3) COMS 117 Multimedia Communication
- (3) COMS 136 Communication Graphics
- (3) COMS 149 Multimedia Message Design (Prerequisites: COMS 117,136, or GPHD 113)
- (3) GPHD 101 Commercial Graphics - Visual Principles
- (3) GPHD 102 Advanced Graphics - Symbol and Color (Prerequisites: GPHD 103A)
- (3) GPHD 103A Typography I-Theory (Prerequisites: 101 or 102)
- (3) GPHD 103B Typography II-Publication and Collateral Design
- (3) GPHD 104 Corporate Identity & System Design (Prerequisites: GPHD 103A)
- (3) GPHD 105 Design Management (Prerequisites: GPHD 103A)
- (3) GPHD 113 Visual Principles of Publication Design (Prerequisites: JOUR 30)
- (3) PHOT 100/196 Introduction to Digital Imaging (Prerequisites: PHOTO 40)

**C. Choose 3 of the following (9 units) in curricular of related coursework**

- (3) ART 197 Computer Art (Prerequisites: ART 20A or 21)
- (3) BUS/MGMT120 Principles of Marketing
- (3) BUS/MGMT125 Advertising (MGMT 120)
- (3) GPHD 106 Product Design (Prerequisites: GPHD 103A)
- (3) GPHD 195 Fieldwork in Graphic Design
- (3) GPHD 199 Special Problems

Lower Division	24 units
Upper Division	42 units
<b>Total for Major</b>	<b>66 units</b>
<b>Total for BA:</b>	<b>132</b>

Soph-2 Semester Year	JR. 1 Semester Year	JR. 2 Semester Year	SR. 1 Semester Year	SR. 2 Semester Year
Classes:	Classes: GPHD 101 GPHD 102 GPHD 103A ART 197 PHOT 100/196	Classes: GPHD 102 GPHD 103B GPHD 105 COMS 117 GPHD 199	Classes: GPHD 104 GPHD 106  COMS 136 BUS 120 GPHD 195-199	Classes: GPHD 106 GPHD 113  COMS 149 GPHD 195-199 BUS 125

(Pages 23-27 of 9/25/96 document)

## SECTION IX

### PROCEDURES FOR ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEWS

(see Form I)

#### A. ~~Description~~ The Self Study

Board of Trustees regulations require that every academic unit be reviewed on a regularly scheduled basis. For this review each academic unit prepares a self study of its academic programs. These self studies are to conform to a common University format, including implementation of the university assessment policy (contact the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs for the current self-study format) and utilize data supplied by the University for program planning and evaluation.

The self studies are forwarded to the school dean who, according to school policy, examines them and, in consultation with appropriate school committees, makes recommendations concerning program offerings to both the academic unit and to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

After the school's review, the self studies are forwarded to the Vice President's office for conveyance to the Academic Senate's ~~appropriate~~ Curriculum Policies Committee's Program Review Subcommittee. The Program Review Teams, appointed by the VPAA in consultation with the Curriculum Policies Committee, conduct the ~~University-wide-level~~ academic program reviews.

#### External Consultants

The program review shall use at least one external consultant, and may use two, as determined by the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs.

#### Program Review Team Procedures

The Program Review Team examines the unit's self study and other relevant materials, conducts interviews, and gathers additional information including ~~seeking expert opinion as necessary from~~ the comments of the outside consultants. As a result of this study, the Team prepares, originally in draft form and then in final form, a detailed substantive report (see Form I) reflecting both qualitative and quantitative aspects of all programs offered by the unit.

The chair of the Review Team is responsible for the preparation, submission and interpretation of review reports, including minority findings. It is the responsibility of the Review Team chair to confer with as many team members as possible and to discuss the contents of the report with team members and the academic program faculty prior to final editing and subsequent submission to the Program Review Subcommittee of the Academic Senate's Curriculum Policies Committee. The chair acts as a non-voting consultant when the Review Team's report is under consideration.

#### Distribution and Evaluation of the Draft Review

The Program Review Team's draft report is forwarded to the unit whose program(s) is being reviewed, the dean of the school of the reviewed unit and simultaneously to the ~~appropriate Curriculum Committee~~ Program Review Subcommittee. The unit and the dean are is given two weeks to respond to the report, correct inaccuracies in fact or data, and take reasoned exception to judgments or conclusions drawn. Likewise, the ~~Academic Senate's appropriate Curriculum Committee~~ Program Review Subcommittee has the same period of time to study the report, make further investigation, and to instruct the Review Team as to suggested additions, deletions, or modifications to the narrative of the draft report.

#### ~~Evaluation~~ Program Review Subcommittee Procedures

A Panel appointed by the Program Review Subcommittee evaluates the draft Review. The Panel consults with the reviewed unit, the dean of the unit's school, the Program Review Team and other parties as the Panel considers appropriate. The Panel may take reasoned exception to the draft review narrative, and has full authority to delete, modify or add recommendations to the draft review recommendations.

#### Appeals to the Program Review Subcommittee

The full Program Review Subcommittee considers appeals from the decisions (1) if the Panel divides concerning any recommendations, or (2) if in the judgment of the Panel, there is significant disagreement concerning recommendations between the Panel and the Program Review Team or the Panel and the reviewed unit. In addition, the Chair of the Curriculum Policies Committee may direct the Program Review Subcommittee to hear an appeal.

After the Program Review Team receives the responses from the reviewed unit and the ~~appropriate Curriculum Committee~~ Program Review Subcommittee, it prepares its final review report for submission to the Program Review Subcommittee. ~~for resubmission to the appropriate curriculum committee.~~

~~The appropriate curriculum committee adopts or modifies the review team recommendations and~~ The Program Review Subcommittee submits the final report and recommendations to the Academic Senate, President, Vice President for Academic Affairs, appropriate dean, and those ~~listed~~ on the distribution list. Departments who choose to do so, may file a final response to be appended to the Review Team's final document.

~~Academic degree programs are scheduled for review at least once every six years, and summaries of program review findings must be forwarded annually to the Chancellor's Office. These recommendations become the basis for the preparation of the CSU Academic Master Plan which authorizes each campus to offer specific degree programs.~~

~~B. Report on the Standards for Length of Period of Approval in the Review Process~~

Approval

The normal period of approval for a program undergoing campus review is six years. A number of circumstances can lead to an approval for a reduced length of time. Some of these circumstances are related to concerns about the quality of the program but not all are. The following definitions are used in recommending approval:

- a. Unconditional Approval: recommendation that the unit's programs be approved for ~~the full duration of the cycle~~ six years or until the next review.
- b. ~~Conditional~~ Less Than Full Cycle Approval: recommendation that the unit's programs be approved for less than a full cycle, subject to the fulfillment of specified conditions. Once these conditions have been met, and upon favorable review by the appropriate curriculum committee(s), unconditional approval ~~will~~ may be recommended for the remainder of the cycle or until the next review. Less than full cycle approval may include a recommendation to delete the program.

Reasons for Less Than ~~Conditional~~ Full Cycle Approval:

Under some circumstances in any discipline, a situation can evolve sufficiently rapidly to raise some concerns about the wisdom of approving a program for the full duration of the cycle. These concerns do not necessarily reflect a negative view of the quality of the program. In such cases, the review team may consider that it is important to monitor the situation more closely than is possible under normal circumstances. Among the situations which may warrant less than full cycle approval are:

- a. Problems brought about by rapid changes:

(1) declining enrollment

Are there too many options for too few students?

Is the program over funded or over staffed?

Is the program still viable?

Is there repeated low enrollment in a significant number of classes?

(2) rapidly increasing enrollment

Are all components of the program still being satisfactorily supported; e.g., advising, computer, library, media, etc.?

Is the program still coherent and complete, or do new options need to be considered?

Are there sufficient facilities in the department, school and/or campus to support the program?

(3) ~~impending retirement of faculty~~ Inability to maintain adequate instructional staff for the program

Do the mission and goals of the program need to be reevaluated before new faculty are hired?

How can the new hiring taking place enhance the program?

Will the programs faculty have the critical expertise to teach the program? be able to adequately staff the program curriculum?

(4) changes external to the program

Should the mission of the program change, given other changes taking place on campus?

Do significant new developments imply a need for reevaluation of departmental offerings?

- b. Lack of response to recommendations from previous reviews.
- c. In addition to the above, significant problems identified by the review

team and external consultant in some of the following areas:

- (1) undergraduate and graduate advising procedures that are not consistent with school and university practices; or evidence that advising is not sufficient for students in the major;
- (2) grading patterns that are out of line with typical practices in the school and university;
- (3) course syllabi which reflect a lack of rigor (e.g., lack of currency in course material; simplistic exams; inappropriate grading methods; inadequate reading and writing requirements);
- (4) faculty teaching courses for which they are not sufficiently prepared;
- (5) course syllabi and materials which do not require the quantity and quality of student work typically expected by normal practices in the school and university;
- (6) lack of clarity among the faculty of the department with respect to departmental goals and objectives;
- (7) a structure to the major which is inconsistent with similar major programs at other institutions or which is inconsistent with typical practices in the school or university;
- (8) a loss of professional accreditation;
- (9) impact of governance structure on academic program.

(This list is not meant to be exhaustive.) ~~Flexibility and discretionary power are retained by the review team to address unforeseen circumstances.)~~

## Review Team Composition Guidelines

### Program Review Team Size

Program Review Teams shall have a minimum of three and a maximum of nine members. A majority of the members and the chair shall be faculty.

## Selection of Team Chairs

The review team chair, who must have served on at least one program review team, shall be chosen by the Vice President for Academic Affairs in consultation with the chair of the Curriculum Policies Committee.

## Selection of Review Teams

Members of the review team shall be chosen by the Vice President of Academic Affairs in consultation with the chair of the Curriculum Policies Committee. The Vice President for Academic Affairs may nominate an off-campus community member after consultation with the unit to be reviewed. If the Vice President does not nominate an off-campus community member, s/he shall consult with the reviewed unit about other means of including the community in the review process--e.g., survey of graduates from the unit, survey of employers of the graduates, requests for formal comment from community groups directly affected by the reviewed unit's programs.

The Review team members are to be drawn from units other than the one being reviewed.

~~At least one member of the team should be from a professional school, and one member from Arts and Sciences.~~

No more than one faculty member from a department or unit (unit is not to be defined as a school) shall serve on a review team.

~~The school having programs reviewed may appoint one faculty member as a voting member to the review team, provided that the appointee is not from the unit being reviewed or is not otherwise involved in the program.~~

Appointed members of review teams may disqualify themselves from service if they believe there may be a conflict of interest in serving.

Units being reviewed may request a change in membership of a review team if the unit presents reasons why a conflict of interest may be present in one or more of the team members.

## **SUMMARY OF CHANGES IN PROGRAM REVIEW POLICIES AND PROCEDURES**

Over the past three years, the Curriculum Policies Committee (nee Curriculum Committee and Graduate Policies and Programs Committee) have devoted considerable time to an evaluation of the Program Review process. The Committee has made recommendations amounting to a systematic restructuring of the process. The most important of those changes are:

### **The separation of review team membership from the policy committees**

Under the old system members of the Curriculum and the Graduate Policies and Programs Committees were required to serve on review teams as well as on the full Committees. Diligent service on the Committees was itself time-consuming, and many faculty refused to volunteer for them because they thereby accepted almost equally demanding review team responsibilities. Furthermore, members would volunteer for review teams for which they were sometimes ill suited.

**Under the new system**, the Vice President for Academic Affairs appoints team members.

### **Changes in the number and composition of review teams**

Under the old system teams comprised five members besides the chair and had to include a representative of the school of the reviewed unit. The Associate Vice President also served as an ex-officio member.

**Under the new system** the Vice President appoints from three to nine members in consultation with the Chair of CPC, may appoint administrative members so long as a majority and the chair of the team are faculty, may appoint a community member, and need not appoint a member from the school. The chair of the review team now must have served on a prior program review team.

### **External Consultants**

Under the old system the University provided one external consultant for each review.

**Under the new system** implemented this year, the process requires the use of two external consultants, one being from outside CSU. Although there was unanimous approval of the two-consultant requirement, a year's experience has shown that it is impractical in its current form. CPC will therefore recommend a change in the requirement, giving the Associate Vice President the authority to decide between one and two consultants.

### **A Program Review Subcommittee**

Under the old system joint sessions of the Curriculum and Graduate Policies and Programs Committees evaluated the responses of reviewed departments and made final Committee decision on recommendations. Joint Committee members commonly lacked the time and the expertise to judge the program review, and a crowded Committee agenda forced some hurried decisions.



**Under the new system** those responsibilities devolve upon a Program Review Subcommittee of CPC. The Subcommittee appoints panels, usually drawn from its own members, to evaluate separate reviews. The panels read the relevant material, meet with the program review team and the department and then decide on the final review recommendations. Appeals to the full Subcommittee are permitted (1) if the panel divides in its decisions; (2) if the panel believes that either the program review team or the department have such fundamental disagreements with the panel decisions that an appeal is advisable. (3) In addition, CPC will soon propose giving the chair of CPC the authority to direct the Subcommittee to hear an appeal.

### **Assessment**

University policy now requires that departments develop assessment plans and that program reviews evaluate departments implementation of those plans.

### **The Self Study**

For some time informed parties have agreed that the self study and program review report questionnaires are too detailed (often including questions irrelevant to the programs under review), too fragmented and too "check-listy." Consequently, every answer to the questions can be true and clear and yet fail to explain the strengths and weaknesses of programs, or to allow outside readers to understand the review team's evaluation. The interim self study questionnaire improves its predecessors by requiring a narrative overview.

The proposal now before the Executive Committee is designed

- (1) to give both the department and the review team greater flexibility in explaining their positions, and
- (2) to encourage a broader approach by which the department compares its programs to those in similar CSU departments.

## NEW RECOMMENDATIONS

The Curriculum Policy Committee recommends the following changes in program review procedures.

- **Dean's Response**

The draft of a program review shall be sent to the reviewed unit and to the dean of the reviewed unit's school for formal response within two working weeks.

### **Rationale**

Deans commonly agree in principle with a draft program review recommendation but believe its implementation impossible -- usually on fiscal grounds. It will be useful for the review team and the panel to have that information during the consideration of final recommendations so that they can consider modifications in the recommendations. Equally, when the deans have substantive objections to draft recommendations, it is important to raise those questions for discussion.

## **External Consultants**

- Each program review shall use one consultant and may use two at the discretion of the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs.

### **Rationale**

As already remarked, a year's experience has shown that the absolute requirement of two consultants, one from outside the CSU, was impractical. It has been difficult to find adequate consultants outside the CSU, logistically difficult to bring them to campus and has seemed unnecessary for several reviews. At the same time, the Committee believes that the AVPAA should have the authority to require a second consultant because:

- (1) Some departments combine such diverse programs that they require separate expert evaluation.
- (2) Sometimes consultants' reports are inadequate; the Associate Vice President could then arrange for a second evaluation.

## Appeals to the Program Review Subcommittee

- The Program Review Subcommittee hears appeals from decisions of Panels when (1) the Panel divides in its vote on any recommendation; (2) the Panel believes that the disagreement of the reviewed unit or the program review team is so important as to make an appeal advisable or (3) the chair of the Curriculum Policies Committee directs the Subcommittee to hear an appeal. The Subcommittee shall judge only appeals concerning recommendations formally disputed by the Panel, the reviewed unit or the program review team.

### **Rationale**

The new program review system is designed to make Panel decisions final in almost every review. It is, however, necessary to have an appeals system. Note that the Panel determines whether there will be an appeal under (1) and (2). The Committee believes that the chair of CPC should serve as an alternate means of appealing, so that the Panel does not absolutely control appeals from its recommendations.

## PROGRAM REVIEW SELF STUDY GUIDELINES

### I. INTRODUCTION

The Department may use a general narrative to introduce its discipline and programs. The narrative should, however, describe:

- A. the Nature and Character of your academic discipline;
- B. the mission of the department (degree programs; General Education; off campus programs; service functions; participation in other university programs);
- C. the relationship of your program to the University's Strategic Plan goals;
- D. the structure of the curriculum (core, prerequisites); and
- E. curriculum strengths and weaknesses.

### II. HISTORICAL INFORMATION

Please describe:

- A. the placement of your program in the University's Academic Plan; and
- B. responses of the department, school and University to recommendations in the last program review. (Include recommendations from last program review in the main text or the appendix.)

### III. STUDENTS

#### A. University Data

This section requires departmental comment on University-supplied data. Those data provide information on:

1. the gender and ethnic composition of majors; the proportions of part-time /full-time, and native /transfer students;
2. enrollment patterns (number of undergraduates, graduates; retention and graduation rates);
3. academic status (preparation and readiness for undergraduate and graduate programs; grading distribution: GPA s; number on probation, etc.)

Evaluate the data, noting any departmental concerns and plans to respond to them (e.g., recruitment strategies).

B. Academic Support

Please describe and evaluate:

1. departmental advising policy and implementation;
2. departmental retention strategies/tutorial support; and
3. student professional organizations/clubs, awards, recognition and other activities.

**IV. FACULTY**

A. Characteristics

This section requires departmental evaluation of University-supplied data. That data will include:

1. the gender and ethnic composition of the faculty; and
2. the proportion of part-time vs. full-time faculty.

Evaluate the data, noting any concerns about faculty composition and plans the department has to address them.

B. Faculty Training, Scholarly and Creative Activities and Currency in the Field

1. Please provide faculty resumes and syllabi for all courses.
2. Summarize faculty participation in faculty development, research and scholarly programs, professional organizations and activities beyond campus.

C. Teaching Effectiveness

Summarize the Department's methods of measuring teaching effectiveness.

**V. ACADEMIC PROGRAM GOALS/ STUDENT OUTCOMES**

A. Academic Program Goals

1. Outline the goals of your academic program(s).
2. Summarize the results and your responses to various surveys (alumni, employers, graduating seniors); focus groups; and other sources of information used to assess the overall effectiveness of the department and its programs.

B. Student Outcomes

Please describe:

1. Student learning goals and objectives (knowledge, skills and abilities) for each program offered.
2. The standards used to measure the extent to which students are meeting those goals and objectives.
3. The strategies used by the department to measure student outcomes.
4. The actual results of various assessment measures.
5. The department's evaluation of the data collected thus far and its plans to use the data to improve teaching and learning.

(Include the department's assessment plan in the appendix.)

**VI. INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT FOR ACADEMIC PROGRAMS**

Evaluate the following services if they affect your department's ability to offer its academic programs.

- A. Library, information technology and computers
- B. Student support services (Admissions and Records, Advising Center, Learning Skills Center, etc.)
- C. Physical facilities/financial resources
- D. Governance processes at department, school, University level

**VII. FUTURE PLANS**

Describe any plans the department has for changing its curriculum. Relate the changes to assessment data as appropriate. If the department has a five year plan, please include a copy.


## New Course Proposal Policy

*[The areas shaded with gray denote significant changes from the current policy.]*

1. All new course proposals require department, school, and university approval. The members of the Curriculum Policy Committee Curriculum Subcommittee review new course proposals for both undergraduate and graduate courses offered on campus, off-campus, and through distance learning (PM 95-01) as well as all credit and noncredit courses offered through Regional and Continuing Education.
2. New course proposals should normally be initiated by department faculty, should be reviewed according to written department faculty curriculum policies and procedures, and should be evaluated for their curricular soundness.
3. If the proposed new course involves a program change, a separate specific request for the program change must accompany the new course proposal through the review process at the school and university level.
4. Each new course should be submitted as a separate proposal.
5. All new course proposals must include:
  - (a) a one paragraph description of the general course content;
  - b) a description of the expected learning outcomes (e.g., process, content, skills objectives) and the assessment instruments (e.g., portfolios, examinations, 01 performance pre- and post-tests, conferences with students, student papers) which will be used by the instructor to determine the extent to which students have achieved these learning outcomes;
  - (c) a list of the required and recommended course readings and activities [NOTE: it is understood that these are updated and modified as needed by the instructor(s)];
6. Each new course proposal must indicate for which students and/or programs this course is being developed (e.g. majors in the department, minors in the department, majors of other departments, general education).
7. New course proposals must include a statement which affirms either (a) that the department currently (without any additional funding or resources) has the necessary faculty, facilities, support materials and support staff to offer this course on a regular and continuing basis (i.e., a minimum of once every two academic years), or (b) from where the additional funding, facilities, support materials and staffing expenditures required to provide the new course are expected to come and a breakdown of these additional costs.

8. Departments, with the approval of their school curriculum committee and the dean of their school, can offer a course that is developmental (e.g., 96, 196, 296) as an experimental offering. With the approval of the dean of their school, departments may continue to offer a course under an experimental number while the proposal for a permanent course number is under consideration at the university level. Such offerings must follow the normal course review and approval process. If, after being offered two times, the department or program unit wishes to offer the course again, the experimental course must be resubmitted and reviewed under its new permanent number. The proposal for a permanent new course must include all the accompanying documentation required for any new course proposal, and must undergo the entire new course review process.
  
9. **At the department level**, the faculty shall review and decide whether to propose the course. The standards by which course proposals should be evaluated are as follows [departments, of course, may develop additional standards]:
  - (a) completeness of a syllabus (as per item 5 above);
  - (b) appropriateness of the proposed number for the course and the rationale for the course level (e.g., lower division, upper division, graduate level only) and type (e.g., lecture, seminar);
  - (c) reasonableness of the explanation provided for developing/offering the new course (e.g., to satisfy a need within the department curriculum, to meet the service needs of the school or university, to fulfill certain certification requirements, to fulfill the department's stated mission or program goals, to meet recommendations of the most recent program review);
  - (d) concordance of the content and/or method of the proposed course with the department's academic discipline (as indicated, for example, by narrative description, by an attached bibliography of works in the discipline which use or discuss the content or methods in the proposed course, or by some other means);
  - (e) availability of qualified faculty (as indicated, for example, in resumes, professional development activities and projects) in the department to staff the course;
  - (f) consistency with department program priorities as reflected in the University Academic Plan and the Instructional Program Priorities Documents;
  - (g) suitability of the method(s) of teaching and learning (e.g., laboratory experimentation, seminar discussions, lectures, fieldwork) and the mode of delivery (on campus classroom meetings, television/distance classrooms with on-site facilitators, computer "virtual" classrooms) to be used in the class.



10. **At the school level**, the faculty and the dean shall conduct a substantive review and shall decide whether to approve the new course. The following criteria shall be used to evaluate each new course proposal [schools, of course, may develop additional criteria and standards]:
- (a) the curricular soundness of the proposed course;
  - (b) consistency with relevant department, school, and university curriculum policies and procedures for new course proposals;
  - ✓ (c) adequacy of budgetary resources required to offer this course;
  - (d) <sup>→</sup>nonduplication of current university offerings or reasoned and relevant explanation for substantive duplication when duplication appears to exist.
11. Upon approval by the appropriate school faculty body and the Dean, a signed approved proposal shall be forwarded to the CPC Curriculum Subcommittee. If the school faculty body or Dean recommends disapproval of the course, a written explanation of the disapproval shall be transmitted to the department.
12. Each new course proposal submitted to the CPC Curriculum Subcommittee for approval must include a cogent summary of the approval process through which the course has progressed at the department and school levels, including any salient discussions.
13. **At the university level**, the CPC Curriculum Subcommittee and the Vice President of Academic Affairs (or designee) shall  review new course proposals and shall recommend approval or disapproval. In deciding whether to approve proposed new courses, the following criteria shall be used to evaluate each new course proposal:
- (a) the curricular soundness of the proposed course;
  - (b) consistency with relevant department, school, and university curriculum policies and procedures for new course proposals;
  - (c) adequacy of budgetary resources required to offer this course;
  - (d) nonduplication of current university offerings or reasoned and relevant explanation of substantive duplication when duplication appears to exist.
14. The CPC Curriculum Subcommittee shall serve as the first level of appeal for substantive and jurisdictional disagreements that cannot be resolved at the school level, and for substantive jurisdictional disagreements between schools on curricular matters. Decisions of the CPC Curriculum Subcommittee shall be transmitted to the Academic Senate and to the Vice President of Academic Affairs.

TO: Lige Christian, Chair, and Members of the Curriculum Policies  
Committee

FR: Suzanne Ogilby and Jerry Tobey

April 8, 1997

We have completed the editing of the Committee's revision of the New Course Proposal and Substantive Course Changes procedures. We request that the finished text be placed on the Committee Consent Calendar and, if approved, transmitted to the Academic Senate.

The new procedures modify the old in several respects; we judge the most important of those changes to be:

The requirement of specific information from the proposing unit detailed in New Course Proposal (5) and new (9).

Specific recognition of a unit's right to offer 96, 196 and 196 courses for two years without CPC or University approval.

Specific recognition of the right of CPC to evaluate the "curricular soundness of the proposed course." (new 13)

Specific recognition of the CPC's authority over off-campus, distance learning and RCE substantive course change proposals. [ Note that the Committee has also submitted a proposal to modify PM 95-01 to the Academic Senate.]