

81-8
VOID

ACADEMIC SENATE

AGENDA

Wednesday March 11, 1981

2:00 p.m. SSC-107

Info
Petty repl. Connor
4/8/81

3/11/81 Info
Special Mtg CS
4/1/81

CONSENT CALENDAR

AS 81-12/Ex. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS ✓

Academic Policies Committee: ROLAND ESQUERRA (Spring 1981 replacement for S. Serrano, Senator, 1982)

Curriculum Committee: MARSHA DILLON, Arts/Sci., 1983 (replacement for C. Barnes)

Graduate Policies/Programs Committee: JUANITA BARRENA (Spring 1981 replacement for J. Simes, at-large, 1983)

Committee on Committees, 1980-81:

- Convenor: ROBERT FOREMAN
- Student Senator: none (no students appointed for 1980-81)
- Arts and Sciences, Social Sciences: JOHN BRACKMANN
- Arts and Sciences, Humanities & Fine Arts: ROBERT EISNER
- Arts and Sciences, Science & Mathematics: SUSAN SLAYMAKER
- Education: HAROLD MURAI
- Business and Public Administration: MICHAEL WEININGER
- Engineering: JOHN GILLESPIE
- Social Work: NORMAN ROTH
- ~~Health and Physical Education: LOUIS ELFENBAUM~~
- Nursing: PHYLLIS SEMAS
- Library: STANLEY FROST
- Student Affairs: ALGARD WHITNEY
- Ethnic Studies: DAVID COVIN

* AS 81-13/Ex. ACADEMIC SENATE APPOINTMENT, 1981-83 ✓

Replacement for Douglas Neifert, Staff, 1981: GEORGIANA HORINE or TOSHI KAWAMURA or SANDY OFSENEK or MARIE PEREZ or PENNIE PROVO

* AS 81-14/GP,CC,FA,Ex. EDUCATION OPTION ✓

Thomas Neal Alexander
Muller Stuckey

The Academic Senate approves the proposed Master of Arts Option in Gifted/Talented Education. (Copies of the program proposal will be mailed to Senators under separate cover.)

* AS 81-15/GP,CC,FA,Ex. BEHAVIOR MODIFICATION CERTIFICATE PROGRAM ✓

Marrow
Stuckey
Alexander

The Academic Senate approves the Behavior Modification Certificate Program proposal. (Copies of the proposal will be distributed to Senators under separate cover.)

REGULAR AGENDAAS 81-11/F1r. MINUTES ✓

Approval of Minutes of the February 25, 1981 meeting

* AS 81-6/AP, Ex. EXAMINATION SUPERVISION ✓

The Academic Senate recommends the policy that when the nature of a test is such that cheating is possible, the proctor will, so far as possible, remain in the room to supervise the examination.

Kelly

* AS 81-7/UARTP, Ex. QUORUM - ARTP COMMITTEES ✓

The Academic Senate recommends that sections 4.05.05.B.2, 4.13.09.D.2, and 4.21.05.C of the FACULTY MANUAL be amended as follows:

Bynum

~~Each primary level evaluation report shall be approved by a simple majority of the primary level ARTP committee. Substantive evaluations and final recommendations shall require the participation of a quorum of two-thirds (2/3) but not fewer than three (3) of all elected committee members or duly elected alternates. Each primary level evaluation report shall be approved by a simple majority of all members of the primary level ARTP committee. The department chair shall be an ex officio non-voting member of the committee and shall make an independent evaluation. The department chair shall indicate in writing concurrence with the department report; or, in the event that the department chair does not concur with the report, s/he shall specify in writing the reasons for her/his non-concurrence, based upon evidence in the candidate's personnel action file.~~

AS 81-8/F1r. BYLAWS AMENDMENT

The Executive Committee transmits to the Academic Senate the ASI President's proposed amendment to the Bylaws of the Academic Senate (below).

Gilson

D. Executive Committee

1. Membership. Voting membership of the Executive Committee shall consist of the Chair and Vice Chair of the Academic Senate, the Academic Senate Chair of the preceding term, and four elected members of the Academic Senate, and the President of ASI or his/her designee. Ex officio, non-voting members are the President of the University, or his/her representative, the Senior State Academic Senator, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs; and the Student Body President. The Chair of the Academic Senate shall be the Chair of the Executive Committee.

AS 81-16/Ex. SALARY SCHEDULE ✓

The Academic Senate, CSUS, opposes the Faculty Salary Schedule ("Option III") adopted by the Board of Trustees at their January meeting. *J. Henry*

The Senate believes that there has still been no adequate or reasonable consultation with the statewide or local senates on the Salary Schedule, and that the policy adopted is substantially the same as the prior proposal. On October 29, 1980 the CSUS Academic Senate condemned the original proposed Salary Schedule on the following grounds:

The proposed salary schedule violates the principle of merit review by making difficulty-in-hiring and retaining faculty, because of salary consideration, a criterion for promotion. The proposed schedule would, therefore, seriously damage faculty morale by making promotions depend in part on fluctuating market considerations, and by treating faculty in different university units unequally.

The proposal would entail annual, substantive evaluation of a large proportion of faculty members. It would, therefore, demand excessive blocks of faculty members' time. This added burden would detract significantly from teaching and university committee work.

The proposal will not achieve its goal of attracting and retaining faculty for engineering, business, and computer science. Even under the proposed system, university salaries would be significantly lower than salaries available in those areas in the private sector.

Before the Board of Trustees acts on the proposal, alternative means of assisting schools with planning, hiring, and retention problems should be studied carefully at the state and local levels.

The Academic Senate affirms that these objections also pertain to the policy adopted by the Board of Trustees.

(Copies of memoranda on this subject are attached for information.)

TO: FACULTY SENATE MEMBERS
FROM: Joseph Furey, Economics Rep.

The Faculty Affairs Committee passed the following resolution at its meeting of February 17, 1981.

THE RESOLUTION

The Faculty Affairs Committee condemns the proposed Trustee Merit Salary policy (Option III). It views such policy as invidious, demeaning and, therefore, harmful to the faculty. As well, such a policy allows greater power to University presidents to arbitrarily determine the salary levels of individual faculty members, thus creating the potential for salary levels to serve as a mechanism to reward and punish faculty based on the whim of presidents.

The Faculty Affairs Committee objects to any salary proposal based on "market prices" for faculty members.

The Faculty Affairs Committee urges the Academic Senate to formally protest this policy.

3/2/81

TO: FACULTY SENATE MEMBERS
FROM: Joseph Furey, Economics Rep.

The Economics Department at its meeting of February 23, unanimously passed the following resolution, and directed their senator to bring it to the Academic Senate for appropriate action.

THE RESOLUTION

Academic
The Department recommends that ~~the~~ ^{Academic} Senate ^{will} take no action on the New Faculty salary schedule which the Trustees are attempting to implement. Before any action is taken, whether to oppose its implementation or go along with its provisions, ~~we~~ should wait until the PERB Board has ruled on the unfair labor practices charges made both by the UPC and the CFA.

the Senate will
If it becomes necessary as a result of the rulings, the Department ~~will request the~~ Academic Senate ^{will} to resist the implementation of the Trustee's new merit pay scheme. Appropriate supporting arguments will be forthcoming at that time, if it becomes necessary.

3/2/81

OPTION III

MEETING THE COMPETITION OF THE MARKETPLACE AND REWARDING MERIT

1980-81 Salary Structure		Add new half-steps to major ranks to increase range of rewards possible		
				39,732
				38,808
				37,896
				37,008
				36,144
				<u>35,304</u>
		34,476		34,476
		32,892		32,892
	Professors—	31,380	31,380	31,380
		29,940	30,648	
		28,560	29,940	29,940
			29,244	
			28,560	28,560
			<u>27,900</u>	
		27,252	27,252	27,252
			26,628	
		26,004	26,004	26,004
	Associate Professors—	24,828	25,404	
		23,700	24,828	24,828
		22,620	24,252	
			23,700	23,700
			23,148	
			22,620	22,620
			<u>22,104</u>	
		21,600	21,600	
	Assistant Professors—	20,616	20,616	
		19,692	19,692	19,692
		18,804	18,804	18,804
Instructors—		17,964	17,964	17,964
		17,160	17,160	
		16,392	16,392	
No. of steps	5	5	5	5
				19
				15
				15