1998-99
FACULTY SENATE
California State University, Sacramento

AGENDA
Thursday, February 4, 1999
Foothill Suite, University Union
3:00-5:00 p.m.

INFORMATION

1. Tentative Spring 1999 Faculty Senate Meeting Schedule:
   February 18 (4:15 p.m., Faculty Merit Scholars Reception), 25
   March 4, 11, 18, 25
   April 1 (Spring Recess), 8, 15, 22 (3:00-3:30 p.m., 1999-2000 Senate Nominations;
      3:30-5:00 p.m., 1998-99 Senate), 29
   May 6 (3:00-3:30 p.m., 1999-2000 Senate Elections; 3:30-5:00 p.m., 1998-99 Senate),
      13 (3:00-4:00 p.m.; 4:00-5:30 p.m., Outstanding Teacher Award Reception), 20,
      27 (Finals Week)

2. Senate Home Page (http://www.csus.edu/acse/ *or* CSUS Home Page *then* Administration and
   Policy *then* Faculty Senate) - Vice Chair Arthur Jensen

3. Report on Academic Affairs
   Time Certain: 3:20 p.m., Jolene Koester, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

CONSENT CALENDAR

FS 99-03/Ex. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS--University

Director of International Programs, Selection Advisory Committee
   PAM MILCHRIST, Faculty At-large
   MING TUNG "MIKE" LEE, Faculty At-large
   RICHARD SHEK, Faculty At-large

FS 99-04/Ex. COMMENDATION

The Faculty Senate commends Professor John Oldenburg and Professor Warren Smith for
their unstinting efforts, as faculty members in the CSUS Biomedical Engineering Program, to
maintain the quality and viability of the program in recent years, especially given the serious
challenges the program faced during that period.

CONSENT -- INFORMATION

FS 99-02/Ex.   WANG FAMILY EXCELLENCE AWARD--NOMINEES
[see Attachment A, for background]

The Executive Committee, on behalf of the Faculty Senate, recommends that nominees for the Wang Family Excellence Award be selected in the following manner:

1. *For the current year*: Given the short time line involved, the President should select faculty nominees for the four identified award categories from among CSUS faculty who have served as or been a recipient of any of the following:

   - Livingston Annual Faculty Lecturer;
   - Outstanding Teaching Award;
   - Scholarly Achievement Award;
   - President's Award for Research and Creative Activity;
   - Performance Salary Step Increase (PSSI).

2. *For subsequent years*: The Executive Committee has requested that the Faculty Policies Committee develop a formal process by which recommendations for campus nominees will be made. We expect this process to be in place in time for next year's call for nominees.

REGULAR AGENDA

FS 99-01/Flr.   Minutes

Approval of the Minutes of December 10 (#10), 1998.

FS 99-05/Ex.   SENATE FLOOR PROCEDURES, CHANGES TO

The Faculty Senate adopts, on a trial basis for the Spring 1999 semester, the changes to Senate floor procedures recommended by the ad hoc Committee on Faculty Governance (Attachment B).

FS 99-06/Flr.   1999-2000 COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

The Faculty Senate elects college representatives to the 1999-2000 Committee on Committees, as follows: [see Attachment C for eligibility by college]

FS 99-07/APC, Ex.   DROP POLICY PROPOSAL

The Faculty Senate recommends amendment of the CSUS drop policy as shown in Attachment D.

<u>FS 99-08/APC, Ex.</u> ACADEMIC ADVISING POLICY

The Faculty Senate recommends adoption of the recommendations contained in the Academic Policies Committee's "Analysis of Department Compliance with CSUS Advising Policies" (Attachment E). The Senate further recommends that Academic Affairs distribute copies of the analysis report to all department and program chairs.

<u>FS 99-09/CPC, Ex.</u> WRITING AND READING IN THE UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM

The Faculty Senate recommends adoption of the following policy on Writing and Reading in the Undergraduate Major [refer to Attachment F for synopsis by Curriculum Policies Committee]:

WRITING AND READING IN THE UNDERGRADUATE MAJOR

I. **Purpose**

CSUS is committed to the development of sound writing and reading skills

A. appropriate to the requirements of majors and their related careers, and

B. recognizing the needs of ESL students.

Beyond General Education requirements, major programs are responsible for writing and reading standards and development at the upper-division level.

II. **Goals**

A. Writing skills shall include an ability to communicate in a clear and organized form by both general expository writing and at an appropriate level, writing specific to the discipline.

B. Reading skills shall include an ability to understand general expository writings and at an appropriate level, writings specific to the discipline.

C. In order to assist programs in developing standards of general expository writing and reading comprehension, Academic Affairs will distribute copies of Senate-approved standards for those skills. In addition, it will distribute copies of Senate-approved standards relevant to ESL students. **The standards distributed shall be advisory:** Programs may adopt or modify them as the needs of their majors require.

D. Subject to the approval of Academic Affairs, programs will decide which additional writing and reading standards, goals and assessment methods are appropriate for their disciplines.

III. **Program Reviews**

The University shall assist writing and reading development in the majors by a modification of program review requirements.

A. Major programs' program review self studies shall include 1) descriptions of current writing and reading requirements; 2) standards for general expository and discipline-specific writing and reading; 3) any plans for the development of writing and reading skills; and 4) plans for the assessment of current requirements and of measures to develop writing and reading skills.

B. Program reviews shall include an evaluation of programs assessment of writing and reading skills, current requirements and plans for the development of writing and reading skills.

IV. **Pilot Projects**

A. The University shall begin the phased-in implementation of the program-designed writing and reading requirements by offering programs University-supported pilot projects. **Program participation in pilot projects shall be voluntary.**

B. Programs not involved in preparation for program reviews may also request participation in a pilot project.

V. **A Faculty Senate Committee**

Academic Affairs shall consult with a representative Faculty Senate committee on the implementation of this policy and on the development of pilot projects for interested programs. Programs may in any case consult directly with the committee.

FS 99-10/CPC, Ex. WRITING AND READING SUBCOMMITTEE, ESTABLISH

The Faculty Senate establishes a Writing and Reading Subcommittee of the Curriculum Policies Committee, with the following membership and charge:

A. **Membership**

The Writing and Reading Subcommittee of the Curriculum Policies Committee shall comprise three regular faculty members serving three-year, overlapping terms and such ad hoc members as are necessary to provide the expertise needed to discharge the subcommittee's duties.

B. **Charge**

The Subcommittee shall:

Advise departments and programs on means of meeting the Writing and Reading in the Majors policy;

Advise departments and programs on the development of possible pilot projects;

Advise Academic Affairs and the Center for Teaching and Learning on any matter related to the implementation of the policy;

Advise the Curriculum Policies Committee on any proposed modification of the policy; and

Evaluate self-study descriptions of current writing and reading requirements and assessment measures, and any changes planned to implement the Writing and Reading policy.

FS 99-11/CPC, Ex. GRADUATE CONCENTRATIONS

[Note: For background, refer to CPC report, Attachment G.]

The Faculty Senate recommends adoption of the following policies regarding graduate concentrations:

1. Students currently enrolled in a maser's degree program may, with the consent of the program, fulfill the requirements for one or more concentrations within that one degree program. The degree program shall require a minimum of 9 nits of 200-level seminar courses, exclusive of the culminating experience for each concentration, original, concurrent or subsequent. Concentrations may be completed concurrently or sequentially, but all concentration course work must be completed before the awarding of a master's degree. All concentrations will be noted on the diploma and the transcript.

2. CSUS students who have earned a master's degree in a program offering concentrations may, within seven years of starting the degree and with the consent of the degree program, return to CSUS in order to add one or more concentrations in that program. Each additional concentration shall require a minimum of 9 units of 200-level seminar courses exclusive of the culminating experience. Students must meet the admissions and catalog requirements in effect at the time of enrollment. The additional concentration(s) will be noted on the transcript and no new diploma will be issued.

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

November 30, 1998

MEMORANDUM

TO: Professor Thomas Krabacher
         Chair, Faculty Senate

FROM: Donald R. Gerth

Attached you will find a memo from Dr. June Cooper describing the Stanley T. Wang award.

California State University, Sacramento, will participate in the Wang award. I should like to invite the Faculty Senate to join in this effort and consider processes and names of individual faculty members for the award. Given the fact that the deadline this year is January 20, I ask that names of individuals be sent to me by commencement on December 18. I will consider these, possibly along with other names, and forward my nominations prior to January 20.

Thank you.

DRG/ko

c. Provost Jolene Koester
   Vice President Elizabeth Moulds
   Dean David Wagner

JUNE M. COOPER
SPECIAL CONSULTANT TO THE CHANCELLOR

November 12, 1998

TO: CSU Presidents

FROM: June M. Cooper
           Special Consultant to the Chancellor

SUBJECT: Stanley T. Wang Award

Purpose of the Award

At the November 10-11, 1998 Board of Trustees meeting, Trustee Stanley T. Wang and Chancellor Charles Reed announced the establishment of the Stanley Wang Recognition Award. The purpose of this award is to recognize and celebrate those CSU faculty who, through extraordinary commitment and dedication, have distinguished themselves by exemplary contributions and achievements in their academic disciplines. Similarly, an administrator will also be recognized for extraordinary accomplishments in appropriate areas of his/her University assignment.

Trustee Wang's pledge of a $1,000,000 gift to the California State University will be awarded in the amount of $100,000 each year for ten years. Each year, four faculty members and one administrator will be honored and each honoree will receive $20,000. This gift has been accepted and will be administered through the CSU Foundation.

Selection Committee

The Stanley Wang Recognition Award Selection Committee will be appointed by Chancellor Reed in consultation with Trustee Wang. Members of the committee will include: (1) two members of the Board of the Trustees, (2) Executive Vice Chancellor, (3) Vice Chancellor for Human Resources, (4) Chair of the CSU Systemwide Academic Senate, and (5) a CSU tenured faculty member previously recognized by the Board of Trustees for outstanding accomplishments. On a periodic basis, Trustee Wang may serve as an advisor to the Committee.

Nomination Process

Each campus president annually may nominate for consideration by the Wang Award Committee one probationary or tenured faculty member from each of the following academic disciplines:

(a) Visual and Performing Arts and Letters;
(b) Natural Sciences, Mathematical and Computer Sciences, and Engineering;
(c) Social and Behavioral Sciences, and Public Services; and
(d) Education, and Professional and Applied Sciences Fields.

Faculty members nominated for the award must have participated successfully in a campus peer-academic administrative review process such as the reappointment, tenure, and promotion or faculty merit award of teaching, research or scholarship grant processes, and the like. These reviews must have occurred no earlier than the 1996-97 academic year. Although a CSU president may elect not to nominate four faculty members, no more than one faculty member from each of the disciplines cited above may be nominated.

The Chancellor/CSU President may also nominate one administrator/manager who currently serves as an administrator in the management personnel plan as an Administrator III or IV on a campus or in the Chancellor's Office. To be eligible, the administrator /manager's record of performance, activities, accomplishments cited must occur after January 1, 1997. Only one administrator may be nominated.

Criteria

Awards will be made to those who have made truly remarkable contributions to the advancement of their respective universities and/or the CSU system. Nominees should have a demonstrated record of unusually meritous achievements documented by evidence of superior accomplishments and contributions to the discipline or achievements in an assignment. The activities must advance the mission of the university, bring benefit and credit to the CSU, and contribute to the enhancement of the CSU's excellence in teaching, learning, research, scholarly pursuits, student support and community contributions.

Announcement of Awards

Nominations with supporting documentation should be forwarded to the Chief of Staff no later than January 20, 1999. Consideration and selections will take place during Spring, 1999 with presentation of the first annual awards at the May, 1999 Board of Trustees meeting.

Questions regarding this award program should be addressed to Vice Chancellor Douglas Patiño (562) 985-2542 or Chief of Staff William Dermody (562) 985-2131.

cc: Trustee William Hauck
        Trustee Stanley Wang
        Chancellor Charles Reed
        Executive Vice Chancellor David Spence
        Vice Chancellor Douglas Patiño
        Chief of Staff William Dermody

January 27, 1999

Memo To: Faculty Senators

From: ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Governance

Re: Senate Floor Procedures for the Spring 1999 Semester

OVERVIEW

This memo sets forth and explains recommended changes to
Senate floor procedures. All modifications are aimed at
improving the efficiency and effectiveness of the Senate. We
recommend that the Senate adopt these changes on an experimental
basis for the spring 1999 semester.

BACKGROUND

Last spring, the CSUS Faculty Senate passed a resolution to
create an ad Hoc Faculty Governance Committee (FS 98-12). The
Committee was charged with examining the way faculty governance
was working at our campus and recommending possible improvements.
The Committee met over the summer and issued its report last
October.

The ad Hoc Committee offered recommendations requiring a)
amendments to the **Senate Constitution,** b) changes to the **Senate
By-Laws,** and c) changes to the **Senate Standing Rules.** All such
recommendations were discussed in the Committee's report.
However, because the constitutional changes were subject to the
strictest time deadlines, the fall 1998 governance debate in the
Senate focused on those items. Most of the constitutional
amendments originally proposed by the Committee were included in
a referendum that went to the faculty in the late fall. The
package of changes was overwhelmingly approved.

Nevertheless, we wish to emphasize that *the recommendations
most directly affecting the conduct of regular senate meetings
are contained in the proposed standing rule changes summarized in
this memo.* These changes address widely expressed concerns

The extent of such concerns is underscored in the table below, which presents data from the summer 1998 survey of faculty senator. As shown in the table, survey respondents expressed particular concern about the Senate being dominated by a few individuals, and about poor use of Senate time.

PHRASES USED TO DESCRIBE SENATE MEETINGS
(From Summer 1998 Survey of Faculty Senators)

Phrase	% Marking Phrase
"Dominated by a few"	89
"Poor use of time"	50
"Too little follow-up"	34
"Disliked by participants"	32
"Loosely organized"	21
"Valued by participants"	18
"Tightly organized"	9
"Disorganized"	7
"Good use of time"	5
"Little discussion"	2

We have attempted to craft the rule changes carefully. Yet it is an *empirical* question whether these modifications would lead to greater satisfaction on the part of senators. Accordingly, we recommend that the changes be in effect for a single semester and then reevaluated at the end of that period.

SUMMARY AND RATIONALE FOR CHANGES

The following chart summarizes the differences between the way business is currently conducted in the Senate and the way we are proposing it be conducted in the spring of 1999. The right hand side of the chart also contains the rationale for the changes.

Important Note Regarding "First and Second Readings." We propose to draw a distinction between agenda items that are on "first reading" and those that are on "second reading." First reading items would come to the Senate

floor for discussion rather than action such as amendments or up-down votes (however, first reading items could be referred to a committee for further consideration). Items that have completed first reading would appear on the "second reading" file of the *subsequent* Senate meeting, at which time any action would be appropriate.

SUMMARY OF SPECIFIC CHANGES TO SENATE RULES

CURRENT RULES	PROPOSED RULES
Whether Action Can Be Taken on Agenda Items	**Whether Action Can Be Taken on Agenda Items**
o Items are ready for action when they appear on the agenda	o Normally items initially will be placed on "first reading;" items completing first reading would go on the "second reading" at the *subsequent* meeting
	- The Executive Committee may request a waiver of the first reading requirement to place the item on the agenda for immediate action; such requests will appear on the printed agenda. the waiver would require a 2/3 vote of the entire Senate
	Rationale: This best ensures that senators are prepared to address action items
Order of the Meeting	**Order of the Meeting**

o Normal Order:
  1. Open forum
  2. Information items
  3. Approval of the agenda(followed by approval of minutes)
  4. Action on agenda
	o Normal Order:
	  1. Open forum
	  2. Approval of the agenda(followed by approval of minutes)
	  3. Second reading agenda items

items

4. First reading agenda items (at a time certain or at the end of completion of the second reading file)
5. Information items

Rationale: Information items are lower priority; it's desirable to get to action items earlier

Re-Ordering the Agenda

o Re-ordering the agenda requires a motion and a majority vote

Re-Ordering the Agenda

o Re-ordering the agenda requires a motion and a 2/3 vote

> *Rationale*: Re-ordering the agenda can be time consuming and possibly result in high priority items not being addressed

Adding a New Agenda Item from the Floor

o Adding a new agenda item requires a motion and a majority vote

Adding a New Agenda Item from the Floor

o Adding a new first reading item to the agenda requires a motion and a ~~2/3 vote~~; any new item added would go at the end of the first reading file *majority vote*

> *Rationale*: Many senators are not prepared to address items added from the floor; it's desirable to stick to the published agenda

Time Limits on Considering Agenda Items

o There are no time limits on the length of time that can

Time Limits on Considering an Agenda Items

o 1) the executive committee would set time limits on

be devoted to any agenda item

first reading items; and 2) the default time limit for each first reading item and each item added from the floor would be 10 minutes (by 2/3 vote, the Senate could allocate more than 10 minutes) *Rationale*: This will improve the efficiency of the Senate's work

Order of Items on the First Reading Calendar

o Not applicable

Order of Items on the First Reading Calendar

o The Executive Committee would set the order of items on the first reading calendar; normally, second reading items would appear on the agenda in the order in which they were moved from first to second reading, although the Executive Committee may adjust the order of items when appropriate; the Senate could re-order the items by 2/3 vote

> *Rationale*: The Executive Committee ought to be able to determine which first reading items are lesser or higher priority

Limits on Time Allocated Individual Speakers

o There are no limits on how long an individual speaker can have the floor

Limits on Time Allocated Individual Speakers

o Speakers normally would be limited to three minutes at a time; longer remarks would be allowed when a senator is making an opening presentation on an item (on either first or second reading) or a summary

argument against an item

- A motion could be made to allocate a speaker additional time; the motion could be approved by unanimous consent or, failing that, by majority vote

Rationale: This limitation addresses the commonly heard complaint about long-winded remarks

FLOW OF ITEMS TO THE SENATE FLOOR

If our proposals are approved, agenda items could come to a vote before the full Senate in the following ways:

1. (*Most common route*) Senate standing committee (e.g., Academic Policies Committee) ===> Senate Executive Committee ===> full Senate for first reading ===> full Senate for second reading

2. Recommendation of individual senator (e.g., in the "open forum") ===> Senate Executive Committee ===> full Senate for first reading ===> full Senate for second reading

3. At a meeting of the full Senate, item added to the first reading file by floor motion (~~2/3~~ *majority* vote required) ===> full Senate for second reading at subsequent meeting

4. At a meeting of the full Senate, item of pressing importance added to the agenda (2/3 vote required); second reading requirement waived so action can be taken on the item on the same day (2/3 vote required for this motion as well)

SENATE ACTION

We request that the package of changes be approved for the spring 1999 semester only (i.e., that there be a "sunset clause" on the new rules). We further recommend that the Senate

evaluate the effectiveness of the changes by the end of the semester. After the evaluation a motion could be made to implement any or all of the proposed changes on a full-time basis, as appropriate.

1999-2000 COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

Committee Meeting Schedule:
  #1: Tuesday, March 2, 3:00-5:00 p.m., SAC 275
  #2: Tuesday, March 16, 3:00-5:00 p.m., SAC 275

Committee Members:

Thomas Krabacher	Chair, Faculty Senate
Arthur Jensen	Vice Chair, Faculty Senate
Bob Buckley	Member, Executive Committee
Joan Dworkin	Member, Executive Committee
Ted Lascher	Member, Executive Committee
Melinda Seid	Member, Executive Committee
Gregory Wheeler	Member, Executive Committee
Ben Amata	Senior Library Senator
Booker Banks	Senior Student Services Senator
PLUS:	One Senator elected from each college

Eligible College of Arts and Letters Senators

✓ Joan Bauerly   — Linda Palmer
— Henry Chambers   — Manuel Pickett
— Stan Dundon   — Estella Serrano
— Edith LeFebvre   — Catherine Turrill
— _____ (Learning Skills) *Robbie Ching*   — Laurel Zucker
— Chevelle Newsome   — _____ (Humanities)

Eligible College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics Senators

— Juanita Barrena   — James Hill
— Bruce Behrman   — Dennis Huff
— J. Michael Bossert   ✓ Roger Leezer
— Donald Hall   — Paul Verdone

Eligible College of Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies

— Rita Cameron Wedding   — Peter Lund
— Ken DeBow   — Otis Scott
✓ Tom Kando   — Doreen Stabinsky
— Walter Kawamoto   — Valerie Wheeler

2/5/99 Sent e-mail

Eligible College of Business Administration Senators

— Margaret Cleek   ✓ Ming-Tung "Mike" Lee
— Jong Kim   — David Scanlan

2/5/99 Sent e-mail

Eligible College of Education Senators

— Sharon Alexander   — Michael Lewis
— Lila Jacobs   — Raul Rodriguez
✓ Victoria Jew   — Nathan Smith

Eligible College of Engineering and Computer Science Senators

— Steven de Haas   ✓ Kwai-Ting Lan
— George Kostyrko   — Fred Reardon

2/5/99 Sent e-mail

Eligible College of Health and Human Services Senators

— Joseph Anderson   — Louis Elfenbaum
— Ed Barakatt   — Lynette Lee-Sammons
— Edilberto Cajucom   — Michael McCrystle
✓ Elizabeth Dokimos   — Bonnie Raingruber

California State University, Sacramento

SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95819-6036

Academic Policies Committee
DEPARTMENT OF ELECTRICAL
http://www.csus.edu/~bayardj/
ELECTRONIC ENGINEERING
apc/index.html

VOICE: 916-278-5847
FAX   : 916-278-5949
email: bayardj@ecs.csus.edu
http://gaia.ecs.csus.edu/~bayardj/index.html

DATE   : December 7, 1998

TO   : Thomas Krabacher, Chair Faculty Senate

FROM   : Jean-Pierre R. Bayard, Academic Policies Committee Chair

SUBJECT: Drop Policy Proposal

By way of this memo, the Academic Policies Committee recommends the following drop policy to the Faculty Senate. A comparison table is included to highlight the differences between the current policy and that proposed here, as well as to provide a rationale for these changes. In order to evaluate the effect of this proposal, if it were to become policy, a table providing the number of drops per week for each of the seven Colleges during the spring 1998 semester is also included. In that table, one should note the large number of drop requests right before the last 3 weeks of the semester at which time the Dean's signature is required.

POLICY PROPOSAL

Each student has the responsibility of dropping any courses, in which he/she is enrolled, but did not attend or stopped attending.

Although instructors may exercise their authority to administratively remove any student who, during the first two weeks of instruction, fails to attend, students should not assume they will be dropped by this procedure. "Failure to attend" is defined as failure to attend any two class meetings (for courses that meet two or more times a week), or one class meeting (for courses that meet once a week), or attend those courses that require attendance at the first class meeting. Students should verify their registration to make sure they are enrolled in only the classes they are attending.

Until the end of the second week of instruction, students drop courses by telephone during CASPER or CASPER Plus.

After the second week of instruction all drops will result in a W grade recorded on the students' permanent record and are permitted only for serious and compelling reasons. Drops during the third through the sixth week of instruction require the signature of the course instructor and the department chair. Reasons for dropping include a student carrying an excessive course load, a student inadequately prepared for the course, or a student having significant job / career changes and medical problems.

After the sixth week of the semester all drops require the approval of the course instructor, department chair and the college dean. Drops during this period must be for career related or medical reasons beyond the control of the student (a student initiated job change would not qualify) and must be verified in writing. No drops are allowed after the last week of instruction. Students will receive a final grade of U or F in courses they fail to officially drop.

Comparison Table

WEEK	Current Policy	Proposal	Rationale
1-2	Students drop through Casper – No record of Enrollment	Students drop through Casper – No record of Enrollment	No Change
3-4 (Until Census Date)	Drop requests require Instructor and Department Chair approval – Drops are approved only for serious and compelling reasons. No record of Enrollment	Drop requests require Instructor and Department Chair approval – Drops are approved only for serious and compelling reasons such as course overload, medical problems, and significant job / career changes. A grade of W will result.	A grade of W is assigned in the proposal – The standard drop period is 2 weeks. Over that time, instructors can maintain class waiting lists for students trying to enroll. After 2 weeks, a drop request is considered a withdrawal from the course. Actions by students to drop courses in a timely manner will allow other students to enroll in those courses. This follow the practice of the majority of US Universities (over 58% in 1992 journal of Grade / Grading Practices). Also proposal clarifies reasons for dropping a course beyond the nebulous "serious & compelling". This should help insure consistency of application of the drop policy across departments. Moreover, consistent with current practices, it is not intended that students be permitted to petition for removal of W grades.
5-6	Drop requests require Instructor and Department Chair approval – Drops are approved only for serious and compelling reasons. A grade of W will result.	Drop requests require Instructor and Department Chair approval – Drops are approved only for serious and compelling reasons such as course overload, medical problems, and significant job / career changes. A grade of W will result.	No Change

7 – until last 3 weeks	Drop requests require Instructor and Department Chair approval – Drops are approved only for serious and compelling reasons. A grade of W will result.	Drop requests require Instructor, Department Chair and College Dean approval – Drops are approved only for career related or medical reasons beyond the control of the student (a student initiated job change would not qualify) and must be verified in writing. A grade of W will result.	Proposal requires the additional approval from the College Dean – After 6 weeks, a student should be able to make a final commitment to the course. It is hoped that by that time some assessment instrument has been administered giving the student clear indication of his/her performance and readiness. Reasons for dropping are clearly stated and require written verification.
Last 3 weeks	Drop requests require Instructor, Department Chair and Dean approval – Drops are approved only for serious and compelling reasons. A grade of W will result.	Drop requests require Instructor, Department Chair and College Dean approval - Drops are approved only for career related or medical reasons beyond the control of the student (a student initiated job change would not qualify) and must be verified in writing. A grade of W will result.	In both cases, drop requests require Instructor, Department Chair and College Dean approval – A grade of W will result. In the current proposal, reasons for dropping are clearly stated and require written verification.

Spring 1998 - Number of Drops by College per week

WEEK →

COLLEGE	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8	#9	#10	#11	#12	#13	#14	#15	#16
ALS	181	490	29	46	50	57	43	54	4	65	173	10	14	20
BUS	38	176	6	30	24	11	5	20	0	7	32	13	1	0
ECS	64	121	9	40	19	22	16	14	0	17	34	7	2	7
ED	74	163	6	11	6	12	9	12	0	6	19	2	6	4
HHS	124	288	17	28	33	27	28	41	4	27	96	18	10	29
SCI	68	333	17	26	19	31	15	33	1	24	115	9	1	4
NSM	176	297	24	79	26	35	24	45	0	33	130	13	10	14

CENSUS DATE ←

SPRING BREAK

INSTRUCTOR-CHAIR-DEAN

ANALYSIS OF DEPARTMENT COMPLIANCE
WITH CSUS ADVISING POLICIES

By
THE FACULTY SENATE'S ACADEMIC POLICIES COMMITTEE
May 1997
February l 998 (revised by APC)

- *PROBLEM*

- *SURVEY METHODOLOGY*

- *IDEAS FOR IMPROVING DEPARTMENT ADVISING*

- *CONCLUSION*

- *RECOMMENDATIONS TO INCREASE DEPARTMENT ADVISING CAPABILITIES*

PROBLEM

In the SNAPS Spring 1994 survey, students were asked how the campus could assist their education goals. Forty percent responded, "more and better advising." In the Spring 1995 CASPER survey, 63 percent of the students responded that they were "fairly" to "completely" satisfied with academic advising. Yet, 18 percent of these students responded that they had never been advised.

Are students who need advising receiving such advising before getting into academic difficulties? Are academic resources being squandered on prescriptive advising for students who don't need such advising—and are doing quite well in their academic pursuits? Are we improperly using old advising models to serve a student population that spends a decreasing number of hours on campus? Are all faculty capable of effective "user-friendly" student advising? These are but some of the questions relating to student advising on this campus.

The original charter to the Academic Policies Committee was to answer the question: "Are academic departments complying with current University advising policy?" The Committee broadened this initial question to "How can CSUS better provide resources for and motivate faculty and students to improve the current state of academic advising?"

SURVEY METHODOLOGY

In response to the problem, an Academic Advising Policy Survey was sent to 46 CSUS academic departments in the late Spring and early Fall of 1996. After two follow-up efforts on our part, 41 departments responded. There was a response rate of 87 percent. All academic schools were represented by at least three department responses. Based on survey results, the Academic Policies Committee is proposing the following recommendations.

IDEAS FOR IMPROVING DEPARTMENT ADVISING

Academic Affairs should distribute the following ideas to all departments and use these ideas as a foundation for advising training.

A. *Strategies Affecting Advisor Workload*

   1. Division of labor into specialists with faculty specialists assigned (e.g., Graduate Coordinator, Credential Program Coordinator). These specialists may be excused from general advising chores.

   2. Requirement that each advisor keep a file on each advises, including such items as the advising sheet, current semester class schedule, GE evaluation if available, copies of petitions, a record of advising sessions, and current graduation application. (This burden of paper can be reduced by faculty skill with SIS+ especially screen # 148 as a record keeper.)

3. Requirement that faculty submit office hours in the last week of the preceding semester since student utilization is heaviest in the first weeks of a new semester and messages must be sent to them before the semester starts.

4. Keep in the department, for distribution to students (see below) with the advisement manual, copies of an updated list of all faculty with their advising duties noted (such as specialized responsibility, general student responsibility, range of students under the faculty person's care (last names beginning with A to F. G to J. etc.), and the current semester's office hours and office locations.

5. Since students are entitled to request a change in initially assigned advisors, the advisement general meeting (see #6 below) could be used to equalize the uneven loads which may occur.

6. Explicitly include effective participation in advising among ARTP factors.

B. *Strategies Affecting Faculty Advising Skills*

1. A practical University Advisement Manual for use by faculty shall be developed and periodically updated. The Manual should include the following:

   a. Succinct recapitulation of university and program rules on topics of academic progress toward graduation, major requirements, etc., with precise (page number) references to fuller treatments in the University Catalog or elsewhere. Possibly include or distribute separately all or some of the seven-page Academic Advising Policy (revised November 4, 1994.).

   b. Select copies of SIS screens with instructions on how to access them, how to enter data (where that is allowed), how to read the different fields, and troubleshooting notes for common problems for less computer-literate faculty.

   c. Nicely indexed list of common problems students experience (of an academic progress nature, of course) and the appropriate solutions. List should include referral persons (phone or office numbers) for problems beyond the advisor's competence or responsibility.

   d. A kind of instructional motivational section detailing the importance of quality advising and the personal/communication skills needed to provide that quality (CE).

2. Specialized department sections developed as addenda to the University Advisement Manual that include items such as:
   a. Faculty advisors specializations,
   b. Special department policies,
   c. Student organizations,
   d. Course articulation agreements with Community Colleges

3. Training sessions provided by the Academic Advising Center.

4. Buddy-system training within the department, especially with respect to SIS+.

C. *Strategies Affecting Student Optimum Utilization of Advising (i.e., Compliance)*

1. On each major's SIS+ screen (#119) the advisor's name is entered. If possible, the name would also appear on the records that students can access via the kiosks on campus or their own e-mail.[1]

2. Current semester office hours and phone number of advisor communicated to advisees before each semester starts.

3. Formation of a "moderated"[2] list-proc list (automated e-mail group mailing list) on which all advisor's contact information is given (as in #2 above). For departments with a small number of majors, the list could also have a single message with each major's name and name of the assigned advisor.

4. For complicated programs, the publication of several specific advisement manuals for subprograms.

5. Distribution of the list indicated in A, #4 above in classes attended by majors.

6. Establishment of an annual attractive career-with-academic advisement general meeting attended by all advisors and majors, a dynamics speaker, breakout sessions to meet advisors, student club officers, socialize, etc.

7. Advisement Coordinator (or department head) will send a letter to each new major with various new items and the notice of the necessity of obtaining an advisor or assigning one.

CONCLUSIONS

The subject of faculty advising to students has been a constant concern on this campus for many years. The Committee believes that emphasis on this vital subject must change from "Why aren't faculty doing their job?" to "How can we motivate and enable faculty to effectively advise students in a changing educational environment?" Our suggested approach is one that stresses possibilities and opportunities, rather than one that merely fixes blame. If we are truly serious

---

[1] Many of the suggestions made in this document are actually University policy. See, for example, the required listing of advisors on SIS+ in the Academic Advising Policy (revised November 4, 1994) p. 3.

[2] "Moderated" means only the "owner" of the list can enter messages. There can be multiple owners, such as department secretary and all/some of the faculty. "Moderated" is recommended to avoid the list mails becoming cluttered with junk.

about improving student advising at CSUS, then let us appropriately and effectively devote the resources and ideas necessary to do the job. To these ends, the Academic Policies Committee recommends that the Faculty Senate adopt the following recommendations:

RECOMMENDATIONS TO INCREASE DEPARTMENT ADVISING CAPABILITIES

1. That Academic Affairs set-aside one to two faculty positions annually to provide assigned time to support and strengthen academic advising in departments in which the ratio of majors to full-time faculty exceeds 25 to 1.

2. That Academic Affairs ensure that New Faculty Orientation include training on: General Education advising, academic policies, graduation requirements, use of SIS+ and major requirements.

3. That annual workshops on academic advising be conducted and that each department designate at least one faculty member who will represent the department at the annual academic advising workshop.

4. That in accordance with existing policy, each department create, review and update, if necessary, their academic advising plans.

5. That Academic Affairs provide seed-funding to departments to encourage the development of alternative advising models to complement the traditional "faculty office" model, e.g., use of e-mail sessions between faculty and students, advising WEB pages.

6. That Academic Affairs ensure that the Academic Advising Center develop a University Advisement Manual of the type described in section B. 1. of this document.

7. That Academic Affairs encourage each academic department to develop addenda to the University Advisement Manual as described in section B.2. of this document.

8. That Academic Affairs distribute this document to all departments in order that the recommendations be available to departments when considering their own advisement policies.

I.   **Origin of Committee Consideration**

In Spring semester 1996-97 the Council on University Planning requested that CPC explore the possibility of a policy to strengthen writing and reading skills in the majors and at the upper-division level. That Spring CPC conferred with departments, curricular committees and individual faculty from all schools. Those consulted agreed without dissent that some requirement for the improvement of writing and reading skills beyond General Education was necessary.

During 1997-98 CPC formed an ad hoc committee expert in teaching composition and reading, and with its valuable assistance prepared a policy proposal for Senate consideration. In April the full Senate referred the proposal back to CPC for reconsideration in light of objections raised at the Senate meeting. The most important of those objections were that:

> The proposed policy was too prescriptive;
> was too expensive, especially in its requirement of a designated writing and reading class with a maximum enrollment of 30;
> and lacked any guarantee of special University funding.

The current proposal, designed with the assistance of an expanded ad hoc committee, takes those objections into account and maximizes program discretion.

II.   **Alternatives Considered**

The Committee considered three alternatives:

(1) a modified version of last year's proposal;

(2) a voluntary pilot project program;

(3) the proposal here submitted which emphasizes flexibility and gradual implementation, but does mandate a writing and reading program fully implemented in six-seven years.

III.   **Pro and Con Arguments**

Arguments Against the Proposal Submitted

• Several colleagues have argued that we should first attempt **only** selected voluntary and University-funded pilot projects and **thereafter** propose a policy. The advantage of this approach would be its demonstration that programs working with the University can significantly improve the writing and reading skills of their majors, and that the improvement of those skills need not disrupt a program's curriculum or strain its budget. Such an approach would, as one colleague put it, reduce

the "horrifying" factor in programs' judgments about the implementation of a writing and reading requirement. Finally, the experience gained from pilot projects in a discipline would be valuable for the designing of writing and reading requirements in related disciplines.

- Some colleagues have argued that the proposal submitted is too weak — that it will take too long to implement a the policy and that it will lack effective enforcement.

Arguments for the Proposal Submitted

- The proposal itself will eliminate the "horrifying" factor which might well beset a stronger proposal The current proposal is so clear in its assignment of responsibility for the development both of performance and assessment standards and of pedagogical techniques to the each major program that no one will confuse it with the more "prescriptive" approach of last year's proposal. It is, in short, an ultimately delegating policy proposal. **(NB: even the general expository standards to be distributed by Academic Affairs are voluntary; programs may use, modify or replace them as they see fit.)**

- The proposal provides for an extremely gradual implementation: Its utilization of the program review process for implementation means that only about 1/6 to 1/7 of programs annually must develop a writing and reading requirement. Programs will develop standards and assessment programs as part of the self studies which they must in any case prepare for their upcoming program reviews.

- In preparation for their program reviews or at any other time program may — **but need not** — request participation in a University-supported pilot project. Such projects should provide them with valuable advice (from Academic Affairs and a representative Faculty Senate committee), financial support and experience. On the other hand, the Committee believes it important to have more than pilot programs. If we do not, proposals for writing and reading improvement policies may well be "pilot-projected" to death. In addition, no policy is needed for pilot projects. The University may now offer and programs request participation in pilot projects.

- If the Senate and/or the University are not willing to support the non-prescriptive policy submitted, it is important for CPC and its ad hoc committee members to know so now, so that they can stop wasting time on the development of a writing and reading policy doomed to ultimate rejection. As one colleague put it, "If the Senate will not accept this tame puppy, I want to know now, so that I can do other things."

  After careful discussion, the Curriculum Policies Committee unanimously endorsed the proposal submitted.

IV.   Persons and Documents Consulted

Over the three years of its consideration of the writing and reading issue, CPC has engaged in extensive discussion with campus faculty and units, and has consulted a wide range of documentation:

- In Spring semester 1997 Committee members interviewed curriculum committees and academic councils from all of the Colleges, and the Committee conducted a written poll of units.

- Since CPC established its ad hoc committee in Fall 1997 it has met several times with it, and both Chair Tobey and Liaison Amata have kept CPC informed of the actions and opinions of the ad hoc committee. (In an effort to maximize representation on the ad hoc committee, CPC invited the Associate Deans of the Colleges to recommend additional members.)

- In December 1997 the Committee attended a special meeting of the full Senate devoted to the question of the writing and reading requirements in the major.

- In April 1998 the Committee attended Senate consideration of a policy proposal. The extensive discussion of the problem and objections to the proposal have strongly influenced the current proposal.

- In October 1998 the Committee met in a special session with President Gerth and Provost Koester to discuss the general issue and alternative approaches to its solution.

- The Committee has this semester invited all programs to comment on a series of possible solutions to the writing and reading in the major problem, and received a number of valuable responses.

- Both the ad hoc committee and CPC have invited Alan Kalish, the Director the Center for Teaching and Learning, to meet with it, to learn of his experience with similar programs at another university.

10/27/98 -- Approved by Curriculum Policies Committee

GRADUATE CONCENTRATIONS

The Curriculum Policies Committee   November 23, 1998

Introduction

This policy recommendation covers (1) first or **original** graduate concentrations, (2) additional or **concurrent** concentrations taken by students as part of the same degree program, and (3) **subsequent** concentrations taken by returning students. Proposal A covers situations (1) and (2); proposal B covers situation (3).

NB: The recommended policy would establish the minimum number of units for these concentrations; programs are free to require more units and other requirements in addition to the minimum. Student acceptance to all concentrations requires program approval.

NB: The recommended policy does not forbid **all** overlap among concentrations; it forbids double counting in order to meet the 9 unit minimum.

The Proposal

(A) Students currently enrolled in a master's degree program may, with the consent of the program, fulfill the requirements for one or more concentrations within that one degree program. The degree program shall require a minimum of 9 units of 200-level seminar courses, exclusive of the culminating experience for each concentration, original, concurrent or subsequent. Concentrations may be completed concurrently or sequentially, but all concentration course work must be completed before the awarding of a master's degree. All concentrations will be noted on the diploma and the transcript.

(B) CSUS students who have earned a master's degree in a program offering concentrations may, within seven years of starting the degree and with the consent of the degree program, return to CSUS in order to add one or more concentrations in that program. Each additional concentration shall require a minimum of 9 units of 200-level seminar courses exclusive of the culminating experience. Students must meet the admissions and catalog requirements in effect at the time of enrollment. The additional concentration (s) will be noted on the transcript and no new diploma will be issued.

I. Origins of Committee Consideration

In 1997-98 Research and Graduate Studies, after consultation with the Graduate Coordinators, recommended a policy regarding *additional* concentrations, earned concurrently or upon return to CSUS. CPC approved RGS's recommendation requiring a minimum of 12 units.

The full Senate first approved the recommendation after a floor amendment making the minimal number of units for the second concentration 9 instead of 12 units. At the next Senate meeting, however, the Senate returned the matter to CPC, directing the Committee to recommend a policy covering all concentrations.

II. Alternatives Considered: The Number and Types of Units

In 1997-98 CPC considered the question of the minimal number of units necessary for a second concentration and endorsed RGS's recommendation of 12 units. The chief reason for preferring 12 to 9 units involved variety of faculty judgment: A 12 unit minimum, while not guaranteeing proper variety of faculty opinion about a student, would provide reasonable certainty of that variety, while 9 units would not do so.

The 1998-99 Committee discussed the 12/9 unit difference and decided that the policy now proposed by RGS justifies a 9 unit minimum. The Committee's acceptance of 9 units in place of 12 recognizes a significant change in the proposal submitted. In contrast to 1997-98 the current proposal specifies that the 9 unit minimum for original, concurrent and subsequent concentrations shall not include culminating experience units and shall comprise 9 units of "200-level seminar" courses. These significant changes make 9 units much more reasonable— much more likely to provide a satisfactory variety of faculty judgment of a student doing any type of concentration.

III. Pro and Con Arguments

There are three arguments against the recommended policy:

(1) The first argument is that there should be no University policy restricting program discretion about concentrations. Such a course would maximize program discretion.

Response: The Committee believes that there should be a minimal standard for first as well as concurrent and subsequent concentrations to guarantee that concentrations meet nationally recognized discipline standards end to provide sufficiently varied faculty judgment of a student's knowledge of specialized fields within a program.

(2) The second argument claims that even with the important modifications from 1997-98 involved in the current proposal, 9 units does not provide the desired assurance of a proper variety of faculty judgment to certify that a student qualifies f or a concentration; the minimum number of units should be 12 or more. This argument would especially apply to subsequent concentrations, taken without the benefit of course work to meet core requirements.

Response: The Committee believes that 9 units **as currently specified** in the recommendation will provide an adequate guarantee of quality. The Committee also believes, however, that any reduction of the requirement for 9 units "of 200-level seminar" work outside the culminating experience will fundamentally alter the policy.

(3) The third con argument claims that the requirement of a minimum of 9 units of 200-level seminar work may work to the disadvantage of programs, especially in the liberal arts, unable to provide a large number of regular 200-level courses. Whereas the professional schools usually provide a graduate curriculum comprising many regular 200-level courses, liberal arts programs often rely on upper-division undergraduate courses to complete students' requirements. Since the recommended policy forbids double counting—using units from one concentration to meet the minimum requirements for another concentration—programs with a 9 unit core requirement will need 27 200-level seminar units to offer two concentrations. Many liberal arts programs do not offer that may seminar units.

Response: The Committee (1) believes that the potential restriction on offering additional concentrations is a necessary safeguard of program and student work quality, and (2) points out that the recommended policy permits the inclusion of courses from other graduate programs. Such interdisciplinary cross-listing will give many liberal arts programs sufficient course work to open second concentrations.

IV. Sources and Documents Consulted

The Committee consulted with Research and Graduate Studies, and through RGS with the graduate coordinators. It also consulted the "Blue Book" and other relevant University policy statements in an effort to find relevant existing policy.

2/4/99 Senate Meeting:

MOMENT OF SILENCE:

JO-ANN BULF
Administrative Operations Analyst
College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics
CSUS 1974-1999

Average Class Size by College by Level

		Fall 94	Fall 95	Fall 96	Fall 97	Fall 98	Four-year Change
ALS	Lower Division	24.9	25.0	25.4	24.8	24.2	-3.1%
	Upper Division	27.0	26.3	27.7	26.7	27.0	0.1%
	Graduate	12.5	12.4	13.3	12.0	12.6	1.1%
	Total	25.2	25.0	25.7	25.0	24.8	-1.6%
BUS	Lower Division	42.1	42.2	50.1	45.8	44.8	6.4%
	Upper Division	36.3	38.2	37.6	38.9	42.6	17.2%
	Graduate	19.5	27.8	25.0	30.5	29.3	50.3%
	Total	35.5	37.7	38.4	39.4	41.4	16.6%
ECS	Lower Division	26.5	28.7	28.9	27.0	24.0	-9.5%
	Upper Division	23.3	21.0	20.3	19.6	20.6	-11.3%
	Graduate	14.3	15.2	13.9	13.6	12.1	-15.8%
	Total	23.1	22.7	22.6	21.7	21.0	-9.1%
ED	Lower Division	40.6	38.8	40.0	39.7	33.6	-17.2%
	Upper Division	29.1	25.8	26.8	24.8	23.5	-19.2%
	Graduate	18.5	18.7	18.2	17.3	17.0	-8.1%
	Total	23.8	22.4	22.7	21.6	20.9	-12.2%
HHS	Lower Division	31.3	30.6	29.6	28.2	26.9	-13.9%
	Upper Division	30.8	29.8	29.1	29.4	27.8	-9.5%
	Graduate	17.6	19.9	20.7	19.4	20.6	16.9%
	Total	29.3	28.8	28.2	27.8	26.7	-8.9%
NSM	Lower Division	34.3	33.5	34.1	34.6	34.0	-0.9%
	Upper Division	28.4	28.3	27.7	27.6	28.2	-0.5%
	Graduate	11.5	11.6	12.6	9.8	10.7	-6.7%
	Total	30.5	30.3	30.5	30.3	30.5	0.0%
SSIS	Lower Division	49.2	48.7	47.6	47.2	47.1	-4.3%
	Upper Division	32.7	31.0	32.8	31.4	29.5	-9.9%
	Graduate	12.9	10.7	13.6	14.6	13.4	4.1%
	Total	35.8	34.3	35.9	35.3	33.9	-5.3%
UNIV	Lower Division	30.2	30.3	30.7	29.8	28.7	-4.9%
	Upper Division	29.3	28.3	28.6	28.0	27.9	-4.8%
	Graduate	16.2	17.7	17.6	17.2	17.2	5.6%
	Total	28.2	27.8	28.1	27.4	27.0	-4.3%

Student/Faculty Ratios by College and Level

		Fall 94	Fall 95	Fall 96	Fall 97	Fall 98	Four-year Change
ALS							
	Lower Division	25.5	24.9	24.8	24.4	25.1	-1.5%
	Upper Division	20.1	20.3	20.3	20.2	20.5	2.0%
	Graduate	7.8	7.7	8.3	7.8	8.3	5.7%
	Total	21.3	21.4	21.4	21.2	21.8	2.3%
BUS							
	Lower Division	41.3	39.7	47.2	41.1	39.0	-5.4%
	Upper Division	26.0	27.3	28.3	28.8	29.6	13.8%
	Graduate	9.8	17.0	14.4	15.7	17.9	82.1%
	Total	24.7	27.1	27.8	28.1	29.2	18.2%
ECS							
	Lower Division	19.8	22.3	24.3	25.5	22.3	12.4%
	Upper Division	18.6	17.5	16.6	15.9	16.7	-10.1%
	Graduate	9.1	10.5	10.0	10.3	8.4	-7.8%
	Total	16.9	17.3	17.3	17.3	16.6	-1.8%
ED							
	Lower Division	28.4	28.0	29.5	30.3	25.8	-9.2%
	Upper Division	18.0	18.1	18.8	18.4	17.7	-1.9%
	Graduate	12.6	13.2	12.8	12.7	12.5	-1.0%
	Total	15.3	15.7	15.8	15.8	15.4	0.7%
HHS							
	Lower Division	25.8	26.4	26.3	23.9	24.3	-5.8%
	Upper Division	24.3	23.0	23.1	22.7	22.0	-9.3%
	Graduate	11.4	12.9	13.0	13.1	13.1	14.4%
	Total	21.3	21.2	21.1	20.6	20.1	-5.6%
NSM							
	Lower Division	25.6	25.3	26.1	26.7	25.8	0.8%
	Upper Division	20.9	21.1	20.1	19.7	20.0	-4.2%
	Graduate	9.7	9.0	9.3	7.9	7.8	-19.6%
	Total	22.4	22.4	22.4	22.3	22.0	-1.8%
SSIS							
	Lower Division	41.8	40.4	40.0	40.3	39.3	-5.9%
	Upper Division	24.9	24.5	26.5	24.3	22.5	-9.7%
	Graduate	9.2	7.5	9.3	8.2	8.7	-4.9%
	Total	27.4	26.7	28.3	26.8	25.6	-6.6%
UNIV							
	Lower Division	25.5	25.4	26.0	25.7	25.3	-0.7%
	Upper Division	22.1	21.9	22.0	21.5	21.3	-3.5%
	Graduate	10.7	11.9	11.7	11.7	11.7	9.2%
	Total	21.0	21.2	21.4	21.0	20.8	-1.0%

Average Section Size by College and Level
Shaded Cell Indicates Highest Value Over 18-year Period

		Fall 81	Fall 82	Fall 83	Fall 84	Fall 85	Fall 86	Fall 87	Fall 88	Fall 89	Fall 90	Fall 91	Fall 92	Fall 93	Fall 94	Fall 95	Fall 96	Fall 97	Fall 98
Ann Ave FTES		16957	16922	17026	17335	17699	17756	17942	18582	18897	19441	19019	18103	17270	17045	17192	17591	17881	18250 a
ALS	Lower Division	27.0	25.4	25.9	27.1	25.8	25.6	24.0	23.8	23.5	24.3	25.6	23.8	24.2	24.9	25.0	25.4	24.8	24.2
	Upper Division	24.0	23.3	23.3	25.4	26.4	27.0	26.6	27.7	28.3	29.6	29.6	31.2	28.6	27.0	26.3	27.7	26.7	27.0
	Graduate	12.4	11.1	9.2	10.3	9.9	11.1	11.2	12.1	12.7	13.4	14.0	12.6	12.5	12.5	12.4	13.3	12.0	12.6
	Total	24.8	23.7	23.7	25.5	25.5	25.8	24.8	25.3	25.2	26.1	28.0	26.8	25.7	25.2	25.0	25.7	25.0	24.8
BUS	Lower Division	28.4	28.4	31.1	34.3	42.6	39.8	46.0	40.3	42.1	53.5	45.1	39.8	42.6	42.1	42.2	50.1	45.8	44.8
	Upper Division	29.8	29.6	28.9	30.5	30.2	34.1	33.3	31.3	33.8	34.8	37.7	38.9	38.7	36.3	38.2	37.6	38.9	42.6
	Graduate	18.0	16.1	13.0	14.7	13.4	17.4	15.7	16.7	20.3	21.8	22.9	22.7	20.8	19.5	27.8	25.0	30.5	29.3
	Total	27.6	27.1	26.9	29.5	30.3	33.6	33.5	31.5	33.8	36.3	37.2	37.3	37.4	35.5	37.7	38.4	39.4	41.4
ECS	Lower Division	27.9	27.5	28.7	26.2	22.2	22.6	22.2	23.3	24.7	23.9	26.4	26.3	25.3	26.5	28.7	28.9	27.0	24.0
	Upper Division	21.3	22.2	22.7	23.0	21.6	21.3	19.6	20.7	19.9	20.2	22.6	25.6	23.6	23.3	21.0	20.3	19.6	20.6
	Graduate	13.2	13.6	12.7	10.6	10.4	10.3	12.0	12.8	12.1	13.3	13.9	17.8	15.5	14.3	15.2	13.9	13.6	12.1
	Total	22.3	22.7	23.4	22.9	20.8	20.6	19.4	20.5	20.3	20.7	22.7	24.9	23.0	23.1	22.7	22.6	21.7	21.0
ED	Lower Division	24.3	29.3	37.7	33.0	26.6	28.0	30.0	35.6	35.8	33.4	39.0	33.4	39.5	40.6	38.8	40.0	39.7	33.6
	Upper Division	24.9	25.0	26.0	26.6	27.2	27.5	27.7	28.0	27.5	26.1	28.9	29.5	28.8	29.1	25.8	26.8	24.8	23.5
	Graduate	18.1	19.1	19.5	16.6	16.6	17.8	19.2	19.4	19.7	18.0	19.3	18.8	19.7	18.5	18.7	18.2	17.3	17.0
	Total	20.8	21.7	22.5	22.0	22.3	23.0	23.6	23.9	23.7	22.2	24.2	24.1	24.6	23.8	22.4	22.7	21.6	20.9
HHS	Lower Division	27.6	26.6	27.5	24.8	26.6	26.4	25.6	25.8	26.9	29.0	30.7	28.3	32.3	31.3	30.6	29.6	28.2	26.9
	Upper Division	21.8	21.4	23.6	23.7	26.2	26.1	26.9	28.3	28.6	30.0	29.0	29.7	30.1	30.8	29.8	29.1	29.4	27.8
	Graduate	17.5	15.8	16.0	15.3	16.3	17.0	16.3	17.4	16.3	16.0	18.7	19.2	17.0	17.6	19.9	20.7	19.4	20.6
	Total	22.8	22.1	23.5	23.0	25.0	24.9	24.9	25.9	26.3	27.7	28.0	27.9	28.7	29.3	28.8	28.2	27.8	26.7
NSM	Lower Division	31.4	29.9	30.4	31.7	30.7	30.1	30.4	32.0	31.4	32.3	35.2	33.8	34.0	34.3	33.5	34.1	34.6	34.0
	Upper Division	21.6	21.7	19.8	23.0	22.6	22.3	22.7	24.8	25.0	26.4	27.9	28.7	27.9	28.4	28.3	27.7	27.6	28.2
	Graduate	10.0	10.1	8.1	11.1	10.1	12.3	11.0	10.3	10.2	12.1	11.3	12.5	12.1	11.5	11.6	12.8	9.8	10.7
	Total	26.4	25.8	24.6	27.3	26.5	26.0	26.2	27.9	27.6	28.9	31.2	30.9	30.4	30.5	30.3	30.5	30.3	30.5
SSIS	Lower Division	38.1	35.3	33.8	38.9	40.3	41.1	43.3	43.2	44.1	43.4	47.7	48.0	46.7	49.2	48.7	47.6	47.1	47.1
	Upper Division	24.4	23.3	22.6	27.7	26.3	28.7	29.4	30.2	31.4	34.6	37.6	36.3	35.1	32.7	31.0	32.8	31.4	29.5
	Graduate	11.4	11.7	8.2	13.6	12.1	12.7	11.3	14.7	13.6	15.2	14.0	13.9	14.2	12.9	10.7	13.6	14.6	13.4
	Total	28.4	26.7	25.1	31.1	30.8	32.6	33.0	33.9	34.4	36.3	39.0	37.9	36.7	35.8	34.3	35.9	35.3	33.9
UNIV	Lower Division	29.5	28.1	28.7	29.5	29.2	28.7	28.4	28.4	28.3	29.4	31.1	29.4	30.0	30.2	30.3	30.7	29.8	28.7
	Upper Division	23.9	23.7	23.7	25.6	25.8	26.6	26.3	27.2	27.7	28.8	30.8	31.3	30.1	29.3	28.3	28.6	28.0	27.9
	Graduate	16.0	15.4	13.9	14.1	13.9	15.4	15.5	16.3	16.2	16.3	17.5	17.7	16.9	16.2	17.7	17.6	17.2	17.2
	Total	25.0	24.3	24.3	25.9	25.8	26.3	25.9	26.5	26.7	27.7	29.4	29.1	28.6	28.2	27.8	28.1	27.4	27.0

Student/Faculty Ratios by College and Level
Shaded Cell Indicates Highest Value Over 18-year Period

		Fall 81	Fall 82	Fall 83	Fall 84	Fall 85	Fall 86	Fall 87	Fall 88	Fall 89	Fall 90	Fall 91	Fall 92	Fall 93	Fall 94	Fall 95	Fall 96	Fall 97	Fall 98 a
Ann Ave FTES		16957	16922	17026	17335	17699	17756	17942	18582	18997	19441	19019	18103	17270	17045	17192	17591	17881	18250
ALS	Lower Division	23.7	22.5	24.5	24.9	23.2	22.1	22.2	24.8	24.3	25.4	26.5	24.8	25.0	25.5	24.9	24.8	24.4	25.1
	Upper Division	18.0	17.4	18.3	18.3	19.0	19.7	20.1	20.4	21.7	21.8	23.8	24.0	22.0	20.1	20.3	20.3	20.2	20.5
	Graduate	8.1	7.5	7.6	6.8	6.2	6.7	6.6	6.8	6.8	7.9	8.7	8.2	8.6	7.8	7.7	8.3	7.8	8.3
	Total	19.5	18.6	20.0	20.1	19.9	20.0	20.0	21.1	21.5	22.0	23.5	22.8	21.9	21.3	21.4	21.4	21.2	21.8
BUS	Lower Division	24.7	24.0	26.9	30.9	33.7	32.5	37.5	33.7	33.9	35.7	39.2	38.1	43.7	41.3	39.7	47.2	41.1	39.0
	Upper Division	24.6	24.9	25.0	24.5	22.7	25.3	24.6	24.5	26.0	24.8	28.6	29.6	28.1	26.0	27.3	28.3	28.8	29.6
	Graduate	13.1	11.7	9.5	10.4	8.0	10.8	10.4	10.3	11.8	12.8	14.8	12.9	12.9	9.8	17.0	14.4	15.7	17.9
	Total	22.5	22.1	22.6	23.7	22.1	24.7	24.6	24.1	25.3	24.8	27.9	27.8	27.2	24.7	27.1	27.8	28.1	29.2
ECS	Lower Division	22.5	21.6	23.2	20.2	17.0	16.6	16.6	18.0	17.5	17.3	19.7	19.8	19.1	19.8	22.3	24.3	25.5	22.3
	Upper Division	16.9	16.7	17.4	16.8	16.1	15.9	15.0	15.3	14.4	15.5	17.1	21.2	19.1	18.6	17.5	16.6	15.9	16.7
	Graduate	9.5	8.5	8.7	6.3	6.1	6.2	7.4	7.6	7.2	7.6	8.9	10.9	9.5	9.1	10.5	10.0	10.3	8.4
	Total	17.2	16.6	17.6	16.2	15.0	14.8	14.2	14.7	13.8	14.6	16.1	18.9	17.0	16.9	17.3	17.3	17.3	16.6
ED	Lower Division	19.8	23.0	34.8	28.7	16.2	17.4	19.4	24.0	23.7	20.5	21.5	41.8	27.8	28.4	28.0	29.5	30.3	25.8
	Upper Division	17.8	18.8	16.1	16.5	16.1	16.6	17.1	16.7	17.2	16.3	17.8	19.4	18.8	18.0	18.1	18.8	18.4	17.7
	Graduate	12.5	12.0	12.8	10.8	11.5	11.9	12.9	12.8	12.4	12.1	12.7	13.1	13.6	12.6	13.2	12.8	12.7	12.5
	Total	14.4	14.1	14.5	13.9	14.1	14.5	15.2	14.9	14.7	14.2	15.2	16.3	16.4	15.3	15.7	15.8	15.8	15.4
HHS	Lower Division	20.3	19.2	20.1	19.1	19.2	19.4	20.8	22.2	22.4	23.8	26.1	24.1	25.3	25.8	26.4	26.3	23.9	24.3
	Upper Division	18.3	17.6	17.8	16.5	18.3	18.9	19.5	20.8	21.2	22.4	23.3	24.0	23.8	24.3	23.0	23.1	22.7	22.0
	Graduate	10.4	9.6	11.5	9.6	10.1	11.4	10.7	10.9	10.9	10.0	11.6	13.0	12.6	11.4	12.9	13.0	13.1	13.1
	Total	16.5	15.6	16.7	15.3	16.4	17.1	17.3	18.3	18.6	19.2	20.4	21.2	21.2	21.3	21.2	21.1	20.6	20.1
NSM	Lower Division	23.3	22.9	21.8	23.4	22.6	21.7	21.8	23.4	23.1	23.9	25.4	25.3	25.3	25.6	25.3	26.1	26.7	25.8
	Upper Division	16.9	16.6	16.0	16.7	16.4	15.8	16.1	18.0	18.6	19.3	20.3	21.7	21.0	20.9	21.1	20.1	19.7	20.0
	Graduate	8.2	7.4	7.7	7.9	7.7	8.4	7.6	7.0	7.6	9.0	8.8	10.0	9.5	9.7	9.0	9.3	7.9	7.8
	Total	19.6	19.2	18.6	19.7	19.1	18.3	18.3	19.9	20.1	21.0	22.3	22.9	22.4	22.4	22.4	22.4	22.3	22.0
SSIS	Lower Division	34.4	29.2	27.2	31.6	32.6	33.8	36.1	37.0	35.8	35.6	40.4	40.4	41.2	41.8	40.0	40.0	40.3	39.3
	Upper Division	19.6	18.9	20.3	20.9	19.8	21.8	21.9	23.0	23.1	25.6	28.2	27.9	27.8	24.9	24.5	26.5	24.3	22.5
	Graduate	8.4	8.1	8.4	9.0	7.7	8.4	7.9	9.2	9.3	9.4	10.2	9.9	10.0	9.2	7.5	9.3	8.2	8.7
	Total	23.0	21.1	21.7	23.5	23.1	24.8	25.1	26.2	25.7	27.0	29.7	29.2	29.1	27.4	26.7	28.3	26.8	25.6
UNIV	Lower Division	24.1	22.8	23.3	24.4	23.3	22.6	23.1	24.3	23.8	24.6	26.0	25.0	25.3	25.5	25.4	26.0	25.7	25.3
	Upper Division	19.2	18.8	19.1	18.9	18.7	19.5	19.5	20.2	20.8	21.3	23.3	24.3	23.2	22.1	21.9	22.0	21.5	21.3
	Graduate	10.9	10.1	10.4	9.2	9.0	10.0	10.1	10.3	10.2	10.3	11.3	11.8	11.7	10.7	11.9	11.7	11.7	11.7
	Total	19.2	18.4	19.1	19.1	18.7	19.1	19.1	19.8	19.9	20.3	21.9	22.3	21.8	21.0	21.2	21.4	21.0	20.8

a. Projected