

ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
SACRAMENTO

MINUTES

Issue #45

Wednesday, October 10, 1984

ROLL CALL

Present: Alexander, Anderson, Beckwith, Busick, Chmaj, Comstock, Deaner, Dillon, Farrand, Figler, Gelus, Harriman, Helder, Holmes, Hornback, Huff, Jensen, Kelly, Knepprath (Parliamentarian), Koester, Kostyrko, Kramer, Maxwell, McGillivray, Nelson, Pettay, Pucci, Robbins, Scott, Shahda, Shattuck, Spray, Stillabower, Stroumpos, Swanson, Wade, Westphal, Wheeler, Winters

Absent: Collins, Glenn, Good, Hernandez, Hitchcock, Holl, Radimsky, Wilson

ACTION ITEMS

AS 84-42/Flr. MINUTES

The Minutes of meeting of September 12, 1984, are approved.
Carried unanimously.

*AS 84-43/Ex. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS

Senate Committees:

Academic Policies Committee: ANNE MAREK, Staff, 1986

Affirmative Action Committee: TERESA MENDICK, At-large, F'84
(repl. for P. Sonntag)

VALERIE ANDERSON, At-large, 1985 (repl. for L. Maestas)

Curriculum Committee: RITA DEL GRANDE, Staff, 1986

Graduate Policies and Programs Committee: MARILYN WINTERS,
Senator, 1985

Military Studies Advisory Board: WILLIAM DILLON, At-large,
1987

Election Committee: BETTE POLKINGHORN, At-large, 1985
ROBINDRA CHAKRAVORTI, At-large, 1985

University Committees:

*Commencement Planning Committee: PAULA ELDOT, At-large, 1987

*CSUS Foundation Board of Directors: JAY CRAIN, At-large,
1986 (repl. H. Thornton)

RICHARD DICKINSON, At-large, 1987

*Parent Advisory Council: FRANK BAUTISTA, At-large, 1985

*Public Safety Advisory Committee: TOM JOHNSON, At-large,
1985

*Student Health Advisory Committee: LOUISE TIMMER, At-large,
1985

*University Union Board of Directors: SARA GREEN, At-large,
1985

Hearing Officers, Student Disciplinary Actions:

JUANITA BARRENA, At-large, 1985

TALIB HAQ, At-large, 1985

DAVID LONG, At-large, 1985

T. EUGENE SHOEMAKER, At-large, 1985

DONNA SELNICK, At-large, 1985

Faculty Representative to Student Senate: LARRY CHASE,
At-large, 1985

Carried unanimously.

10/11/84 - Pres. approved.

*AS 84-44/CC, GPPC, Ex. CURRICULUM REVIEW

The Academic Senate approves the following recommendations contained in the Academic Program Review for the Department of Geology:

1. the Bachelor of Arts degree program in Geology be approved for a period of five years or until the next scheduled program review.
2. the Bachelor of Science degree program in Geology be approved for a period of five years or until the next scheduled program review.

[A copy of the Academic Program Review for the Department of Geology is available for review in the Academic Senate Office, Adm. 264.]

Carried unanimously.

10/11/84 - Pres. approved.

*AS 84-39/Ex. PROFESSIONAL LEAVES - CRITERIA AND PROCESS

The Academic Senate approves the following policy on professional leaves: (See Attachment A)

Carried.

10/11/84 - Pres. approved.

AS 84-45/AP, Ex. REPORT ON THE ADMISSION OF FIRST-TIME FRESHMEN

The Academic Senate postpones discussion of AS 84-45 until a special Academic Senate meeting on October 24, 1984.

Carried.

AS 84-46/Ex. PROPOSITIONS 36 and 37

The Academic Senate of California State University, Sacramento endorses and applauds the actions of the CSU Board of Trustees and the CSU Academic Senate in opposing Proposition 36 (Taxation: Jarvis Initiative) and Proposition 37 (Lottery Initiative).

Carried. (Abstentions: Alexander, Beckwith, Deaner, Farrand, Figler, Kramer, Kostyrko, Pettay, Pucci, Robbins, Stroumpos, Westphal, Wheeler)

AS 84-47/Ex. PROPOSITION 41 (Welfare Reform Act)

The Academic Senate objects to consideration of AS 84-47/Ex.

Carried.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:10 p.m.

Janice McPherson
Janice McPherson, Secretary

JM

*President's response requested.

(See Attachment B.)



California State University, Sacramento

6000 J STREET, SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95819-2694

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

October 10, 1984

MEMORANDUM

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

OCT 11 1984

Academic Senate Received
413.

TO: Professor Peter Shattuck
Chair, Academic Senate

FROM: Donald R. Gerth

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'D. Gerth', written over the printed name.

SUBJECT: Recommendations of the Academic Senate

I have received your memorandum of October 10 containing the following recommendations of the Academic Senate:

AS 84-43/Ex. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS

AS 84-44/CC, GPPC. Ex. CURRICULUM REVIEW

AS 84-39/Ex. PROFESSIONAL LEAVES - CRITERIA AND PROCESS

I am approving them. Let me also express my appreciation to the Executive Committee and to the entire Senate for its well-considered and thorough deliberation of the Sabbatical Leave issue.

cc: Provost Barkdull

PROFESSIONAL LEAVE POLICY

INTRODUCTION

Traditionally, paid academic leaves are not a privilege, but a right. In affirming that tradition, the Statement of Principles on Leaves of Absence, adopted by the American Association of University Professors in 1972, states:

Leaves of absence are among the most important means by which a faculty member's teaching effectiveness may be enhanced, his scholarly usefulness enlarged, and an institution's academic program strengthened and developed. A sound program of leaves is therefore of vital importance to a college or university, and it is the obligation of every faculty member to make use of available means, including leaves, to promote his professional competence. The major purpose is to provide opportunity for continued professional growth and new, or renewed, intellectual achievement through study, research, writing, and travel.

The Statement further states that leaves should "be provided with reasonable frequency and preferably be available at regular intervals because they are important to the continuing growth of the faculty member and the effectiveness of the institution." At many reputable institutions of higher learning, sabbatical leaves are granted automatically as an incentive for professional growth. Sabbatical and other paid leaves are among the most precious assets that the University and its faculty possess and should be used as instruments of policy. Through the leaves faculty development and renewal occurs, faculty advance their disciplinary knowledge, attain additional competence in related or new fields of inquiry, and produce impressive scholarly and creative works. Through the experiences gained by faculty on leaves the University benefits from revitalized people who bring new insights, vigor, and enthusiasm to their teaching assignments and other scholarly pursuits. The University promotes program development by assisting faculty through paid leaves to gain new awareness, knowledge and skills in advancing and new fields. By not adhering to this standard policy on sabbatical leaves, the California State University has long been doing a disservice to its faculty, its students, and the people of the State.

Because the California State University does not provide sabbatical leaves according to the ideal pattern, a limited number of leaves must be allocated to a larger number of eligible faculty. CSU policy is defined in Articles 27 and 28 of the Memorandum of Understanding. The following shall be the policy of CSU, Sacramento; it conforms to and elucidates Articles 27 and 28.

The President shall allocate professional leaves on the basis of recommendations of a Professional Leave Committee. The Professional Leave Committee will be a University Committee, composed of nine elected members serving staggered three-year terms; to include four members elected by and from faculty members in Arts and Sciences, and one each elected by and from faculty members in Business and Public Administration, Education, Engineering and Computer Science, Health and Human Services, and the Library.* The Professional Leave Committee shall recognize the importance to individual faculty members and to the University of professional leaves. The Committee shall function according to the following process and criteria.

APPLICATION PROCESS FOR PROFESSIONAL LEAVES

1. An eligible faculty member who applies for a sabbatical leave must submit three copies of his/her proposal on the form provided, by the announced University deadline, to the Office of Faculty and Staff Affairs.
2. The Associate Provost for Faculty and Staff Affairs shall send a copy of the proposal to the Professional Leave Committee, to the faculty member's home department or unit, and to the appropriate School Dean or Librarian.
3. The Department or library unit shall prepare a statement regarding the possible effect on the curriculum and the operation of the department during the time of the leave should it be granted. This statement shall be forwarded to the School Dean.
4. After considering the departmental statement, the Dean or Librarian shall forward to the Professional Leave Committee an assessment of the implications to the department's program, other campus programs, and the budget, should the leave be granted, and may comment concerning the merit of the proposal as compared with the specified criteria. The Dean shall include the departmental statement with the material forwarded to the Professional Leave Committee.
5. After reviewing all leave proposals against the specified criteria (6.B below) and considering the deans' comments concerning the merits of the proposed projects, the Professional Leave Committee shall sort the proposed projects into no more than three categories as follows:

*At its first meeting, the 1984-85 PLC will determine by lot three members to serve three-year terms, three members to serve two-year terms, and three members to serve one-year terms.

- a) Those that are judged by the Professional Leave Committee to be not acceptable;
- b) Those that are judged by the Professional Leave Committee to be meritorious;
- c) Those that are judged by the Professional Leave Committee to be outstanding and exceptional.

Of the three categories, it is the intention of this policy that the third category, those projects judged to be outstanding and exceptional, be reserved for those projects which, by virtue of some feature or features of extraordinary value or promise, warrant that the proposals be approved for funding regardless of equity, defined as accrued service since the establishment of initial eligibility for sabbatical leave.

The Committee shall recommend to the President that all proposals for projects placed in the second category, those judged to be meritorious, be ranked in order of accrued service and forwarded to the President with a recommendation that they be funded. All proposals placed in the first category, those judged not acceptable, shall be forwarded to the President with a recommendation that they not be funded.

The Professional Leave Committee shall provide the President with a written statement of the reasons for recommending or not recommending funding of each proposal, including, when appropriate, a justification for recommending outstanding and exceptional projects for funding irrespective of accrued service. In conveying its recommendations to the President, the Professional Leave Committee shall include the departmental statements and the deans' comments.

EVALUATION OF APPLICATIONS

A. Dimensions of Evaluation

The Committee shall assess the appropriateness of the substance of each proposal, the benefits which would ensue from its being undertaken, and its practicability.

B. Criteria

1. Appropriateness. Appropriate sabbatical leave activities may include the following; this list implies no ranking of relative worth among the categories. The PLC will

evaluate each proposal on the basis of standards relevant to its character.

- a. A course of study leading to increased mastery of the applicant's own field, or the development of an additional area of specialization within his/her field, or the development of a new field of specialization;
 - b. A plan for professionally beneficial travel, which will enable the applicant further to develop his/her knowledge, skill, or expertise in a discipline or area of specialization within a discipline;
 - c. Professional development of a scope or nature not possible through normal workload assignment;
 - d. Pursuit of a scholarly, research, or creative project of a scope or nature not permitted through normal workload assignment;
 - e. Study or experience designed to improve teaching effectiveness;
 - f. Study or experience designed to improve professional practice.
2. Benefit. Sabbatical leave projects should demonstrate clear promise of producing results beneficial to students, to the development of the profession or a discipline within the profession, to the university, and/or to the faculty member as a teacher, scholar, or professional practitioner.
 3. Practicability. The PLC shall determine whether the proposed project is clearly defined and articulated, and conforms to the requirements of Contract Article 27.3, and the stated objectives of the proposal are realistically attainable.

DIFFERENCE IN PAY APPLICATIONS

Faculty members eligible for Difference in Pay leaves shall submit applications to the PLC on the forms provided. Deans and departments will submit to the PLC assessments of the impact of proposed leaves on curriculum and programs. The PLC will forward to the Provost all Difference in Pay proposals which meet minimal quality standards. Deadlines for Difference in Pay applications shall be flexible; it shall be campus practice to grant

Difference in Pay leaves whenever possible in the interests of faculty members, departments, and schools. Sabbatical leave applications that have been recommended by the PLC shall also be considered to have been recommended for Difference in Pay leaves if requested.