

ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
SACRAMENTO

Minutes

Issue #8

Wednesday, December 12, 1984

ROLL CALL

Present: Alexander, Anderson, Barkdull, Beckwith, Bess, Busick, Chmaj, Collins, Comstock, Cowden, Deaner, Dillon, Farrand, Figler, Gelus, Glenn, Good, Helder, Hitchcock, Holl, Hornback, Huff, Kelly, Koester, Kostyrko, Knepprath (Parliamentarian), Kramer, Maxwell, McGillivray, Nelson, Pettay, Pucci, Radimsky, Robbins, Scott, Shattuck, Spray, Swanson, Wade, Westphal, Wheeler, Wilson, Winters

Absent: Harriman, Hernandez, Jensen, Stroumpos

INFORMATION

A moment of silence was observed in memory of:

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

ACTION ITEMS

AS 84-59/Flr. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of November 14, 1984, are approved.

Carried unanimously.

AS 84-60/Ex. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS

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

Carried unanimously.

*2/19/85
memo to
John de
concord*

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

The Academic Senate of California State University, Sacramento endorses the program change proposal for faculty development contained in the 1985-86 CSU Support Budget, pages 76-80. (See Attachment A)

Carried unanimously.

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 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.

. Carried unanimously.

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." (A revised version of this document will be considered by the Academic Senate, CSU, in January. If it is adopted, it will be distributed to the campus. A copy of the version endorsed by this resolution is available for review in the Academic Senate Office, Adm. 264.)

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 B)

Carried.

1/20/85 Pres. approved.

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

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. (The complete proposal is available for review in the Academic Senate Office, Adm. 264.)

Carried unanimously.

1/23/85 - Pres. approved - sent to URPC

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

The Academic Senate approves the following policy:

A grade of "C-" will be considered as a "C" for prerequisite courses, unless a department specifically decides otherwise.

Carried.

1/23/85 - Pres. approved.

AS 84-67/Ex., Flr. OUTSTANDING PROFESSOR AWARD

The Academic Senate shall submit for faculty referendum the question: Shall California State University, Sacramento, continue its policy of not participating in the Outstanding Professor Awards selection?

Carried.

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

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

AS 84-68/FacA, Ex. (continued)

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

RESOLVED, That criteria and standards for all academic 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.

Carried.

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

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

AS 84-69/FacA, Ex. (continued)

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.

Carried.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

Janice McPherson
Janice McPherson, Secretary

JM/CD

*President's response requested.

Fm: SUPPORT BUDGET, 1985-86
The California State Univ.

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.

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.