

**NOTE: Bring your October 29 Agenda Attachment B-1.**

1998-99  
FACULTY SENATE  
California State University, Sacramento

AGENDA  
Thursday, November 12, 1998  
Foothill Suite, University Union (3<sup>rd</sup> floor, new wing)  
3:00-5:00 p.m.

## INFORMATION

1. Tentative Fall 1998 Faculty Senate Meeting Schedule:  
November 19--MEETING  
November 26--No meeting—Happy Thanksgiving!  
December 3--  
December 10--  
December 17--
2. All faculty members are invited to attend Cornerstones Implementation Plan Forum #2, on Monday, November 16, 1:30-2:30, Orchard Suite I and II (2<sup>nd</sup> floor, UU)  
*(Note: The draft "Cornerstones Implementation Plan" is also available at <http://www.csus.edu/acse/corner/spense.htm>)*
3. Senate Home Page (<http://www.csus.edu/acse/> or CSUS Home Page then Administration and Policy then Departments then Faculty Senate) - Vice Chair Arthur Jensen
4. Report on Academic Affairs  
*Time Certain: 3:20 p.m., Jolene Koester, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs*

## CONSENT CALENDAR

### FS 98-75/CPC, Ex. PROGRAM CHANGE PROPOSAL

The Faculty Senate recommends approval of the following program change proposal:

Computer Engineering: Adds an upper division engineering course to the Computer Engineering curriculum. This increases the total number of units from 134 to 137.

**REGULAR AGENDA**

FS 98-73/Flr. MINUTES

Approval of the Minutes of the meeting of October 29 (#6), 1998.

FS 98-74/Flr. MINUTES

Approval of the Minutes of the meeting of November 5 (#7), 1998.

Old Business

FS 98-72/Ex. CONSTITUTION OF THE FACULTY--Amendments

The Faculty Senate approves amendments (FS 98-72A, B, C, D, and E) to the Constitution of the Faculty of California State University Sacramento (October 29, 1998, Faculty Senate Agenda Attachment B-1) for submission to the voting membership of the faculty in a referendum.

FS 98-72A/Flr. CONSTITUTION OF THE FACULTY--Amend Faculty Senate Duties and Membership

*Amended  
y=15  
n=13*

To improve the communications and reporting procedures of the Faculty Senate, the Constitution of the Faculty of California State University Sacramento [see Article II, Section 3.B (Duties) and Article II, Section 5.A (Membership) of October 29, 1998, Faculty Senate Agenda Attachment B-1] shall be amended to specify that the chairs of certain specified standing committees shall be elected by and from the Faculty. [Note: This change would be addressed in detail in the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate.]

*man  
Carried  
y=17  
n=8*

FS 98-72B/Flr. CONSTITUTION OF THE FACULTY--Amend Organization Membership and Faculty Senate Membership

*Carried*

In response to changes requested by the Counseling Faculty (SSP-ARs), who were recently moved into Unit 3, the Constitution of the Faculty of California State University Sacramento [see Article I, Section 2 (Membership) and Article II, Section 5.B.1 (Membership) of October 29, 1998, Faculty Senate Agenda Attachment B-1] shall be amended.

FS 98-72C/Flr. CONSTITUTION OF THE FACULTY--Amend Faculty Senate Responsibilities

*Carried*

To clarify the responsibility of the Faculty Senate, as addressed in the Constitution of the Faculty of California State University, Sacramento, several statements that specify "policy" shall be expanded to "policy and procedures" [see Article II, Section 4 (Responsibilities)]

***preamble and Article II, Section 4 (Responsibilities) A, B and C of October 29, 1998, Faculty Senate Agenda Attachment B-1].***

FS 98-72D/Flr. CONSTITUTION OF THE FACULTY--Amend Faculty Senate Membership

*Carried*  
The Constitution of the Faculty of California State University Sacramento shall be amended to redefine representation of the Emeritus Association to allow either the Association President or a designee to be an ex officio, non-voting member of the Faculty Senate [see ***Article II, Section 5.A (Membership) of October 29, 1998, Faculty Senate Agenda Attachment B-1].***

FS 98-72E/Flr. CONSTITUTION OF THE FACULTY--Amend Faculty Senate Membership

The Constitution of the Faculty of California State University Sacramento shall be amended to include the President of the University and the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs as ex officio, non-voting members of the Faculty Senate [see ***Article II, Section 5.A (Membership) of October 29, 1998, Faculty Senate Agenda Attachment B-1].***

New Business

FS 98-76/Flr. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBER--ELECTION OF

*[Note: Senator Linda Palmer has resigned as a member of the Executive Committee. An election will be conducted. Any elected senator is eligible to serve on the Executive Committee. The "Bylaws of the Faculty Senate, California State University Sacramento," Section III, state: "A vacancy in the voting membership of the Executive Committee shall be filled by nomination and election at the first meeting of the Faculty Senate after the vacancy occurs. The nominee elected shall have received more votes than any candidate not elected." The member elected must be available to meet on Tuesdays from 3:00-5:00 p.m. See Attachment A for a list of those eligible for election.]*

FS 98-77/CPC, Ex. COURSE AND PROGRAM CHANGE PROPOSALS, UNIVERSITY LEVEL REVIEW PROCESS FOR (amends AS 97-47 and AS 97-48)

*[Note: See Curriculum Policies Committee memorandum in Attachment B-1.]*

The Faculty Senate recommends adoption of the following process for appeals against new course proposals (amends AS 97-47, "New Course Proposal Policy", Attachment B) and substantive course change proposals (amends AS 97-48, "Policies Pertaining to Substantive Course Change Proposals", Attachment B):

A. The CPC Curriculum Subcommittee shall consider appeals against new course or program change proposals only by:

- a department, program or college against a proposal course or program change;

- a department or program *and* a college against a proposed RCE offering;
- an individual member of the Subcommittee against any proposed course or program change from any source including RCE.

B. In order to facilitate this process, Academic Affairs shall:

- circulate notice of new campus academic credit course offerings, program changes and RCE offerings to all department, programs and colleges;
- ensure that all proposals comply with current CSUS and CSU policy;
- in cases of objections by a department, program or college against a new course or program change proposal, consult with involved units;
- inform departments, programs and colleges of their right to appeal to the Curriculum Subcommittee;
- advise members of the Subcommittee in cases of appeal.

C. After the completion of these procedures, including any Subcommittee decisions on appeals, Academic Affairs shall recommend approval or disapproval of the proposals to the President.

#### First Reading

#### FS 98-66/Flr. DISTANCE LEARNING, PROPOSED POLICY STATEMENT ON

The Faculty Senate recommends approval of the following statement: California State University, Sacramento recognizes the value of different teaching strategies and pedagogies in higher education, including those used in distance (or distributive) education. It is ultimately the responsibility of the faculty to determine the appropriate format in which a course should be offered.

# 1998-99 Faculty Senators, CSU, Sacramento

Senate Unit	Senator	Senate Unit	Senator
Accountancy	Kim, Jong	Library	Amata, Ben
Anthropology	Wheeler, Valerie	Management	<del>Jensen, Arthur</del>
Art	Turrill, Catherine	Management	Lee, Ming-Tung "Mike"
Athletics	Strahan, Kathy	Mgmt Info. Science	Scanlan, David
Biological Sciences	Barrena, Juanita	Mathematics/Stat.	Leezer, Roger
Biological Sciences	Huff, Dennis	Mathematics/Stat.	Bossert, J. Michael
Biling./Multicul. Ed.	Jew, Victoria	Mechanical Engr.	Reardon, Frederick
Chemistry	Hill, James	Music	Zucker, Laurel
Civil Engineering	Moore, Joel	Nursing	Raingruber, Bonnie
Comm. Studies	Newsome, Chevelle	Org. Beh. & Environ.	Cleek, Margaret
Comm. Studies	LeFebvre, Edith	Philosophy	Dundon, Stan
Computer Science	Buckley, Bob	Physics & Astro.	Hall, Donald
Computer Science	Lan, Kwai-Ting	Physical Therapy	Barakatt, Ed
Counselor Ed.	Smith, Nathan	Psychology	Verdone, Paul
Criminal Justice	Lee-Sammons, Lynette	Psychology	Behrman, Bruce
Criminal Justice	McCrystle, Michael	Publ. Pol. & Admin.	<del>Laecher, Ted</del>
Economics	Lund, Peter	Rec. & Leis. Studies	Olson, Ernest
Ed. Adm. & Policy Studies	Jacobs, Lila	Social Work	<del>Dworkin, Jean</del>
E&E Engineering	de Haas, Steven	Social Work	Anderson, Joseph
English	Palmer, Linda	Sociology	Kando, Thomas
English	Bauerly, Joan	Special Ed.	Lewis, Michael
Environ. Studies	Stabinsky, Doreen	Spch Path. & Audio.	Dokimos, Elizabeth
Ethnic Studies	Scott, Otis	Student Services	Banks, Booker
Fam.&Cons.Sci.	Kawamoto, Walter	Student Services	Llamas-Green, Vivian
Foreign Languages	Serrano, Estella	Teacher Education	Rodriguez, Raul
Geography	<del>Krabacher, Thomas</del>	Teacher Education	Alexander, Sharon
Geology	<del>Wheeler, Greg</del>	Temp. Faculty Rep.	Phillips, Kerry
Government	DeBow, Ken	Temp. Faculty Rep.	[vacant]
Health & P.E.	<del>Seid, Melinda</del>	Temp. Faculty Rep.	Klyse, Lynne
Health & P. E.	Elfenbaum, Louis	Temp. Faculty Rep.	[vacant]
History	Chambers, Henry	Theatre Arts	Pickett, Manuel
Humanities	[vacant]	Women's Studies	Cameron Wedding, Rita
Learning Skills	McKee, Sue		

## II. Course Proposals

(Form A)

Guidelines for Catalog Course Descriptions

### A. New Course Proposal Policy

1. All new course proposals require department, school, and university approval. The Curriculum Subcommittee of the Curriculum Policy Committee reviews 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, performances, 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 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.

#### At the Department Level

1. 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]:
2. Course proposals are reviewed according to department procedures to determine
  - 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.

The department is responsible for consulting with other departments and/or schools affected by the course change proposal.

### At the School Level

1. 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. nonduplication of current university offerings or reasoned and relevant explanation for substantive duplication when duplication appears to exist.
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. The Dean recommends the appropriate course classification for the course that accompanies the proposal through the University review process.
5. Course change proposals submitted by School for university review and approval carry no implicit request for change in program requirements or supplemental funding. If a course change proposal requires either of these, it is the responsibility of the School Dean (or designee) to support the program change and/or provide supplemental funding when the course change proposal is conveyed to the next university review level.

### At the University Level

1. Course change proposals are placed on a list by the Office of the Associate Vice President who circulates the list periodically to the campus community (i.e., Deans, Department Chairs, President's Staff, members of the Academic Senate's Executive Committee, and the appropriate Senate Curriculum Committee). The circulation of the list is also publicized in the CSUS Bulletin. Department Chairs are requested to post the list so that all faculty have access to it. Faculty who have substantive or jurisdictional concerns about proposed course changes are to notify the Associate Vice President through a dean, department chair, unit head or appropriate Senate committee chair within ten days of the posting of the list.
2. 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 for substantive duplication when duplication appears to exist.

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.

3. Final decision of whether to offer an approved course rests with the School Dean and Department Chair based on a judgment of the impact the change will have on other existing school programs given the resources available to support the change.

## B. Substantive Course Change Proposal Policy

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 of 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.

## C. Guidelines for Catalog Course Descriptions

Use the following criteria for course catalog descriptions. The descriptions should:

1. provide an overview of the course purpose in one or two brief sentences or phrases.
2. describe course content in specific terms; i.e., list the major course topics in brief phrases.
3. be less than 80 words in length.
4. specifically state the number of units granted for the course and the number of lecture and/or laboratory hours per week. Courses which count for full time enrollment but not graduation should be identified as such. Courses that are graded Credit/No Credit should also be identified as such.
5. provide information on prerequisites, corequisites, etc. in a consistent order; e.g., prerequisites, corequisites, required concurrent enrollment, standard language for "corequisites." A suggested form is "Prerequisites: Math XX, YY and ZZ; concurrent enrollment in Math ZZZ permissible."
6. explain enrollment restrictions such as class level requirements, course open to majors only or non-majors only, course not open to students who have completed a specific similar course, and instructor's permission in lieu of completion of a prerequisite being acceptable or unacceptable.
7. co-requisite is used for concurrent enrollment.
8. use a consistent style within programs; in particular, all course descriptions within a program should be complete sentences or not complete sentences, but not a mixture of both in any one description or within a given program's offerings. **Example:**

Introduction to differences between historical periods. Site visits to various historic locations of interest.  
Lecture three hours/discussion one hour.



**-versus-**

Course offers an introduction to the differences between historical periods of related interest. Class visits will be made to the various sites to be discussed in lecture presentations. Course format includes a three hour lecture followed by one hour of interactive discussion.

9. include instructional method only if it is pertinent to the course or is unusual; e.g., a self-paced course in math.
10. include CAN (California Articulation Number) designation if applicable.
11. specifically include when the course is offered by indicating semester references for all courses. Include one of the following references: "offered alternate years only," "Fall only," "Spring only."
12. omit ambiguous phrases such as "additional topics as time permits."
13. use standard abbreviations consistent with the class schedule for all subject designations; e.g., abbreviation "ECON 1A" should match the class schedule abbreviation.
14. do not include any reference to G.E. categories; these designations appear in each semester's Class Schedule.

Catalog course description copy should be formatted using the following text sequence

- Number
- Title
- Content Description [notes, i.e., open only to seniors or other enrollment restrictions]
- Lecture and Lab Hours per Week
- Misc. info., i.e.,
  - a. Prerequisites and Co-requisites
  - b. When offered
  - c. Credit/No Credit
  - d. Enrollment restrictions, if any
  - e. Designation (when applicable) that course may be taken for workload credit toward full-time enrollment status, but is not applicable to the baccalaureate degree.
  - f. Number of Units

---

Return to [CSUS Home Page](#), [Academic Affairs](#), [Bluebook Index](#).

OCT 26 1998

To: Tom Krabacher, Chair, Faculty Senate  
Fr: Jerry Tobey, Chair, Curriculum Policies Committee  
Re: Course and Program Change Approval Policy Recommendation

Faculty Senate Received  
413

October 26, 1998

The attached is CPC's proposal for a modification of our current University course and program change approval procedure.

### I. **Origins of Committee Consideration**

During his September, 1997 address to the faculty, President Gerth suggested that the University might significantly reduce the paperwork and time demands on programs by a simplification of the new course and program change procedures. The Curriculum Policies Committee requested that its Curriculum Subcommittee explore the possibilities of such a simplification, and the attached proposal is the result of that consideration. It has the unanimous endorsement of the Curriculum Subcommittee and of the Curriculum Policies Committee.

### II. **Alternatives Considered**

The Subcommittee considered the alternative of retaining the current procedures for evaluating new course and program change proposals.

### III. **Pro and Con Arguments**

A possible argument against the proposed procedure is that it weakens Senate review of curricular proposals, that the current procedure guarantees that the Curriculum Subcommittee will both specifically see and act upon *all* curricular proposals. Under the proposed procedure the Subcommittee will *chiefly* consider only those proposals which are appealed to it.

The prevailing pro argument is as follows:

- The proposed procedures leaves intact the Curriculum Subcommittee's responsibility for evaluating proposed *new programs or program deletions*. It will continue to forward its recommendations regarding these changes to the Senate Executive Committee.
- The proposed procedures provide for two instances by which the Curriculum Subcommittee can consider new course and program change proposals without a formal appeal: (1) upon the request of the Provost, and (2) at the request of *any member* of the Subcommittee.
- The proposed procedure recognizes that departments, programs and colleges provide adequate evaluation of new course and program change proposals and should retain their

right to object to Academic Affairs about any proposals which have a negative impact on them. If dissatisfied by Academic Affairs's response, any department, program or college may formally appeal any course or program change proposal.

### **Conclusion**

Curriculum Policies believes that the proposed procedures will save programs a time-consuming step for most curricular proposals, will allow the Curriculum Subcommittee to concentrate on new program and program deletion proposals, while preserving all rights of departments, programs and colleges to appeal proposed curricular changes to a Senate committee.

### **Parties Consulted**

Curriculum Policies consulted directly with its Curriculum Subcommittee, which has extensive experience of the University-level evaluation of curriculum proposals, and with Academic Affairs, which has responsibility for curricular proposal circulation and processing. In addition, Associate Vice President Gray has alerted various units to the proposed new procedures. She reports favorable responses.

## COURSE AND PROGRAM CHANGE APPROVAL PROCESS

- I. The Curriculum Subcommittee of the Curriculum Policies Committee **shall continue** to evaluate all proposals for new academic credit programs (including options) and program deletions and transmit its recommendations to the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate.
- II. The Subcommittee also considers appeals against new course or program change proposals only by
  - a department, program or college against a proposed course or program change;
  - a department or program *and* a college against a proposed RCE offering;
  - an individual member of the Subcommittee against any proposed course or program change from any source including RCE.

The Subcommittee shall also consider other course or program change proposals at the request of the Provost.
- III. In order to facilitate this process Academic Affairs shall
  - circulate notice of new campus academic credit course offerings, program changes and RCE offerings to all departments, programs and colleges;
  - ensure that all proposals comply with current CSUS and CSU policy;
  - in cases of objections by a department, program or college against a new course or program change proposal, consult with involved units;
  - inform departments, programs and colleges of their right to appeal to the Curriculum Subcommittee;
  - advise members of the Subcommittee in cases of appeal.
- IV. After the completion of these procedures, Academic Affairs recommends approval or disapproval of the proposals to the President.