A C A D E M I C S E N A T E

AGENDA

Wednesday, December 12, 1984

2:00 p.m.

Student Senate Chambers, University Union

INFORMATION

1. Moment of Silence in memory of:

   John A. Vreeland, Professor, Department of Electrical and Electronic Engineering

2. Collective bargaining update

3. Spring Dialogue - information

4. Sabbatical Leaves - timelines

CONSENT CALENDAR

AS 84-60/Ex. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS

Faculty Address Committee: JOHN BRACKMANN, At-large
LEE KAVALJIAN, At-large
CHARLES G. NELSON, At-large
JOHN SYER, At-large
LITA WHITESEL, At-large

AS 84-61/FacA, Ex. FACULTY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM CHANGE PROPOSALS

Lita to Bernie

The Academic Senate of California State University, Sacramento endorses the program change proposal for faculty development contained in the 1985-86 CSU Support Budget. (See Attachment A)

AS 84-62/GPPC, Ex. ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHIES

The development of sophisticated computer-based literature search systems has raised serious questions regarding the value of an annotated bibliography as a culminating experience. The Academic Senate therefore approves the following policy:

It is the campus policy that annotated bibliographies not be considered an acceptable means to satisfy the

AS 84-62/GPPC, Ex. (cont'd)

culminating experience requirement for a master's degree. However, the Graduate Policies and Programs Committee will consider a request for exemption when the department making the request can demonstrate that an annotated bibliography cannot be done by relying primarily on a computer search. Such an exemption will be subject to review every three years.

REGULAR AGENDA

Approved AS 84-59/Flr. MINUTES

Approval of Minutes of meeting of November 14, 1984.

Carried AS 84-63/Ex. COLLEGIALITY IN THE CSU SYSTEM

The CSUS Academic Senate endorses in principle the CSU Academic Senate's statement on "Collegiality in the California State University System." (See Attachment B)

Carried. AS 84-64/FacA, Ex. PERIODIC REVIEW OF TENURED FACULTY - GUIDELINES

The Academic Senate approves the "University Guidelines for Periodic Review of Tenured Faculty." (See Attachment C)

AS 84-65/FisA, CC, GPPC NURSING MASTER'S DEGREE PROGRAM

Carried unan. The Academic Senate recommends approval of the "Proposed Master's Degree Program for Nursing," (dated March 1984, revised May 1984) with the request for a progress report in three years which shall include an analysis of the impact of the graduate program on the undergraduate curriculum. (See Attachment D for program abstract. The complete proposal is available for review in the Academic Senate Office, Adm. 264.)

AS 84-66/AP, Ex. GRADES (C- FOR PREREQUISITES)

The Academic Senate approves the following policy:

Carried. Substitute The "C" grade as mentioned in the catalog as prerequisite for courses means a 2.0 G.P.A. If departments wish to identify the "C-" grade as appropriate for fulfilling prerequisites, they should so state in the course description.

Ford (M) Hall 2nd
Substitute Referendum
4-24
N-9
Carried

AS 84-67/Ex. OUTSTANDING PROFESSOR AWARD

The Academic Senate reaffirms its policy that "California State University, Sacramento, does not participate in the Outstanding Professor Awards selection." (See Attachments E, F, and G)

AS 84-68/FacA, Ex. RTP CRITERIA AND STANDARDS FOR UNIT 4 EMPLOYEES (AS 84-27 superseded)

The Academic Senate approves the following resolution:

RTP CRITERIA AND STANDARDS FOR UNIT 4 EMPLOYEES

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate has in the past on this campus, through evaluation policies developed under its aegis, been responsible for setting the criteria and standards for promotion, retention, and tenure decisions respecting academic support unit employees; and

WHEREAS, The Higher Education Employer-Employee Labor Relations Act (HEERA) defines criteria and standards for the appointment, promotion, evaluation, and tenure of academic employees to be outside the scope of responsibility of collective bargaining; and

WHEREAS, The Higher Education Employer-Employee Labor Relations Act (HEERA) asserts that criteria and standards for appointment, promotion, evaluation, and tenure of academic employees shall be the joint responsibility of the Academic Senate and the trustees; and

WHEREAS, The principle of collegiality as observed on this campus has resulted in the inclusion of Student Affairs Officers as academic employees; and

WHEREAS, The CSU has adopted new classifications and standards establishing a new Student Service Professional Series; therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the California State University, Sacramento, Academic Senate asserts its joint responsibility in establishing criteria and standards for appointment, promotion, evaluation, and tenure of all academic employees (including employees formerly in Student Affairs Officer classifications); and be it further

AS 84-68/FacA, Ex. (cont'd)

RESOLVED, That criteria and standards for all accademic employees shall continue to be formulated by the University Appointment, Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Committee, which is a committee of the Academic Senate of CSUS; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the CSU Sacramento Academic Senate requests support of this policy from the CSU Academic Senate and other campus Senates.

AS 84-69/FacA, Ex. VOTING ELIGIBILITY - STUDENT SERVICE PROFESSIONALS

Carried

The Academic Senate approves the following:

WHEREAS, The principle of collegiality as observed at CSU, Sacramento, has traditionally defined Student Affairs Officers as members of the faculty, therefore be it

RESOLVED, That former SAO's who are classified as Student Service Professionals are faculty members, with the right to vote in Academic Senate elections and serve on Senate and University committees.

E. Faculty Development $ 2,407,286

The purpose of this proposal is to augment the ability of the CSU to sustain the intellectual and professional development of their faculties to achieve and maintain quality education.

Faculty Development appropriately includes a variety of programs that the institution embraces, as well as a response to changing and expanding knowledge in academic disciplines by maintaining competence in the discipline. This requires not only continued study, but also access to the community of scholarship and creative activity in the discipline. The needs for faculty development are expanding at an accelerating rate while the related funding sources have been reduced from prior support levels. The proposal contains four separate programs which are discussed below.

1. Increase Faculty Instructional Skills Using Computers in the Classroom ($640,970)

Technological advancements in computers, communications, business and data systems continue to affect university curricula throughout the nation at a revolutionary pace. The objective of this program is to upgrade computer user skills for approximately 1,300 faculty.

The computer revolution has already arrived in the university classroom. Increasingly, students enter the university equipped with basic computer skills acquired through training in the secondary schools that exceed those of faculty who are not computer specialists. Yet, it is expected that faculty will assist students in moving beyond the basic skills to become sufficiently literate in the tools of communications and computer technologies to qualify for advanced study or professional employment in the various disciplines.

CSU campuses are endeavoring to meet the needs for increasing faculty instructional skills in the use of the computer, but resources are insufficient to provide a broad, integrated program of skills development of workshop materials and subsequent staffing.

Computer courses provided in the undergraduate curriculum for students preparing to be computer scientists cannot serve the purpose of providing faculty with teaching skills to integrate computer usage into their classrooms. The computer skills the faculty need are more select than those offered to the students. For example, courses for the students do not deal with the specialized skills, nor the content, for developing teaching modules for computer based education in the various university disciplines.

This program is made up of a series of workshops dealing with the acquisition of skills in using microcomputers, specialized computer packages contained in the mainframe CYBER and a modest leave program for more intensive study. These workshops ($365,000) are intensive 40-hour residential type, hands-on workshops. The leave program provides for 20 one term leaves for intensive work to enable faculty to prepare themselves for preparing Computer Assisted Instruction courses and other special, technological, computerized activities, that are deemed necessary for use in their classes.

2. Creative and Scholarly Leaves ($640,425)

The Creative Leave Program was an extremely successful and productive professional development program operative in the CSU from 1967 to 1970. Heavy budget cuts in 1970 forced the discontinuance of the program, although it is still provided for in the California Administrative Code, Title 5 (Article 5.1 43030-3).

The current objective remains as before. Special leaves for scholarly or creative endeavors are often vitally needed by faculty to complete a specific project in a timely manner. This program enables faculty to be granted a special leave at a time when the completion of a scholarly project would be of maximum benefit to the faculty, the students, and the institution in terms of improved teaching, currency in the field and professional development. CSU has no way to grant paid leaves other than the regular sabbatical leave program. Although tenured faculty become eligible for such a leave after six years of service, the resources for sabbaticals are extremely limited in that more than 5,300 faculty are eligible for sabbatical leaves each year with funds provided for fewer than 500 leaves.

The funding request will provide for replacements of faculty who are on creative or scholarly leaves for one term.

3. Faculty Travel to Professional Meetings ($615,796)

The amount of travel permitted to CSU employees, including faculty, was reduced by 25% in 1982 by the Legislature. It, of course, reduced faculty travel even more than 25% because it was a reduction in actual trips rather than dollars only. Campuses were no longer permitted to commit other funds to the depleted travel budget.

Quality faculty professional productivity as evidenced by the presentation of papers at nationally recognized conferences is usually reviewed in most accreditation reports and is necessary to the maintenance of faculty currency in the field, to the overall academic climate at the university.

The confluence of the following factors has produced a major crisis in faculty morale. Campuses are requiring more research and publication activity. The cost of travel is increased while the funds available for travel have not kept pace.

Annual studies done on travel expenditures in the CSU reported the following serious erosion in resources:

	Number of Faculty Trips for Professional Purposes	Total Cost	Average Reimbursement Of Cost Per Trip
1980/81	2,774	$724,243	$261
1981/82	1,992	$436,357	$219
1982/83	1,750	$345,802	$197

Transportation alone to a conference in the Midwest or East coast would cost double or triple the above amount of average reimbursement. In addition, the faculty member would have had to pay for several days lodging, food expenses, and registration fees.

Faculty should receive reimbursement for the bulk of expenditures related to the presentation of scholarly papers.

This proposal would restore the 25% reduction ($590,000) and provide for the reimbursement of travel expenses incurred by those faculty who have had scholarly papers or other creative endeavors accepted for presentation at a regional, national, or international conference by a professional organization.

4. Continued Educational Opportunities for Faculty to Retrain to Meet Changing Institutional Needs ($510,095)

The California State University has entered a period of projected steady State enrollment. At the same time students are continuing their internal migration from the humanities, arts and social science disciplines to high technology programs in Engineering, Business and Computer Science. In a recent survey campuses reported that this shift in student enrollment in the various programs within the university creates an imbalance in faculty staffing. In order to cope with this shifting enrollment, campuses have endeavored to transfer some faculty, for at least part of their teaching load, from departments where the enrollment is decreasing to areas where the need is greater.

The survey shows that the two most prevalent reasons for transferring faculty from their home department to a "borrower" department for part of their teaching assignment are:

a. With a reasonable amount of preparation time a faculty member who is needed to teach a course in a closely related discipline, can prepare him/herself to do so with the quality needed by the borrowing department.

b. With the heavy pressures on recruitment in hard-to-hire disciplines there are faculty who can prepare themselves to teach classes in business or computer science and who are transferred to teach one or two introductory or lower division courses in those departments.

In order for those faculty who are preparing to teach courses new to them with the quality of instruction desirable, it is necessary to provide them with some release time. The objective of this proposal is to provide resources for preparation time for faculty who can offer courses different from their normal specialization in order to meet changing institutional needs.

FOR POSSIBLE DISCUSSION AND/OR ACTION SEPTEMBER 6-7, 1984

COLLEGIALITY IN THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM

Purpose and Definitions

Collegiality is a concept based on what faculty have traditionally regarded as the ideal form of decision-making in the university; the concept includes both a decision-making process and a set of attitudes without which the process itself would be little more than a hollow shell. Fundamental to this concept is the belief that a university is a community of scholars who, out of mutual respect for the technical expertise of their colleagues, agree that shared decision-making in areas of recognized primary responsibility constitutes the means whereby a university best preserves its academic integrity and most efficiently attains its educational mission.

Many C.S.U. faculty perceive that there has been a significant decline in collegiality within the system during the past decade. As a result, faculty have become increasingly concerned for the future of both academic governance and shared decision-making. Though all members of the university community subscribe to the rhetoric of collegiality, its actual operational status varies greatly among the campuses within the C.S.U. system. The Academic Senate, C.S.U., believe that a statement on collegiality, including its historical development and current status, may help to maintain and improve collegial relationships within the California State University system.

I. Historical Development of Collegial Patterns of Decision-making

Shared decision-making in universities is unique among the administrative systems of large, modern organizations. Universities are complex, pluralistic institutions. Their structures are loose, ambiguous, and constantly changing, as are their power structures. The evolution of modern universities has resulted in granting greater authority and responsibility to faculty than is enjoyed by most employees in private industry or government service, most of whom function in a much more hierarchical structure. The historical origins of faculty authority and responsibility may be traced at least to the universities of the late medieval period.

A. European University Governance Patterns

The often cited ideal of the university as a free, independent community of scholars has seldom existed in reality. From their inception in medieval Europe, universities have contained three competing authorities: faculty, internal administration, and external lay governing bodies. There is little consistent historical precedent favoring the exclusive authority of one over the others.

The universities of northern Italy and Paris, dating from the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, created the pattern for subsequent universities. In the case of Paris, especially, the masters or faculty of these institutions generally came to control the curriculum. By the fourteenth century, however, ultimate authority resided with external bodies created to protect the in-

terests of those—whether papal, monarchical, or municipal—who authorized the existence of the university and, in many cases, paid the faculty. Protestant universities created after the Reformation did not significantly depart from this pattern. The Calvinist founders of universities such as Geneva, Leyden, and Edinburgh subscribed to the Calvinist belief that all social institutions, including universities, should be overseen by laymen; they therefore created governing boards with final responsibility. However, they also made specific provision for initial faculty authority in academic matters.

The English universities of Oxford and Cambridge followed the continental pattern. While their charters provided for external boards ("visitors"), they also dramatically extended the authority of the faculty who elected the heads of the colleges and were constituted as a formal governing body exercising internal legislative powers. For some two hundred years, beginning about 1650, the faculty ran the colleges of these universities almost entirely free of external interference. In 1850, however the English government stepped in and began to reform the organization of Oxford and Cambridge; by 1870 the faculty has lost much of its power to rectors and lay boards. Oxford and Cambridge were not typical of English universities. The charters for every English university founded in the past two centuries permitted strong external control through governing boards, though most included provision for faculty responsibility in educational matters.

The German universities of the nineteenth century broke from the tradition of external governing boards. Prior to that time, German universities had been subject to strong control by civil authorities. The University of Berlin, founded in 1810, set a new standard for the governance of German universities; the University's founders deliberately granted complete authority for academic matters to the faculty, hoping thereby to create a true community of scholars, free to study and teach without external control. The University of Berlin, and subsequent German universities, were governed by faculty boards composed of full professors who elected the rectors and deans. Civil authorities retained powers of faculty appointment and salaries, but the faculty had complete control over internal matters. Greatly admired by academics in other countries, these German universities provided a model for the transformation of American universities in the late nineteenth century. They also form the historical basis for the modern view that a university is a community of scholars and that the faculty should properly have primary responsibility for academic matters.

B. University Governance Patterns in the United States

Prior to the Civil War, university governance in the United States drew upon European and English patterns. The charter of Harvard College (founded in 1636) provided for a "Board of Overseers" and the charters of all subsequent American universities contained similar provisions. Those who founded universities retained control over them and exercised that authority through rectors. At the same time, the Calvinist pattern of faculty control of academic matters and the model of Oxford and Cambridge resulted in significant delegation of responsibility to the faculty. Both Harvard and the College of William and Mary (founded in 1693) originally had dual boards, faculty and trustee, which ensured significant faculty involvement. Over time, however, the growth of the power of the external boards resulted in a decline in faculty authority.

The tradition of strong trustee authority continued into the nineteenth century. There were some exceptions: Yale University (founded in 1701) provided for extensive faculty control, and Thomas Jefferson made specific provisions for faculty control of the curriculum when he founded the University of Virginia (1819). Throughout the nineteenth century, patterns of governance varied from university to university depending upon individual traditions and the style of trustee boards and rectors or presidents. Universities were simple organizations, faculties were small, and the curriculum was standard. The faculty constituted nearly the entire university staff; though faculty were generally conceded to have some responsibility over curriculum, trustee authority was supreme. No American university resembled the Oxford-Cambridge model of a corporation of research and teaching fellows; none emulated the German model of near-complete control by faculty.

These conditions changed dramatically after 1860. Over the next four decades, a revolution in American higher education accompanied the emergence of industrial, urban, multi-ethnic America. Just as the giant industrial corporation of 1900 had few similarities to the small, family-run businesses typical of the pre-Civil War era, so too did the university of 1900 bear little resemblance to that of 1860. Universities grew larger and grew structurally more complex, reflecting changes in the curriculum, especially the emergence of majors and electives. The increasing size of the university, and the need of university presidents and trustees to make informed decisions regarding increasingly diverse and specialized activities, prompted the creation of mid-level administrative units and officers in a fashion analogous to the simultaneous appearance of "middle management" in the concurrently emerging industrial corporations. At the same time, the appearance of academic departments, each organized around an increasingly specialized discipline, brought a decentralization of authority over academic matters; the downward shift in authority over academic matters increased the power of the faculty, particularly in the older, elite, liberal arts institutions. Simultaneously, there came an even greater increase in the power of university presidents, who began to exercise many responsibilities formerly wielded by external boards. Trustees retained legal authority but, due to the growing size and complexity of universities, they found themselves increasingly dependent upon the university president to summarize information and to present policy proposals, and the trustees thereby became more and more remote from the details of administration.

By the end of the century, it was generally recognized that the faculty had primary responsibility for academic matters. William Rainey Harper, president of the University of Chicago from 1891 to 1906, stated that it was the "firmly established policy of the Trustees that the responsibility for the settlement of educational questions rests with the Faculties." This authority found organizational expression in the creation of academic senates during the 1890s. Cornell University established the first senate, composed of the president and full professors, in 1889.

By 1900 American universities were structured much as they are today. Changes since then have been largely the result of an increase in size with a resulting expansion of the structure and greater institutional complexity. The rapid growth of universities served to reinforce the patterns of the second half of the nineteenth century: faculty tended to lose responsibility

in administrative areas to presidents and to a rapidly increasing number of middle-level administrators; at the same time, the growing size and complexity of universities necessitated greater delegation of authority over educational matters to faculty and academic departments where expertise would facilitate decision making and maximize the academic integrity of the university.

While the tradition of faculty authority over educational policy has been characteristic of elite, private institutions since the late nineteenth century, the past half century has seen a significant movement toward collegial governance in publicly supported colleges and universities. In 1980, the Association of California State University Professors published a list of a hundred colleges and universities in the United States in which the faculty had been granted legislative authority in academic, educational, and professional matters; among the many state-supported institutions on the list are the University of California, the University of Illinois, the University of Michigan, Ohio State University, Pennsylvania State University, the University of Texas, and the University of Washington.

The growth of faculty influence in university governance accelerated after World War II. Increasingly faculty have come to regard themselves as "professionals" with a technical expertise which, along with tradition, justified a major role in educational policy, research, personnel decisions, athletics, libraries, and auxiliary organizations. They see their authority as "functional," i.e., as based upon competence, and, as professionals, they believe their standards, integrity, and dedication are sufficient to justify their primary control of academic policy.

This professionalism combined with the tradition of faculty governance to produce, by the 1960s, a general acceptance of the ideal of a "collegial" university administrative structure based upon meaningful consultation within a formal goverance structure on all matters of educational policy. The extent of operational collegiality varied among universities. If the influence of the faculty had generally grown, so also had the size of university administrations. Thus, there developed two bureaucracies within most large universities: the administration (president, vice-presidents, provosts, and deans) and the faculty governance structure (senates, councils, and committees). The potential for conflict is inherent is such a bifurcated organization, but the spirit and reality of collegiality between administrative professionals and academic professionals, despite their corresponding different values based on different immediate responsibilities, can lead to satisfactory resolution of these conflicts. The absence of collegiality assures that the conflict inherent in the bifurcated structure becomes actual.

C. Governance Patterns in the California State University System

A bifurcated decision-making structure exists formally in the C.S.U. The sub-chapter of Title 5 which deals with "Educational Programs" defines "Appropriate Campus Authority" as "the president of the campus acting upon the recommendation of the faculty of the campus." Similarly, Section 3561-b of the Higher Education Employee Relations Act states that

> the Legislature recognizes the joint decision-making and consultation between administration and faculty or academic employees is the long-accepted manner of governing institutions of higher

learning and is essential to the performance of the educational missions of such institutions . . .

Most recently this has been confirmed in the statement on "Responsibilities of Academic Senates Within a Collective Bargaining Context" which has received the endorsement of the C.S.U. Chancellor.

The tradition of collegiality has become embodied in legislation and administration code. On some campuses, however, collegiality is respected more in theory than in practice. Even where all participants accept the theory, disagreement in practice may occasionally be inevitable given the coexistence of two bureaucracies and the predictable attitudes of their members. In such a bureaucratic structure, the complexities of human nature and personal administrative style will be sufficient to upset the institutionally valuable and mutually beneficial balance between the administration and the faculty.

D. Recent Changes in Governance Patterns

This collegial balance has been disturbed in recent years in the C.S.U. and in higher education in the United States in general. When the California Department of Education managed a handful of teacher colleges, those institutions attracted little attention, both because of their narrowly defined function and their relatively small budgets. The transformation of these few teachers' colleges into the multi-purpose California State University system, the largest system of higher education in the nation, has brought closer legislative scrutiny of both budget and program; centralization of administration has brought a greater need for information and a greater emphasis on reporting responsibilities. At the same time, some faculty and students in public universities, both those in the C.S.U. and elsewhere, have brought additional attention through occasional, albeit highly-publicized, acts of political nonconformity, e.g., refusal to sign loyalty oaths or opposition to American policy in Vietnam. Both elected officials and gubernatorial appointees to governing boards have gained a public following by promising to "clean up" higher education and have sponsored the careers of university administrators who have defined their duties largely in terms of strict managerial responsibility. Ironically, some university officials have increasingly adopted a hierarchically managerial approach to the administration of universities at the very time when such hierarchical management is increasingly seen as outmoded in private industry. This managerial mentality is prone to regard collegiality in the Weberian sense as inefficient and imprecise. The emphasis is on "resource management" and efficiency; collegiality frustrates those administrators who see themselves as the "managers" of the university who should be left unfettered by the faculty to do their job. In many cases, such administrators seek to redefine collegiality to fit their own mode of operation. The net effect is that such administrators lose touch, or are perceived by the faculty as having lost touch, with the unique character of university governance and with the very purpose of the university.

All of this serves to frustrate and, ultimately, alienate the faculty. Like all professionals, faculty will not comfortably accept managerial control. The hallmark of a professional is self-direction; such an individual will not be susceptible to being "managed." Nor will faculty be inclined to

regard managers as fellow academics, thus further reducing the level of mutual respect necessary for viable collegiality.

When this occurs, the line is drawn between the faculty, who see themselves as defending the traditional values of higher education and the academic integrity of the institution, and administrative managers, who see themselves as fostering the welfare of a large, complex "business." This split and corresponding decline in collegiality has occurred on many campuses in the United States and on many campuses in the C.S.U. system.

This situation has helped to produce and has sometimes been exacerbated by the appearance of collective bargaining in higher education. Collective bargaining is the direct product of (1) the remarkable increase in the size of American universities and the appearance of "multiversities" (over 200,000 full-time faculty positions were created in the 1960s alone); (2) the shift to professional management techniques and the resulting decline in mutual respect and reliance; and (3) fiscal retrenchments made necessary by reduced budgets. Because of these developments, some faculty across the nation embraced unionization as a means to supplement—and occasionally supplant—patterns of academic governance and collegiality, patterns which sometimes seem awkward and inept in a managerial climate of efficiency, productivity, and control.

In the C.S.U., throughout the 1960s and 1970s, many faculty concluded that centralization and prevailing managerial attitudes among central administrators left virtually no opportunity for shared, collegial decision-making. Many of the faculty who ultimately came to embrace collective bargaining did so because they saw it as a last resort for restoring a faculty role in decision-making; they now see collective bargaining being used to undercut this objective. As many campuses in the C.S.U. illustrate, the result is that shared decision-making and the adversarial ambiance of collective bargaining are seen by faculty and administration alike as incompatible. Thus the traditional division between faculty and administration has recently grown wider on some campuses. Presidents, once the first among their academic peers, first became distant administrators of large universities and have now become managers and chief executive officers. Faculty who once took pride in in the professorial ideal of unselfish and underpaid dedication to the university and to teaching and research are now increasingly inclined to regard the same issues as "working conditions."

II. Maintaining and Improving Shared Decision-Making in the California State University System

The Academic Senate, C.S.U., do not believe that the shared decision-making of the collegial model and the shared decision-making of the collective bargaining mode are inherently incompatible. They represent <u>different</u> approaches to <u>different</u> types of decisions. By outlining the types of decisions appropriate to the collegial process and the usual steps involved in the collegial process for these decisions, the Academic Senate hope that this statement will help to keep separate the two approaches to decision-making and simultaneously will help to maintain and to improve the collegial process of shared decision-making. The three major types of decisions to be discussed below are those involving the curriculum, those involving other aspects of academic policy, and those involving the faculty itself.

A. The Role of the Faculty in Curricular Decisions

The University's curriculum is central to the operation of the institution and is the principal concern of the faculty. The curriculum is determined within the framework of established educational goals. Although there is great diversity in the C.S.U. system, all campuses must conform to general policies established by law and by the CSU Board of Trustees. But within those limits each campus develops its own mission statement which is the product of faculty and administrators engaging in a collegial process.

The faculty have a professional responsibility to define and offer a curriculum of the highest academic quality. In some fields, this professional responsibility is exercised within accrediting guidelines developed and enforced by professional associations. This professional responsibility cannot, by its very nature, be delegated. The faculty therefore have primary responsibility for curricular recommendations to the president. Normally the president will take the advice and recommendations of the faculty on curriculum matters. Faculty appropriately have this responsibility because they possess the expertise to judge best whether courses, majors, and programs are worthy of scholarly standards of learning.

Among the curricular decisions for which faculty should have primary responsibility are:

1. The initiation of new courses.

2. Course content, including choice of texts, syllabus design, assignments, course organization, and methods of evaluating students.

3. The designation of courses as non-degree applicable, lower or upper division, or graduate level.

4. The content of the general education program, within systemwide guidelines. Faculty should designate appropriate courses and establish the requirements for completion of the program. Faculty should be responsible for review and revision of the program.

5. The adoption, deletion, or modification of requirements for degree major programs, minor programs, formal concentrations within programs, credential programs, and certificate programs.

6. The initiation of new academic courses and programs, and the discontinuance of academic courses and programs.

7. The establishment of minimum conditions for the award of certificates and degree to students and the approval of degree candidates.

8. Recruitment decisions affecting curriculum

Although practices on the various campuses will differ, in general decisions affecting curriculum will proceed through a process of (1) initiation by

a faculty member, (2) approval by a department committee, (3) approval by curriculum committees at one or more levels, (4) approval by other relevant committees (general education, graduate programs, interdisciplinary), and (5) approval or review by the campus council/senates. The recommendation is then forwarded to the president.

The major limitations on faculty autonomy in curricular decision-making include constraints related to the campus mission, budgets, staffing limitations, and the general policies of the CSU system. Consultation among faculty and administrators should ensure that faculty are well aware of both the constraints on, and the possibilities for, program development and innovation. Faculty can be expected to make responsible judgments if they are in close consultation with administrators and thus kept knowledgeable of developments affecting curricular matters.

B. The Role of the Faculty in Academic Policy Decisions

Because the University's curriculum is of central concern to the faculty, and because faculty should have the major voice in curricular decisions, it follows that faculty should also have a major voice, often the major voice, in decisions which closely affect the curriculum, access to the curriculum, or the quality of the curriculum. "Academic policy" in this context refers to University policies and procedures which affect the curriculum. All of the following are examples of academic policy:

1. Criteria, standards, and procedures for adoption, deletion, or modification of degree major programs, minor programs, formal concentrations within programs, credential programs, and certificate programs.

2. Grading practices and standards.

3. Criteria, standards, and procedures for earning credit or satisfying requirements outside the classroom, e.g., competency examinations for English composition and in U.S. history and government, credit by examination, or credit for experiential learning.

4. Planning of both short-run and long-range natures, including definition or modification of the campus mission statement, determination of the general scope and relative size or priority of campus programs, modifications of the campus academic master plan, annual campus allocation of faculty positions to schools or other units, and annual campus budget allocations.

5. Criteria, standards, and procedures for evaluating programs, the quality of instruction, faculty currency, and all other evaluations of the quality of the curriculum or of instruction.

6. Campus policies which govern resources which support or supplement the curriculum, especially the library and research facilities.

7. Campus policies which govern auxiliary institutions which sup-

port or supplement the curriculum, especially the campus foundation and the campus bookstore.

8. Student policies, especially those governing financial aid, ~~advisement~~, learning services, E.O.P., and related services which determine the extent to which students can avail themselves of the curriculum, and also those governing withdrawal, probation, reinstatement, disqualification, etc., which affect access to the curriculum and which can affect program quality.

9. Co-curricular activities, especially those which increase the likelihood that students will benefit fully from the curriculum or those which distract students from the curriculum, including intercollegiate athletic programs and the relationship of those programs to the academic program and mission of the campus.

10. The academic calendar, including the first and last days of instruction and the scheduling of final examinations.

The process of academic policy-making will vary from one campus to another, and may vary from one type of decision to another on the same campus. However, collegial patterns of decision-making should be followed in all instances. On every C.S.U. campus, the full faculty and the faculty's representative body, the Academic Senate or Council, are the agencies for collegial decision-making. Some types of decisions may be made directly by the Senate or Council. In other instances, the faculty or Senate/Council may create a special body to develop academic policy in some area; if so, that body should include at least a majority of faculty representatives, chosen either by direct election or by the Senate/Council.

Bodies containing faculty members appointed by the campus president without consultation with the Senate/Council or bodies with self-perpetuating governing boards cannot be considered to be agencies of collegial decision-making; for collegial decision-making to have any meaning, the full faculty must themselves participate, either directly, or through elected representatives (e.g., the Senate or Council), or through representatives chosen by the Senate or Council. Disputes may arise whether a decision is purely administrative or involves policy; in such instances, the faculty through its Senate/Council must be able to determine whether it wishes to consider the issue in the same fashion as other policy decisions.

In the case of curriculum decisions, the faculty should usually be the initiator of policy, within the constraints of budget, law, and system policy. By contrast, in the case of academic policy, proposals for changes in policy or for new policy will arise as often, or more often, from academic administrators. The Chancellor or Board of Trustees may designate campus administrators as responsible for implementation of system-wide policies. In every instance, collegiality requires that the academic administrator work closely with the appropriate faculty representatives. When a change in policy or a new policy is needed, the faculty should be invited to participate fully in framing the policy. When an academic administrator presents a policy question to the faculty, the faculty should give it full consideration and the academic administrator should participate as a colleague in order to arrive at agreement. Where there are differences of opinion, compromise should be sought.

All academic administrators should be constantly alert to the policy implications of their decisions. If a decision has policy dimensions or implications, or if it may have policy dimensions or implications, the academic administrator should bring the matter to the attention of the appropriate faculty representatives.

C. Role of the Faculty in Faculty Affairs

The faculty's professional competencies (derived from academic training, pedagogic experience, and continuing professional development) must play a significant and often decisive role in decisions regarding curriculum and academic policy. It is also the faculty who implement academic plans, programs, and curricula. Policies and procedures used in building, maintaining, and renewing the university faculty are vital determinants of the quality of the education the university provides to its students and to society.

The professional competencies which are central to curricular and academic policy decisions should be comparably decisive and significant both in the implementation and genesis of faculty personnel policies, procedures, and criteria. Recommendations regarding hiring, retention or nonretention, awarding of tenure, promotion in rank, and disciplinary actions are best left to faculty who are technically competent in their disciplines and in pedagogy, and who are in the best position to observe and make judgments on such matters as faculty performance and the specific staffing needs of academic programs.

"Faculty affairs" in this context refers to those decisions regarding personnel policies, procedures, and criteria which have a potential impact on the quality of the curriculum. The following are examples of such faculty affairs decisions:

1. The establishment of criteria and standards for hiring, retention, tenure, and promotion.

2. The hiring of new faculty members, including the establishment of qualifications, development of procedures for implementing university policies such as affirmative action, evaluation of candidates, and the recommendation to the appropriate administrator.

3. The granting of tenure to faculty members, including the establishment of criteria and standards, the evaluation of candidates for tenure, and the recommendation to the appropriate administrator.

4. The promotion of faculty members, including establishment of criteria and standards, the evaluation of candidates for promotion, and the recommendation to the appropriate administrator.

5. The selection of department chairs, including establishment of the election process and of criteria and standards, and the recommendation to the appropriate administrator.

6. The selection, evaluation, and retention of all academic administrators (i.e., those administrators who also hold an aca-

demic appointment and who have the potential for exercising retreat rights to a faculty position), including establishment of qualifications, composition of the search committee (which should always include a majority of faculty members), evaluation of candidates for appointment, and recommendation to the appropriate administrator.

7. Recommendations regarding the selection, evaluation, and retention of some non-academic administrators, if the duties of the position involve substantial influence on the curriculum.

The process of collegial decision-making in faculty affairs decisions will vary somewhat, depending on the type of decision. In decisions involving hiring, retention, tenure, and promotion, the criteria and standards shall normally be determined through the Senate or Council, and implemented through departmental committees and other appropriate faculty committees at levels above the department. Faculty committees must abide by all C.S.U. and campus policies, e.g., affirmative action requirements. Administrators should always assume that faculty committees are best qualified to judge the teaching effectiveness and other merits of the candidates; administrators should decide contrary to faculty recommendations only if there is clear indication of violation of system or campus policies or clear indication that the faculty committee failed to consider relevant information, in which instance the administrator should provide the faculty committee with written reasons for the decision and should refer the matter back to the faculty committee for reconsideration.

Department chairs have a potentially profound impact on the quality of the curriculum as well as on the quality of professional life. Because of their key role in implementing a range of decisions, department chairs should be acceptable to both the faculty of the department and to the university's administration. The Senate or Council should develop campus policy defining the minimum guidelines to follow in the selection of department chairs. When faculty act within those guidelines to recommend a candidate for appointment, administrators should assume that the faculty are best able to judge the effectiveness and merits of the candidates; administrators should deny a faculty choice only for cause and should explain fully any such decision to the faculty in question. Administrators should not impose a chair upon a faculty against its wishes except in rare instances and for compelling reasons, which should be clearly stated in writing.

Because academic-administrators hold both an academic position and an administrative position, they have the option of exercising "retreat rights" and thereby becoming a member of the instructional faculty. Academic-administrators also have an impact on the curriculum, ranging from modest to great. To maintain the quality of the instruction, faculty members should be closely involved in the evaluation and recommendation of candidates for academic-administrative positions, both to evaluate the qualifications of the candidate should he or she ever exercise retreat rights and to evaluate the fitness of the candidate to make crucial decisions affecting the curriculum.

Conclusion

Collegial decision-making and pro forma consultation are not the same thing. Ambrose Bierce in 1911 defined "consult" as "to seek another's approval of a course already decided on." His definition finds all too many echoes in the reality of academic policy-making. Webster's definition of "consult" is only somewhat more inviting that Bierce's: "to seek information or instruction from; ask the advice of; refer to . . . ; keep in mind while acting or deciding; consider; show regard for." Nothing in the definition of "consult" suggests the need for shared decision-making.

The faculty, because of their knowledge, are in a unique position vis-a-vis the curriculum. The faculty who study and research a subject are most capable of teaching that subject, most capable of defining a curriculum built around that subject, most capable of knowing the support necessary for that curriculum, and most capable of understanding the impact on that curriculum of a wide range of academic policies. Decisions regarding the curriculum cannot be imposed but must be developed through interaction among those most involved in the subject. Similarly, decisions regarding academic policy ought not be imposed, even if the administrator "consults" the faculty. Consultation suggests only a willingness to listen to contrary opinions; collegiality requires a willingness to change one's position, to seek consensus, to be open to compromise.

The state of mind of participants in collegial decision-making is an important element in the success of the process. All participants should consider themselves to be colleagues, and should respect each other's professional expertise. The hierarchical implications of collective bargaining terminology must be left at the bargaining table and the grievance hearing, and must not enter into the collegial decision-making process. Academic administrators should consider themselves "management" only in the narrowest of collective bargaining senses, in that they are not a part of the faculty bargaining unit. In all other ways, they are administrators, not managers, and the differences are crucial. "Administer" stems from the Latin root meaning "to serve to"; "manage" stems from the Latin word for hand and referred initially to the training of horses. Faculty are not trained horses, to be managed by a driver. By virtue of their professional competencies, they are instead the guardians of the educational quality of the curriculum, and the quality of the curriculum should be the driving force behind all university decisions.

Academic administrators and faculty representatives may not always be able to achieve consensus, even when they approach a problem in a properly collegial state of mind and when they exert their best efforts to achieving consensus through rational dialogue. In such circumstances, the appropriate administrator should meet with faculty representatives to discuss their differences. The more closely a decision affects the curriculum, the more the administrator should defer to the views of the faculty. Administrators should reject faculty proposals if the proposals are contrary to system policy or law or if they cannot be implemented due to budgetary constraints, but administrators should not reject faculty proposals merely out of differences of opinion. If a faculty is substantially in consensus on an issue, and an administrator disagrees, the administrator (who is, after all, also a faculty member) should

realize that he or she is the one out-of-step and undertake a serious reconsideration of his or her position.

The role of the C.S.U. administration is also important in encouraging collegial decision-making. C.S.U. directives requiring campus implementation should always include sufficient time to allow for full consideration through the collegial decision-making process. Shared decision-making is sometimes time-consuming, especially if the issue is complex. When C.S.U. administrators direct campus administrators to develop campus policy and specify short time lines, they place the campus administrator into a sometimes untenable position because faculty representatives are unwilling to accept time constraints as a reason for by-passing full and collegial consideration.

The C.S.U. administration should encourage collegial patterns of thought and behavior in other ways as well. It should itself be a model of collegiality, limiting its managerial mode to the bargaining table and to the working conditions specified in the contracts. It should specifically encourage all campus presidents to do the same, and should incorporate appropriate references to the key role of the faculty and to the process of collegial decision-making into all memoranda and directives which address curricular, academic, or faculty matters. Ability to sustain good collegial relations through shared decision-making should be one of the most important criteria in evaluating campus presidents and candidates for appointment as campus presidents.

The nineteenth-century German university, where the faculty exercised near total authority, is gone forever, save for a few isolated anachronisms. The twentieth-century American university is, in almost every way, a far more complex institution. Authority in the modern public university derives from two quite different sources: (a) from the knowledge of the subject matter and from the pedagogic expertise of the faculty, and (b) from the power vested by law and administrative code in governing boards and administrators. The collegial decision-making process evolved nearly a century ago as a means of reconciling these two types of authority. These two types of authority need not come into conflict if all those involved in university decision-making understand and respect the collegial decision-making process as the best possible means of deploying the technical knowledge and pedagogic expertise of the faculty in the attainment of excellence in education.

California State University, Sacramento

UNIVERSITY GUIDELINES FOR PERIODIC REVIEW OF TENURED FACULTY

These procedures have been adopted to conform to the M.O.U. and local campus policy. Faculty acting under them are advised to examine the pertinent portions of the M.O.U. and the Faculty Manual to discover the content and extent of the rights and obligations arising under these procedures.

A. Purpose of Evaluation: To assist tenured faculty members to maintain or improve their teaching effectiveness.

B. Frequency of Evaluation of Instructional Performance:

Tenured faculty shall be evaluated at least once every five years. An evaluation for purposes of retention, tenure or promotion shall fulfill the requirement.

C. Procedure:

1. For this evaluation a peer review committee of a minimum of three tenured full-time faculty shall be elected annually from the tenured faculty of the department. A department member scheduled for this evaluation may not serve on this committee. The department chair, who will normally and whenever possible be the appropriate administrator, will serve as an ex officio member.
2. The department shall develop a schedule of those faculty to be reviewed, in what order and in which year.
3. State law and University policy guarantee to faculty the right of confidentiality. Consequently, substantive deliberations having to do with periodic review of post tenure faculty unit employees are open only to committee members.
4. The peer review committee shall consider the following subject matter in conducting the review:
   a. Student evaluations taken since the last review of the faculty member's performance.
   b. Signed, written statements from students, and other signed, written statements concerning the faculty member's teaching effectiveness only if the faculty member has been provided a written copy of each statement at least five days before the review.

c. Material submitted by the faculty member being evaluated. This evidence may include, but not be limited to, the following:

Teaching materials
Curriculum development
Participation in professional meetings
Professional lectures, seminars, workshops
Consultant work
Publications and
Leave activities

5. The faculty member being evaluated shall have the right to meet with the peer review committee prior to the submission of the committee's report.
6. The committee shall prepare a written, signed evaluation report containing an assessment of the evidence. It shall provide a written copy of this report to the faculty member at least five days before the custodian places it in the file.
7. The appropriate administrator, normally and whenever possible the department chair, shall provide the faculty member with a written copy of the evaluation at least five days before placing it in the file.
8. The appropriate administrator, normally and whenever possible the department chair, and the chair of the peer review committee shall meet with the faculty member to discuss his/her strengths and weaknesses along with suggestions, if any, for his/her improvement.
9. The evaluation statement shall be placed in the Personnel Action File. The faculty member has the right to submit a written rebuttal to it and this rebuttal shall also be placed in the Personnel Action File.

Proposed Master's Degree Program in Nursing

Abstract:

The purpose of the proposed program is to prepare nurses for leadership positions in nursing through the systematic study of nursing practice. The aim is to prepare clinically competent nursing educators and administrators to perform a variety of professional roles. The development of leadership abilities is founded on expertise in a specialized area of clinical nursing practice, on a scientific approach to nursing, and on knowledge and competency required for leadership roles in a variety of complex health care systems and educational institutions.

Clinical preparation will be offered in: 1) Medical-Surgical Nursing, and 2) Family-Community Nursing which includes concepts from Mental Health-Psychiatric, Parent-Child, Community Health, and School Nursing. Functional leadership role options will include: 1) Nursing Administration, and 2) Teaching.

The required curriculum of 24 units includes courses in nursing practice (theory and practicum), nursing theory, issues, research methodology, and leadership in nursing (theory and practicum in administration or education). Students may take elective courses in nursing or other allied disciplines in order to complete the necessary 30 units for the degree in Master of Science in Nursing. Students will concentrate their study within at least one clinical nursing focus and one functional leadership role. There will be opportunity for self-directed study and experiences provided which will enhance their knowledge and relate to their interests. The program will be sequenced over four semesters to provide working nurses the greatest flexibility in program scheduling.

The curriculum is sequentially structured to integrate relevant theories and methodologies, clinical nursing practices, and functional leadership roles. To achieve the intent of the program, seven (7) new courses will need to be instituted at year one - five didactic courses and two practicums. Two (2) additional didactic courses and two (2) practicums will be implemented for the second year of the program to complete the proposed sequence.

Admissions requirements include: 1) graduation from an accredited baccalaureate nursing program or equivalent, 2) eligible for public health certification in California, 3) current license as a registered nurse in California, 4) malpractice insurance for professional nursing practice, 5) completion of the Graduate Record Examination, 6) at least one year of clinical nursing experience, 7) evidence of personal qualifications and capacity for graduate study (personal references and interview), 8) 3.0 grade point average in upper division nursing coursework, and 3.0 grade point average overall.

Prerequisites to the program include: 1) an introductory course in statistics within the past five years, and 2) completion of a course in Introduction to Nursing Research or the equivalent.

The program will initiate the accreditation process with the National League for Nursing as soon as it becomes operative. Accreditation procedures take at least one year and accreditation may be granted when students have completed or are nearing completion of the master's curriculum in nursing. It is anticipated this should occur during 1987-88.

Seven California State Universities offer Masters Degree Programs in Nursing: Chico, Fresno, Long Beach, Los Angeles, San Diego, San Francisco, and San Jose. The proposed program at CSU, Sacramento will not be in direct competition as these programs are a considerable commuting distance from Sacramento, non-accredited, or offering a curriculum which varies considerably from the proposed program.

The need for a graduate program in nursing was substantially documented by a community survey. Many nursing positions requiring graduate preparation are unfilled and many other positions are filled by academically unqualified personnel. Major efforts to improve health care delivery are contributing to an increased need for nurses who can assume leadership positions. The Division of Nursing has graduated 267 nurses in the past three years. It presently has 208 declared majors in nursing and 253 designated pre-nursing. The Master Plan for the California State Universities includes the institution of a Master's Degree Program in Nursing at California State University, Sacramento. During the first year of the program it is expected 30 nurses will enroll in the program, with a minimum of an additional thirty (30) majors to be admitted annually. National statistics indicate that the demand for nurses with graduate education far exceeds the supply of academically prepared nurses.

An additional 1.4 faculty positions are being requested to implement the program which includes assigned time for coordination, accreditation preparation, and advising for the program. No additional space will be required as several classrooms exising in the Nursing Building are used by other disciplines. Priority for scheduling of classes, conversion of a seminar room for offices, and the use of evening hours for classes should accommodate the increase in students and faculty. Requests for additional equipment and supplies have been included and prioritized in the budget projections.

ATTACHMENT E
12/12/84 Academic Senate Agenda

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

BAKERSFIELD · CHICO · DOMINGUEZ HILLS · FRESNO · FULLERTON · HAYWARD · HUMBOLDT
ONA · SACRAMENTO · SAN BERNARDINO · SAN DIEGO · SAN FRANCISCO · SAN JOSE

LONG BEACH · LOS ANGELES · NORTHRIDGE
SAN LUIS OBISPO · SONOMA · STANISLAUS

OFFICE OF THE CHANCELLOR
(213) 590-

California State University, Sacramento
6000 J Street
Sacramento, California 95819

SEP 4 1984

Academic Senate Received
413

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: PRESIDENTS

DATE: August 29, 1984

FROM: W. Ann Reynolds
Chancellor

John W. Bedell, Chair
Academic Senate CSU

SUBJECT: Trustees' Outstanding Professor Awards

We are happy to announce the beginning of the nomination process for the Trustees' Outstanding Professor Awards for the academic year 1984/85. The Outstanding Professor Awards have been made by the Board of Trustees since 1963 in order to recognize and encourage excellence in teaching.

Through the efforts of the Chancellor, a commitment for funding of this program was obtained from the Joseph M. Schenck Foundation, which now annually makes a cash donation to the California State University Foundation for the awards. Through an agreement worked out for 1983/84 between Chancellor W. Ann Reynolds and Academic Senate CSU Chair John W. Bedell, additional funds (allocated by the Chancellor) were provided to award $500 to the Outstanding Professor nominee from each participating campus, in addition to the $1000 for each of the two candidates judged most outstanding. Also the systemwide winners were funded to give guest lectures at selected campuses. Chancellor Reynolds has arranged for funding to provide the same cash award for the 1984/85 nominees and top two winners.

Because of increased recognition of academic excellence, the number of campuses participating in the OPA program has increased from ten to sixteen since 1980. Each year two distinguished CSU faculty members are honored for their contributions to their students, to their academic disciplines and to their campus communities. Although participation in the Outstanding Professor Awards program is completely voluntary, your campus is invited to participate in the OPA competition and to take advantage of this opportunity to recognize the outstanding contributions of CSU faculty. The criteria for nomination for an Outstanding Professor Award, procedures to be followed in making such a nomination, and the timetable for the nomination/awards process for the academic year 1984/85 are attached.

The appointment of a campus Outstanding Professor Awards nomination committee at this time will facilitate the necessary compilation and review of nomination documents to be submitted. The nomination document prepared by the campus committee in accordance with the attached guidelines should be submitted to the Office of the Academic Senate CSU (400 Golden Shore, P.O. Box 1590, Long Beach, California 90801-1590) no later than Monday, February 4, 1985.

Please inform the Office of the statewide Academic Senate as soon as possible of the name, department and telephone number of the chairperson of the campus nomination committee.

Campus nominations will be reviewed by a statewide Academic Senate Outstanding Professor Awards Selection Committee comprised of the Chancellor or her designee, one member of the CSU Board of Trustees, five faculty members named by the Academic Senate CSU, and one student appointed by the California State Student Association. The Chancellor will present the names of the distinguished professors selected by this committee to the Board of Trustees for approval.

Format of Nominations

One area of difficulty noted consistently by statewide OPA nomination committees is the format of campus nominations. The manner and form in which nominations are submitted vary widely and can have considerable influence on the statewide committee in considering campus nomination. Submissions should be well organized, well documented, complete statements of the faculty member's qualifications and accomplishments. Documents of those persons recently selected for the awards generally include a table of contents, complete curricula vitae, identified letters of support from colleagues, students and community leaders and a black and white glossy photograph of the nominee. The documents were organized to feature teaching excellence, scholarship and/or creative activity and service to the campus community.

We do not wish to impose a "standardized" nomination document format, but believe you should be aware of the importance of both form and substance of nomination documents.

We appreciate your help in this important process for recognizing our distinguished faculty members. Should your campus committee have any questions on this program, they should telephone Mrs. Deborah Hennessy, Administrative Director for the Academic Senate at (213) 590-5578, (ATSS) 635-5578.

WAR/JWB/he

Enclosures

cc: Chairs, Campus Senates/Councils
Vice Chancellors
Academic Vice Presidents
Systemwide OPA Selection Committee

ATTACHMENT F
12/12/84 Academic Senate Agenda

California State University, Sacramento
6000 J STREET, SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95819-2694
GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENT

MEMORANDUM

TO: Mr. Peter Shattuck, Chairman
Academic Senate

FROM: Robert G. Thompson, Professor
Government Department

R.G.T.

SUBJECT: Distinguished Teaching Awards Program

DATE: September 27, 1984

The other day you asked if I had any tangible material relating to the academic Senate's decison not to participate in the distinguished teaching awards program. I have no documents but I remember, through the haze of many years, these events:

(1) There had been a great deal of argument on the campus on the desirability of our participation in the award program. We did not participate at first but later the College Council, predecessor of the Academic Senate, voted to participate for the 1965-66 academic year.

(2) We awarded prizes for two years, 1965-66 and 1966-67, but a great deal of soul-searching, not to mention chest-beating, took place.

(3) For the 1967-68 academic year, the Senate voted not to participate.

The reasons for our non-participation reflected an attitude, once prevalent on our campus, that we were a community of scholars and that selecting particular individuals from that community as distinguished from others and consequently bestowing a few extra bucks on them was demeaning to our total endeavor. It was also felt that we should avoid getting trapped into the corporate syndrome of rewards and punishments and free trips to exotic isles for exceeding our quota. In short, the Senate majority took the position that the Academic community was not the place for the competitive ethic of the market place.

Since this time there seems to have been a distinct change in the conception a faculty has of itself. In this day and age where a professor of management should be paid more than a philosopher because of something called market value and where the management of the University itself is in an adversary relationship with its faculty, a sense of community is difficult to maintain. Monetary awards for some vague standard of "achievement" seem to fit right into the whole pattern. I think it is too bad, but then my day has passed.

I hope this is of some use to you. If I can be of further help please let me know.

San Francisco State University
1600 HOLLOWAY AVENUE • SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94132

Academic Senate

October 31, 1984

W. Ann Reynolds
Chancellor
California State University
Long Beach, California

Dear Chancellor Reynolds:

The faculty at San Francisco State University once again decline to participate in the competition for Outstanding Professor Awards. We take this action for the following reasons:

a. The Outstanding Professor Awards serve no useful purpose. They advance neither teaching nor research at the California State University and serve to ignore the accomplishments of the broader faculty in order to honor the achievements of the few.

b. The Outstanding Professor Awards foster unnecessary and counterproductive competition in the University. In 1978, when San Francisco State participated in the program, the result was an embarrassing political campaign among the candidates. All involved in the administration of this competition recommended that it never be repeated on this campus.

c. The Outstanding Professor Awards waste valuable faculty and administrative time. The efforts of each faculty member to amass supporting materials, the creation of a workable judging structure by faculty affairs committees, the creation of new committees to administer the competition, and the contribution of presidential time in making the final decision far exceed the minimal publicity benefits generated by this program.

d. The Outstanding Professor Awards misuse university funds which might otherwise be directed into faculty development or instructional support.

We therefore urge Academic Senates throughout the California State University to refuse to participate in this program. We also urge the Chancellor to discontinue the Outstanding Professor competition at the earliest possible date.

Sincerely yours,

Bernice Biggs

Bernice Biggs, Chair
Academic Senate

cc: President Woo
Statewide Academic Senate
The Academic Senates of the CSU System

BB/j