

1996-97
ACADEMIC SENATE
California State University, Sacramento

AGENDA

Thursday, September 12, 1996
Forest Suite, University Union
3:00-5:00 p.m.

INFORMATION

1. Moment of Silence: **William H. Westbrook**
Professor of Psychology
CSUS 1968-1996

San Diego State University Professors:
Chen Lian
Preston Lowrey
Constantinos Lyrintzis

[Note: A memorial fund has been established to which contributions may be made. Contributions will be divided equally and be applied according to the needs and desires of each of the three families. It is anticipated that memorial scholarships will be established in the name of each professor. Make contributions payable to Engineering Professors Memorial Fund and mail to Engineering Professors Memorial Fund, San Diego State University Foundation, 5250 Campanile Drive, San Diego, CA 92182.]

2. Fall 1996 Schedule of Meetings (*=tentative):
September 19*, 26
October 3*, 10, 17*, 24, 31 (Livingston Annual Faculty Lecture)
November 7*, 14, 21*
December 5*, 12

CONSENT CALENDAR

agreed AS 96-55/CPC, Ex/Flr GRADUATE PROGRAMS: 200-LEVEL COURSES

[Note: This action was AS 96-48 on the final 1995-96 Academic Senate agenda.]

The CSUS Academic Senate recommends that: CSUS graduate programs shall normally require that a minimum of 18 units in a 30-40 unit degree program and 36 units in a 60 unit degree program be earned in regularly scheduled 200-level courses requiring student

participation (discussion) as the primary instructional method, and seminar courses requiring formal presentations by students and student responses to presentations as well as formal evaluation by the instructor.

Seminar 200-level enrollments should whenever possible be limited to 15.

All 200-level courses shall require students to demonstrate writing and/or presentation abilities appropriate for thesis/project and professional work and provide opportunities for interaction among students and between students and the instructor.

AS 96-58/CPC, Ex. REGIONAL AND CONTINUING EDUCATION SELF STUDY--
QUESTIONS FOR

The Academic Senate recommends approval of the questions for the Regional and Continuing Education Self Study as proposed by the Curriculum Policies Committee and amended (strikeover = deletion; underscore = addition) by the Executive Committee (see Attachment A).

AS 96-59/Ex. PARLIAMENTARIAN

Juanita C. Barrena shall serve as Parliamentarian for the 1996-97 Academic Senate.

AS 96-60/Ex. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS--Senate

Academic Polices Committee:

Thomas Kando, Executive Committee Member, 1997

Curriculum Policies Committee:

Thomas Krabacher, Executive Committee Member, 1997

Rita Cameron Wedding, Senator, 1997 (repl. S. Zuhur)

Faculty Policies Committee:

Marjorie Gelus, Senator, 1997 (repl. D. Huff)

General Education Policies/Graduation Requirements Committee:

Melinda Seid, Executive Committee Member, 1997

AS 96-61/Ex. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS--University

Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management, Selection Advisory Committee:

Otis Scott, At-large Faculty

John Driesbach, At-large Faculty

CSUS Alumni Board:

Chevelle Newsome, Faculty Alumnus, 1997

Council for University Planning:

Mary Ann Reihman, Faculty At-large, 1998

Jennifer Ware, Non-Instructional Faculty, 1997

Nancy Took, Executive Committee Member, 1997

Merle Martin, Academic Policies Committee, 1997

Elijah Christian, Curriculum Policies Committee, 1997

Energy Management Committee:

Nancy Ostiguy, At-large Faculty, 1997

Financial Aid Satisfactory Progress Appeals Board:

Juanita Barrena, At-large, 1999

Honorary Degrees, Committee for:

Nancy Ostiguy, At-large Faculty, 1998

Institutional Scholarship Committee:

Alan Wade (Emeritus), 1998

Persons with Disabilities, Committee for:

Bill Harris, Instructional Faculty, Education, 1998

Eileen Heaser, Library Faculty, 1998

Student Complaint Hearing Panel:

Michael Fitzgerald, At-large, 1997

Student Health Advisory Committee (ASI):

J. Ann Moylan, At-large, 1997

Transportation Advisory Committee:

Michael Fitzgerald, At-large, 1998

CONSENT--INFORMATION

AS 96-54/Ex. COUNCIL FOR UNIVERSITY PLANNING--MEMBERSHIP [Note: This action was AS 96-47 on the 1995-96 final agenda]

The Executive Committee, on behalf of the Academic Senate, recommends that faculty membership on the Council for University Planning (CUP) continue as defined for 1995-96 (per AS 95-57), i.e.:

- two at-large faculty members, recommended by the Academic Senate, and appointed by the President, for staggered two year terms
- one member of the Senate Executive Committee recommended by the Executive Committee and appointed by the President, for a one year term
- one designee of the Faculty Policies Committee, appointed by the President, for a one year term
- one designee of the Academic Policies Committee, appointed by the President, for a one year term
- one designee of the Curriculum Policies Committee, appointed by the President, for a one year term
- one non-instructional faculty member (student services professional or librarian) recommended by the Academic Senate, and appointed by the President, for a one year term.

AS 96-56/CPC, Ex. PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS, 1996-97

The Executive Committee, on behalf of the Academic Senate, recommends continued use through 1996-97 of the revised program review process adopted in 1995-96 (AS 95-59), as recommended by the Curriculum Policies Committee.

AS 96-57/Ex. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS--University

The Executive Committee, on behalf of the Academic Senate, recommends appointment of the following faculty members who have agreed to serve on the Athletic Advisory Board for 1996-97:

- JERI LANGHAM, Biological Sciences, 1997
- MARCUS MARSH, Mathematics, 1997

REGULAR AGENDA

AS 96-53/Flr. MINUTES

Approval of the Minutes of the meeting of May 16, 1996 (#16) and 1996-97 Academic Senate organizational meetings of May 2, 1996 (#1) and May 16 (#2), 1996.

AS 96-65/Flr. ^{RESOLUTION OF} COMMENDATION -- GEORGE WAYNE
AS 96-62/CPC, Ex. / GRADUATE PROGRAMS: THESIS/PROJECT EQUIVALENCY
Flr.

Agreed

[Note: See Attachment B for Curriculum Policies Committee's background.]

The Academic Senate recommends the following proposal of the Curriculum Policies

Committee as amended (strikeover = deletion; underscore = addition) by the Executive Committee:

Theses and projects shall meet equivalent standards of scholarship, writing and logical skills, and contributions to knowledge.

- Each graduate program shall establish clear, written distinctions between theses and projects, and explain the program's standards for the acceptance and assessment of theses and projects, ~~and for comprehensive examinations.~~
Each graduate program that offers compreh. exams shall establish clear standards for assessment of compreh. exams.
- Each graduate program shall establish clear, written guidelines and expectations for acceptance as thesis and project advisors. Such guidelines shall include, but not be limited to, current and recent research, thesis/project direction experience, educational qualification, and currency in the discipline.
- Each prospectus for a thesis or project proposal must be approved by within the department and filed with Graduate Studies before the beginning of the student's work on the thesis/project. Graduate Studies shall ensure department compliance with this requirement.
- Within the Program Review Teams shall evaluate process randomly selected prospectuses theses and projects for all graduate programs reviewed, in addition to randomly selected theses and projects shall be evaluated.

agreed

approved

AS 96-63/CPC, Ex. 1/A GRADUATE PROGRAMS: CO-AUTHORSHIP OF THESES AND PROJECTS

[Note: See Attachment C for Curriculum Policies Committee's background.]

Co-authorship of theses and projects shall not be permitted. This prohibition does not forbid sharing data for separate theses or projects.

see substitute approved

approved

AS 96-64/Ex. CONVOCATION REQUEST--PROPOSITION 209 DEBATE

Whereas, The CSU, Sacramento Academic Senate unanimously supported (AS 96-52) the resolution entitled "Support for Educational Equity Programs in the CSU-- Opposition to the California Civil Rights Initiative (AS 2330-96)" at its May 16, 1996, meeting; and

Whereas, Diversity in higher education and educational equity programs (including outreach and academic support programs), and affirmative action programs are controversial subjects in the State of California; and

Whereas, Regardless of one's position, the passage or defeat of Proposition 209 will be an historic moment in the State of California; and

Whereas, California State University, Sacramento, on October 9, 1996, is sponsoring a day-long teach-in entitled "Diversity, Division & Unity in Higher Education" which includes a formal debate on Proposition 209; therefore, be it

Resolved: That the CSUS Academic Senate recommends that a convocation be declared for the hours of 9:30-11:00 a.m. on Wednesday October 9, in order that the academic community may involve itself in this educational endeavor.

AS 96-55

AS RESOLUTION BY GRADUATE PROGRAMS CO-AUTHORSHIP OF THESIS AND PROJECTS

Where the instructor (or Graduate Fellow/Contractor's background)

Co-authorship of thesis and projects shall not be permitted. This prohibition does not apply to joint projects for separate courses or projects.

AS RESOLUTION CONVOCAATION REQUEST-PROPOSITION 209 DEBATE

Whereas The CSU Sacramento Academic Senate previously reported AS 96-55 (resolution entitled "Support for Educational Equity Program in the CSU") in opposition to the California Civil Rights Initiative (AS 95-09) at its May 1996 meeting and

Whereas Community in higher education on and educational equity programs including (a) not academic support programs, and alternative equity programs and educational subjects in the State of California, and

**PROPOSED SELF-STUDY QUESTIONS
REGIONAL AND CONTINUING EDUCATION SELF STUDY**

I. General Information

RCE should, working closely with Academic Affairs, provide

- A. A list of all RCE staff and a description of their duties.
- B. A list of faculty, part-time and full-time, who have taught RCE classes (aside from Summer and Intersession classes) during 1995-96 and 1996-97, and the courses which they have taught.
- C. ~~A copy of the current RCE budget.~~ With regard to financial resources:
 - 1. A description of the extent to which the current budget for operating expenses, travel, equipment, and clerical-technical staff is adequate to support RCE's instructional programs.
 - 2. A description of actions that might be taken at the University level to strengthen or improve RCE's program effectiveness?
 - 3. A description of additional financial support, outside of state funds, RCE has received in the last five years. A description of any current efforts to obtain such support.
- D. A copy of the RCE assessment plan.
- E. Any other materials helpful to the Program Review Team

The University should, in consultation with Academic Affairs, provide

- F. Responses to a confidential poll of the RCE staff.
- G. Responses to polls of the chief users of RCE services: e.g. students (matriculated and unmatriculated) in RCE classes, academic units, and outside agencies.
- H. Results of a poll of other CSU Continuing Education programs developed by the Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Studies.

- I. Copies of University policies governing the approval and evaluation of RCE programs and courses, and the use of distance learning technology.
- J. Any other materials helpful to the Program Review Team

II. Overview

Describe the chief technical, managerial, marketing and pedagogical developments in the field of continuing education over the past five years. Describe Regional and Continuing Education's efforts to implement those developments at CSUS. Discuss any obstacles to that implementation and feasible University actions to remove those obstacles.

Explain RCE's development plans for the next five years.

III. Questions

- A. Describe RCE's responses to the recommendations of the 1991 Program Review.
- B. Explain the role of RCE in the implementation of the University Mission and Strategic Plan. Are there any changes in University policy and administration which would strengthen RCE's contributions in those areas?
- C. Explain RCE's role in meeting the University's responsibilities for regional education and service. Which areas of regional services can be improved? How can RCE's role in meeting that responsibility be strengthened?
- D. Explain RCE and University efforts to guarantee the equivalency of on and off-campus credit courses and programs. Explain how the RCE and University course and program approval procedures identify any potential conflict or overlap with existing courses and programs.

Explain the procedures for the continuing evaluation and coordination of both credit and non-credit courses by RCE and sponsoring units.

- E. Evaluate RCE's physical and equipment facilities. Evaluate the ability of the current staff to meet RCE's obligations.
- F. Comment on RCE's interactions with faculty and academic units, e.g.
Academic Affairs,
the Academic Senate,
the schools and departments participating in RCE programs,
University Media Services,
the Library,
Food Services, and
Student Services.

Are there any changes in University policy and administration which would strengthen RCE's interactions with those areas?

- G. Describe RCE's programs in the following areas and evaluate measures for improving those programs:

Credit courses offered off and on campus

Specifically describe any obstacles to student and faculty access to University resources, and propose solutions to those problems.

Summer and Winter Intersession courses

Specifically describe the impact an "extended semester" calendar would have on RCE.

CEU and non-credit courses

Distance Learning courses

Specifically describe: (1) RCE's role in "non traditional" delivery systems provision and administration; (2) how faculty and courses are selected for those courses; (3) the faculty development programs available for those courses; (4) measures for the restructuring of on-campus courses necessary for non-traditional offerings.

Describe (5) the chief public and private competitors for CSUS distance learning programs, and (6) the measures which RCE recommends for improvements in and the development of those programs.

International Programs: degrees, courses, workshops, conferences, and other related educational activities

IV . Further Information

Please add any further information and comments which you believe require Program Review Team consideration.

THE EQUIVALENCY OF THESES AND PROJECTS

Statement of the Problem

How can the University implement Title V's requirement that theses and projects differ in the character of the work done, but not in the rigor of standards applied to them?

Evidence Consulted

Title V; the recommendations of the 1993-94 Coordinator's Ad Hoc Committee on Graduate Program Quality; the (unanimous) opinion of the 1994-95 Graduate Coordinators.

Alternatives Considered

Alternative I: Have no University standards or implementing procedures aside from Title V.

Alternative II: Require that theses and project proposals be **approved** by Graduate Studies before students begin work on the thesis or project.

This recommendation constitutes CPC endorsement of a 1994-95 Graduate Policies and Programs Committee recommendation. GPPC concluded that, despite Title V and the Coordinators' unanimous endorsement of the equivalence of thesis and project work, the two types of culminating experience work do commonly differ in the level of performance expected for their completion. However, GPPC believed that prior approval by Graduate Studies of proposals would be extremely difficult to implement and would involve long delays for students anxious to begin their work. The Committee believed it better to make a recommendation which would (1) delegate enforcement of the provision to departments, while (2) providing for monitoring (and possible future recommendations) by Graduate Studies and program review teams: Hence the provision for filing the prospectus with Graduate Studies and for program review checks on randomly chosen prospectuses as well as theses and projects.

COAUTHORED THESES AND PROJECTS

Statement of the Problem

Should the University permit coauthored theses and projects? If so, how many students may be co-authors? Are coauthored theses and projects compatible with each student demonstrating the skills expected of culminating experience work, and with the right of students to finish their culminating experience in the event that a coauthor drops out?

(NB: For this recommendation "coauthorship" means a division of labor within one topic (e.g. data gathering and data analysis and writing) with the consequence that the names of more than one student appear as the authors of the finished thesis or project. It does not apply to the division of broad topics (e.g. the history of the Lutheran Church in Sacramento) into separate topics for individual work.)

Evidence Consulted

The **Graduate Policies and Programs Committee** considered the issue for two years and consulted with many sources before recommending a limit of two coauthors in Spring, 1995. The 1993-94 **Coordinators' Ad Hoc Committee of Quality Graduate Programs** recommended a prohibition of coauthored work, as did a majority of **Coordinators** in meeting and a majority of responses to a poll of **Coordinators** and departments. In 1994-95 **Graduate Studies** polled other GS offices in the CSU and found that only two of the campuses polled allow coauthorship -- and they limit it to two students.

Alternatives Considered

Alternative I: Have no University limit on the number of coauthors and/or restrictions on the program's management of the work.

Alternative II: Allow coauthorship but limit the number of coauthors (e.g. to two students).

Alternative III: Allow coauthorship, but only with the prior approval of Graduate Studies.

The Committee was impressed with the evidence that CSUS is exceptional in allowing coauthorship, and with the opposition of many coordinators to allowing any coauthorship. Opponents of coauthorship argued effectively that it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to enforce an equitable division of labor among coauthors and still ensure that all students achieve the purposes of thesis/project work. They further argued that a division of work among students such as among data gathering, analysis and writing would mean that the individual students would not have demonstrated the full range of independent work intended by the culminating experience requirement.

The Committee considered the argument (endorsed by the GPPC in 1994-95) that two students could, under proper restrictions, coauthor and gain the experience intended by culminating experience work. It believes, however, that the limitation to two students will not cure the defects noted for a larger number of coauthors.

The Committee considered the alternative of requiring Graduate Studies approval of coauthored work but concluded that GS would not be able to effectively exercise that authority.

Amendments
Proposed Amendment to AS 96-63/CPC.Ex.

Graduate Programs: Co-Authorship of Theses and Projects

~~Undergraduate~~

Co-authorship of theses and projects shall be limited to two students.
Student/faculty coauthorship of a thesis or project shall not be permitted.

*Nelson /
Samantha*

A Students planning to coauthor shall:

* submit a separate prospectus for approval to his or her advisor and to the Graduate coordinator of the program describing how the student will demonstrate appropriate skill levels in literature review, data gathering, analysis and writing. Each prospectus shall also include how each student plans to complete the thesis/project if the coauthor does not complete his or her part of the work. It shall also specify that if one coauthor does not fulfill his or her obligations on a semester by semester basis, the advisor may authorize the other coauthor to assume use of raw materials and proceed alone.

* file a copy of the approved prospectus with the Office of Research and Graduate Studies before work begins. No coauthored thesis or project shall be accepted by Graduate Studies unless a prospectus approved by the Graduate Coordinator is on file.

* be held to the two year limit for completion. After two years students must re-register for thesis/project.

Departments that permit coauthorship shall develop approval criteria for application to their own program. Each graduate program shall determine the way coauthored thesis/projects will be counted for the purpose of faculty workload. Any deviation of the above policy shall be approved by the Associate Vice President of Research and Graduate Studies.

RESOLUTION OF COMMENDATION

in honor of

Dr. GEORGE WAYNE

Vice President for Student Affairs

Whereas: Dr. George Wayne, regardless of his title, has served with distinction as a Dean of Students at California State University, Sacramento since 1989; and

Whereas: Dr. George Wayne's concern for students, understanding of student issues, and advocacy on behalf of students have led to CSUS's becoming a more "student friendly" campus; and

Whereas: Dr. George Wayne's personal and professional integrity and firm commitment to the values of the academy have served as an effective defense against the academic entropy that can be caused by competing interests; and

Whereas: Dr. George Wayne's able direction and management of the offices within Student Affairs have resulted in significant improvements in the availability and quality of services to students and faculty; and

Whereas: Dr. George Wayne's successful effort to increase student enrollment at CSUS has restored the opportunity for the Academic Senate to talk about parking issues during the Open Forum; and

Whereas: Dr. George Wayne's ambition to participate in intercollegiate golf competition led to his assumption of responsibility for Intercollegiate Athletics and teaching Shirley Uplinger how to putt, thereby ensuring her appointment and effectiveness as his successor; and

Whereas: Dr. George Wayne's retirement will allow him to "golf in peace" and stop yelling "fore" to administrators, faculty, staff and students who sometimes get in the way; and

Whereas: In retirement, Dr. George Wayne will only have to listen to one "Juanita," the one with class--his wife, whose love and support, encouragement and patience, and wise counsel have contributed immensely to his success; and

Whereas: Dr. George Wayne is a good friend and valued colleague of the faculty at CSUS, and will be greatly missed; therefore, be it

Resolved: That the CSUS Academic Senate, on behalf of all members of the academic community, commend and express its appreciation to Dr. George Wayne for his able and effective leadership as Dean and Vice President of Student Affairs, and for his direct contributions to the education and development of students at CSUS as an educator serving in the public interest; and, be it further

Resolved: That the CSUS Academic Senate wish George and Juanita Wayne great joy in their retirement in Colorado where, as grandparents, they will join their two daughters and take up responsibility for the education and development of still another student--their new grandson; and, be it further

Resolved: That the CSUS Academic Senate convey to Dr. George Wayne the assurance that his friendship and good work will long be remembered and cherished at CSUS.