

S P E C I A L  
A C A D E M I C   S E N A T E   M E E T I N G

Wednesday, April 6, 1983

2:00 p.m.          Psych - 153

AS 83-21/CC, GPPC, Ex.    ACADEMIC PROGRAM PRIORITIES AND CRITERIA AND  
PROCESS OF EVALUATION

The Academic Senate approves the Academic Program Priorities and  
Criteria and Process of Evaluation (see attached memo dated  
March 22, 1983).

Attachment

cc: Department Chairs

AS 83-22/EX.    RESOLUTION ON FACULTY MAINTENANCE &  
STAFFING POLICY

AS 83-23/EX.    RESOLUTION ON VOLUNTARY REDUCTION OF  
FACULTY WORKLOAD



# CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY. SACRAMENTO

6000 J STREET, SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95819

March 22, 1983

TO: Alan Wade, Presiding Member  
Academic Senate

FROM: Marsha Dillon, Presiding Member  
Ad Hoc Committee on Contingency Plans  
for Instructional Programs

SUBJECT: Recommendations from the Curriculum Committee and Graduate  
Policies and Programs Committee respecting academic program  
priorities and criteria and process of evaluation

I am writing at the direction of the Curriculum Committee and the Graduate Policies and Programs Committee to transmit to the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate recommendations respecting academic program priorities and criteria and process of program evaluation. The accompanying recommendations were approved by the Curriculum Committee and the Graduate Policies and Programs Committee at their respective meetings on March 14 and 21, 1983.

The Committees developed these recommendations through a joint Ad Hoc Committee on Contingency Plans for Instructional Programs. Members from the Curriculum Committee are Marsha Dillon, Richard Fish, Eleanor Kirkland, Otis Scott, and Marilyn Thompson. Members from the Graduate Policies and Programs Committee are Pennie Provo, Anne-Louise Radimsky, and David Weinerth.

## I. RECOMMENDATIONS RESPECTING PRIORITIES

- A. that priorities be established in terms of academic programs rather than in terms of teaching positions or faculty assignments
- B. that identification of academic program priorities be based on University and program priorities contained in the University Planning Committee's "University Planning Profiles for Academic Units" (April 18, 1980) and subsequent "Program Planning and Budgeting" documents from the Academic Affairs Budget Committee.

The existing University and program priorities are stated below:

### University Priorities

From "University Mission and Goals Statement: Philosophy, Purpose, Priorities," adopted by the University Planning Committee in May 1979, endorsed by President Johns, Summer 1979, published in "University Planning Profiles for Academic Units"

"In light of our purpose and philosophy, programs will be supported relative to the following priorities:

1. We will support undergraduate offerings which are essential to the liberal tradition of the University and upon which all baccalaureate programs are based, i.e., the core undergraduate programs.
2. We will support professional undergraduate and graduate programs, subject both to demonstrated program need and student demand, at a level sufficient to ensure academic excellence.
3. We will support other graduate programs, subject both to satisfactory academic performance reviews, both on the basis of student demand and demonstrated program need and to satisfactory academic performance.  
(sic)
4. We will support other undergraduate programs, subject to satisfactory academic performance reviews, on the basis of student demand."

Core Programs (not ranked) - from "Core Programs" statement, published with the above

General Education  
service core function

undergraduate major degree core programs - B.A. degrees in eligible departments which devote more than 40% of their respective faculty and operating budgets to G.E. and service offerings

Program Priorities (From "University Planning Profiles for Academic Units")

University Priority #1 (see above) - Core Programs - priorities in departments with B.A. programs eligible for core major status

1. G.E./service function
2. B.A. degree (& minors)
3. Social Science B.A., if applicable

The B.A. will have equal priority with the G.E./service function when core major requirements are met.

Departments eligible for core major status: Anthropology, Art, Biological Sciences, Chemistry, Economics, English, French/German/Spanish, Geography, Geology, Government, History, Humanities, Math & Statistics, Music, Philosophy, Physics, Psychology, Sociology, Theatre Arts

Other G.E. & service core programs (not eligible for core major status):  
Communication Studies, Home Economics, Journalism

Other G.E. core programs (not eligible for core major status):  
Ethnic Studies, Women's Studies

University Priority #2 - professional undergraduate & graduate programs - subject to demonstrated program need, student demand, and satisfactory academic performance

--School of Business & Public Administration program priorities

Business Administration: 1. BS & MBA (& minor)  
2. MS, Accounting Option  
3. MS, MIS Option

Public Administration: 1. MPA  
2. BS in Pub. Admin. (& minor)  
3. service

--School of Education program priorities

1. multiple & single subject credential programs, including single subject waiver programs in Art, Life Science, Business, Physical Science, English, French/German/Spanish, History, Home Economics, Physical Education, Mathematics, Music, Social Science
2. specialist credentials in early childhood, bilingual/cross-cultural, learning & severely handicapped; administrative services credential; MS in counseling; MA options in educational administration; supporting Child Development program
3. MA options in bilingual/cross-cultural & special education
4. Other MA options and service credential options in library services, pupil personnel services, school psychology

--School of Engineering program priorities

Engineering: 1. BS in Civil, Electrical & Electronic, & Mechanical Engineering, & Engineering Technology; MS in Biomedical Engineering  
2. MS in C.E., E.E., M.E.  
3. BS & MS in General Engineering  
4. G.E./service

Computer Science: 1. G.E./service  
2. BS  
3. MS

Note: The Department is seeking a review of these priorities in order to rank the BS equally with G.E./service.

--School of Health & Human Services program priorities

- Criminal Justice: 1. CJ BA (& minor)  
2. CJ MA  
3. BS Forensic Science

- Health & Safety Studies: 1. BA (& minor) 2. credential  
3. G.E./service

Physical Education: 1. BS (& minor) 2. G.E. 3. graduate

Athletics: 1. intercollegiate Athletics 2. service  
(also offers a minor)

- Nursing: 1. BS Nursing  
2. School Nursing Credential Program  
3. G.E./service

- Recreation & Leisure Studies: 1. BS RPA (& minor)  
2. MS RPA  
3. service

- Social Work: 1. MSW 2. BA Social Welfare (& minor)  
3. BA Corrections 4. G.E./service

-- Communication Studies 1. G.E./service 2. BA (& minor) 3. MA

-- Home Economics 1. G.E./service 2. BA (& minor)  
3. graduate courses

-- Journalism 1. BA Journalism & Government-Journalism  
2. G.E./service 3. graduate courses

-- MA International Affairs

-- BA & MA Speech Pathology & Audiology

University Priority #3 - other graduate programs, subject to demonstrated  
program need, student demand, and satisfactory academic performance

graduate programs in A & S core major departments:

1. MA/Social Science MA
2. MS

departments: Anthropology, Art, Biological Sciences (MA & MS),  
Chemistry (MS), Economics, English, French/German/  
Spanish, Government, History, Math & Statistics  
(MA & MS), Music, Psychology, Sociology, Theatre Arts

University Priority #4 - other undergraduate programs subject to student  
demand and satisfactory academic performance (listed alphabetically with  
priorities, unless priorities appear elsewhere in this summary)

Biological Sciences	BS		
Chemistry	BS		
Child Development	BA		
Environmental Studies	1. G.E./service	2. BA (& minor)	
Ethnic Studies	1. G.E./service	2. BA (& minor)	

Foreign Languages

Chinese

1. basic skills courses supporting the bilingual/cross-cultural credential program & G.E.

African, Greek, Japanese 1. basic skills courses for G.E./service

Italian, Latin, Portuguese, Russian 1. basic skills courses for G.E./service  
2. minors

Geology

BS

Learning Skills

Liberal Studies

BA (subordinate to multiple subjects teaching credential)

Music

Bachelor of Music

Physics

BS

Minor not otherwise listed in this summary: Film Studies, Gerontology, Librarianship, Religious Studies (equal priority with Humanities BA), Soviet Studies, Women's Studies

Aerospace Studies (Air Force ROTC); Military Science (Army ROTC)

## II. RECOMMENDATIONS RESPECTING CRITERIA

- A. that the criteria to be used by the Curriculum Committee and the Graduate Policies and Programs Committee include program need, student enrollment/faculty positions, and program quality, leaving assessment of fiscal impact to the Fiscal Affairs Committee.
- B. that the following sources of information be used in the course of assessing each program in accordance with the priorities and criteria approved by the Academic Senate
  1. the most recent data available respecting program need, student enrollment, and faculty positions
  2. the set of most recent program review documents on file with the university
  3. responses to specific questions the evaluation committee may address to program representatives to obtain updated information respecting quality of programs

The Committees recommend the following criteria:

Criteria of Evaluation -- to be assessed concurrently in an effort to identify patterns of strength, adequacy, or weakness

Program Need: programs and offerings as defined by their functions  
(majors, minors, options, concentrations, and special  
emphases) -- Source of data: University administration

- magnitude of need for the function in the local community and service area      large-moderate-small  
growing-stable-declining
- magnitude of need for the function in the state and national contexts      large-moderate-small  
growing-stable-declining
- availability of alternative sources of the function capable of accommodating the need      large-moderate-small  
growing-stable-declining

Student Enrollment/Faculty Positions -- Source of data: University administration

- enrollment - most recent 5-year sequence in total FTES; major FTES; number & percentage of sections that fall below minimum class size standards
- degrees completed - most recent 5-year sequence - undergraduate & graduate
- projected enrollment
- FTEF - full-time tenured; full-time tenure track; full-time lecturer; part-time
- SFR - target, with comment on appropriateness  
- most recent 5-year sequence of actual SFR - lower division; upper division; graduate

Quality of the Program -- Source of information: appropriate portions of the most recent program review document, updated by reports of subsequent significant change

- comments from commendations and recommendations in the most recent program review document      favorable-marginal-unfavorable
- action on review recommendations      effective-ineffective
- faculty      strong-adequate-weak
- library resources & services      excellent-adequate-inadequate
- facilities & equipment      excellent-adequate-inadequate

To assist the evaluation process, the Committees recommend requesting the following additional information from departments:

- actions on recommendations in the most recent program review document
- significant changes in the structure of programs not reflected in the 1982-84 catalogue
- significant changes since the most recent program review in each of the following:
  - quality of each program
  - quality of faculty
  - library resources & services
  - facilities & equipment

### III. PROCESS OF EVALUATION

- The process of program evaluation by the Curriculum Committee and the Graduate Policies and Programs Committee under AS 83-18 (approved by the Academic Senate on March 9, 1983) will be based upon Senate approval of priorities and criteria arising out of recommendations from the Committees.
- The process is intended to develop advice to the Academic Senate respecting contingency plans for instructional programs.
- The evaluation will be conducted by the Ad Hoc Committee on Contingency Plans for Instructional Programs, a joint subcommittee of the Curriculum Committee and the Graduate Policies and Programs Committee. The results of the evaluation will take the form of a set of recommendations to both Committees. The Committees will forward their joint recommendations\* to the Fiscal Affairs Committee for assessment of fiscal impact. The Fiscal Affairs Committee will forward the joint recommendations to the Executive Committee for Senate action.
- The evaluation committee will consider the following sources of information in the course of assessing each program in accordance with the priorities and criteria approved by the Academic Senate:

#### \*Form of recommendations:

- continue program at current level; maintain resource allocation
- continue program at reduced level; reduce resource allocation by a specified magnitude
- expand program to a specified level; increase resource allocation by a specified magnitude
- terminate program and resource allocation



1. the most recent data available respecting program need, student enrollment, and faculty positions
2. the set of most recent program review documents on file with the University
3. responses to specific questions the evaluation committee may address to program representatives to obtain updated information respecting quality of programs.

The appearance of all programs before the evaluation committee will be by means of these written sources. When the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate takes up the joint recommendations of the Curriculum Committee, the Graduate Policies and Programs Committee, and the Fiscal Affairs Committee, it may exercise its discretion to permit the personal appearance of program representatives. Otherwise, program representatives should expect to convey their positions through the agency of their elected Senators. The Senate may also exercise its discretion to permit personal appearances of program representatives during its discussion of the Executive Committee's recommendations. If the Senate chooses not to do so, the program representatives should again expect to convey their positions through the agency of their elected Senators.

Special Academic Senate Meeting

April 6, 1983

AS 83-22/Ex. RESOLUTION ON FACULTY MAINTENANCE AND STAFFING POLICY

- WHEREAS, no institution of higher learning can be stronger than its tenured faculty; and
- WHEREAS, the core of the strength of all colleges and universities is their tenured and tenure-track faculty members; and
- WHEREAS, this university is faced with budget cuts that might threaten through layoffs its capacity to meet its educational mission; and
- WHEREAS, reductions in tenure-track faculty are generally undesirable, and specifically because tenure is a means to certain ends including: 1) freedom in teaching, in research, and in extramural activities, and 2) a sufficient degree of economic security to make the profession attractive to men and women of ability\*; and
- WHEREAS, it is the policy of this university that "reductions in tenure-track faculty are undesirable on many counts and, to the extent that the skills of the full-time faculty can be utilized while maintaining appropriate levels of support and the quality of instruction in the University's programs, must not occur"\*\*\*; and
- WHEREAS, staffing patterns have arisen over the years which may militate against the preservation of the principle stated above; therefore be it
- RESOLVED, 1) that the Academic Senate of CSU, Sacramento reaffirms the principles on Faculty Maintenance and Staffing Policy as enunciated in Section 5.22.00 of the Faculty Manual, and
- 2) that the Academic Senate reaffirms the centrality of the goal of maintenance of tenured faculty in the face of layoffs by strengthening campus procedures for use of qualified existing tenured and tenure-track faculty who may be underutilized in their home disciplines, and in furtherance of the principles cited above,
- 3) that the Faculty Affairs Committee shall examine departmental transfer policies for conformance with Section 5.22.00 of the Faculty Manual, and
- 4) that the Curriculum Committee shall identify educationally sound and acceptable substitute courses for courses now staffed largely by part-time faculty, and
- 5) that no part-time faculty members be hired when the University is threatened with layoffs until it has been determined that existing full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty are not available who can reasonably and responsibly meet the educational needs of the students involved.

\* AAUP 1940 Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure

\*\*Faculty Manual, 5.22.01

Special Academic Senate Meeting

April 6, 1983

AS 83-23/Ex. RESOLUTION ON VOLUNTARY REDUCTION IN FACULTY WORKLOAD

- WHEREAS, the University is faced with severe budget reductions for the 1983-84 academic year; and
- WHEREAS, every possible avenue for savings should be explored before resorting to layoffs; and
- WHEREAS, some faculty members from time to time have expressed a willingness to voluntarily reduce workload and pay in order to help avoid or minimize the threat of layoffs of their junior colleagues; and
- WHEREAS, a precise statement of the consequences of such voluntary reductions in workload/pay in terms of loss of credits toward sabbatical leaves, reduced retirement and other benefits, etc., is necessary information prior to making such a decision; therefore be it
- RESOLVED, that the Academic Senate of CSU, Sacramento urge Executive Vice President Barkdull to inform the faculty as soon as possible of the implications and consequences of such voluntary reductions in workload/pay to the end that such decisions may be forthcoming where appropriate and desirable.