# 1990-91 ACADEMIC SENATE

California State University, Sacramento

AGENDA

ad assilio and yd Thursday, February 21, 1991

.m.q 08:4 - 0 08:2 anent appointment to ano

REDWOOD ROOM, University Union

#### INFORMATION

Spring 1991 Academic Senate Meetings (Tentative Schedule)
 Thursdays, 2:30-4:30 p.m.
 Forest Suite, University Union (unless noted otherwise)

February 28 (G.E.) May 2 March 7 (Regular Agenda) 2:30-3:00, '91-92 Nominations March 14 (Instructional 3:00-4:30, '90-91 Senate Program Priorities, ad May 9 hoc Committee report) May 16 March 21 (Regular Agenda or 2:30-3:00, '91-92 Elections 3:00-4:30, '90-91 Senate April 4 (Regular Agenda or G.E.) [room TBA] April 11 April 25

Faculty Endowment Fund Report (Attachment A)

#### REGULAR AGENDA

AS 91-11/Ex. GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH AND SPONSORED PROJECTS, PROGRAMS AND FUNCTIONS OF OFFICES OF

[Responds to ad hoc Committee on Scholarship recommendation (Attachment B of 2/14/91 Agenda Addendum)]

Whereas, The Academic Senate is concerned about the proposed merger of the Office of Graduate Studies and the Office of Research and Sponsored Projects in relation to how the merger would provide adequate support for the continuation of current programs and functions; and, furthermore,

Whereas, The Academic Senate is concerned that a merger at this time and creation of a new position description may, de facto, define relative priorities and policy direction for graduate programs and research and sponsored projects at CSU, Sacramento. Such definition, prior to completion of the task of the ad hoc Committee on Scholarship and subsequent Senate consideration of the ad hoc Committee's recommendations and adoption of a policy statement on scholarship at CSUS would be premature; therefore, be it

Resolved,

The Academic Senate recommends that, if the offices are merged, priorities, functions and definitions of programs currently supported by the offices be maintained and that no permanent appointment to any newly created administrative position be made until the Senate has had the opportunity to act on the recommendations of the ad hoc Committee.

### DISCUSSION ITEM TO THE SECOND STATE OF THE BEST OF THE PRINCE

Discussion of matters related to the charge of the ad hoc of Committee on Scholarship (Attachment B)

Academic Senate Agenda February 21, 1991

# CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO SCHOOL OF ARTS AND SCIENCES Department of Economics

California State University Sacramento 6000 J Street Sacramento, California 95819

MEMORANDUM

JAN 3 1 1991

Academic Senate Receive.

413

To:

Juanita C. Barrena

Chair, Academic Senate 6036

From:

Robert L. Curry, Jr.

Chair, Department of Economics 6082 Chair, Faculty Endowment Fund Committee

Date:

January 30, 1991

Subject: Faculty Endowment Fund Report

The enclosed report is sent to the Academic Senate from its Faculty Endowment Fund Committee. Most gratifying is the fact that from 1987/88 to 1990/91, the number of contributors grew from 47 to 188. This growth was due to the diligence and commitment of committee members and our facilitator, Marguerite F. McCurry.

RLC:gm

# CSUS FACULTY ENDOWMENT FUND Trust Foundation Account # 859174

<u>Year</u>	Total Gifts	# Donors	Payrol1	<u>Cash</u> <u>Av</u>	e.Gift	FY Balance
1987-88	\$ 1,988	28:	9 (\$77)	19 (\$1,911)	\$71.00	\$ 1,988
1988-89	4,396	70:	11 (\$1,486)	59 (\$2,910)	62.80	6,364
1989-90	10,120	115:	81 (\$5,466)	34 (\$2,770)	71.62	16,484
1990-91*	10,458	129:	92 (\$7845)	37 (\$2613)	216.62	27,944

Emeritus faculty gifts are included in the above figures:

1988-89: Cash	4 (\$700)
1989-90: Cash PERS	10 (\$720) 9 (\$705)
1990-91: Cash PERS	13 (\$ 740) 9 (\$1020)

## Notes:

- Interest is added to the account on a quarterly basis; 1989-90 interest was earned at 8.8%.
- Number of donors on payroll deduction are given as of June 30 of each fiscal year.
- 1989-90 total includes \$1,770 income from Evening of Music event; number of donors were not counted.
- \* Balance 1/25/91 (\$22,892) plus projected payroll income to 6/30/91 (\$85 month PERS, \$757 month current faculty) and including Faculty Show income of \$213, plus interest earned by the account during the year

### OVERVIEW OF CAMPAIGN YEARS Faculty Endowment Fund

1987-88:

First year of solicitation. Campaign held March 1-15, 1988 jointly with Staff Project Fund campaign: Faculty/Staff Campaigns for Excellence. Faculty lead letter signed by Juanita Barrena, James Bradfield (emeritus), and Mary Giles. Letter in solicitation packet signed by Robert Jones, Vice President, University Affairs. Pledge card offered three choices: Universitywide Enhancement Fund, Faculty Endowment Fund, and University Staff Assembly Project Fund. Payroll deduction option offered for first time. Initial payroll donors: Bess, Curry, Gabriel, Hayashagtari, Jones, Kellough, Olmstead, Taylor-McCurry, Torcom.

End of year joint solicitation letter sent May 12, 1988, signed by Juanita Barrena, Chair, Academic Senate and Daphne Gibson-Taylor, Chair,

University Staff Assembly.

Founder's Tribute Dinner held July 28, 1988, celebrating 40th Anniversary of CSUS. Those not able to attend, or who wanted to order copies of the tape that were shown, were given option of making gift to Faculty Endowment Fund.

Solicited 2,000 current faculty and 250 emeritus faculty. Fund

Committee jointly chaired by Les Gabriel and Jean Torcom.

1988-89:

Committee chaired by Les Gabriel. Solicitation to all faculty via

campus mail packet during first two weeks of February.

"Evening of Music" held April 30, 1988 to benefit the Fund, featuring music faculty numbers. Invitation letter to current faculty signed by Juanita Barrena and the Fund committee. Letter to emeritus signed by Wilma Krebs and David Lucas. Raised \$1,722.00, primarily from retired faculty who attended. Largest cash gift of year was \$200, made by Baxter Geeting, emeritus.

1989-90:

Committee more formally organized; Bob Curry named chair. Sent 1300 pledge cards to current faculty and to 240 emeriti faculty the week of Sept. 25. Options listed were the "Faculty Endowment Fund" or "Where other University support is needed." Individual presentations were made to a number of Schools and departments by committee members, encouraging gifts. Committee size increased from three to five faculty members by Senate.

McCurry made presentation to Faculty Emeritus Assn. which resulted in \$500 gift from their treasury, the largest cash gift of the year. Emeritus faculty were able to make gifts through the PERS system on monthly payroll deduction for the first time. Solicitation letter to emeritus signed by

David Lucas.

1990-91:

Curry chaired committee. Campaign letter and pledge card inserted into

Campus Bulletin October 1, 1990 signed by Committee members.

Reminder letter to 720 full and part-time faculty on October 1.5 with different letter sent to 249 "new faculty" hired since July 1, 1989, to 280 retired faculty with the PERS form, and to 69 campus administrators.

A Faculty Show was staged Oct. 26 in the Redwood Room which resulted in a deposit of \$213 to the Faculty Fund. A music faculty recital is planned for Spring to benefit the Faculty Fund.

\*AS 90-114/Ex. FACULTY SCHOLARSHIP, ESTABLISH AD HOC COMMITTEE ON

The Executive Committee, in response to recommendations in the section on Research and Faculty Development of the 1990 Report of the WASC Visiting Team (excerpt provided in Attachment F, November 29, 1990, Academic Senate Agenda) and the President's request in his Fall 1990 Address to the Faculty that the Academic Senate formulate and recommend a definition of scholarship and statement of University expectations for faculty in the realm of scholarship that reflect the collective view of the faculty on these matters, does hereby establish, on behalf of the Academic Senate, an ad hoc Committee on Faculty Scholarship with the following charge and membership.

### Charge

The ad hoc Committee on Faculty Scholarship shall develop and submit to the Senate by May 15, 1991, recommendations that address the following questions:

- 1. How should scholarship be defined (what is its scope)? How does it relate to the mission of the institution?
- What are the University's expectations for faculty in the realm of scholarship? Should there be university-wide weights and specified standards for evaluating scholarship for RTP purposes?
- 3. How should the University recognize, support, and reward faculty scholarship to ensure that expectations for faculty scholarship can be realized?
- 4. If expectations for faculty scholarship are changed, how will it affect the appointment of new faculty, workload assignments, retention and promotion of continuing faculty?

In developing its recommendations, the ad hoc Committee shall consult broadly with the faculty, and shall solicit faculty participation through such means as questionnaires and open meetings on the subject.

### Membership

The ad hoc Committee shall consist of the following membership.

 One instructional faculty member from each of the following committees:

Faculty Affairs, Faculty Professional Development, Research and Creative Activity, University ARTP, Graduate Policies and Programs, and the Executive Committee (appointed by the Executive Committee)

- Two at-large faculty, appointed by the Executive Committee
- Vice President for Academic Affairs or designee.

The Committee shall elect its own chair.

Carried.

AS 91-11 FPDC GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH AND SPONSORED PROJECTS, PROGRAMS AND FUNCTIONS OF OFFICES OF

(The following substitution is proposed by the Faculty Professional Development Committee [underscore=proposed changes; strikeout=deletions]

Whereas, The Academic Senate is concerned about the proposed merger of the Office of Graduate Studies and the Office of Research and Sponsored Projects in relation to how the merger would provide adequate support for the continuation of current programs and functions; and, furthermore,

Whereas, The Academic Senate is concerned that a merger at this time and creation of a new position description may, de facto, define relative priorities and policy direction for graduate programs and research and sponsored projects at CSU, Sacramento. Such definition, prior to completion of the task of the ad hoc Committee on Scholarship and subsequent the Senate's consideration of the written recommendations from the Faculty Professional Development Committee, the Graduate Policies and Programs Committee and the ad hoc Committee's recommendations and adoption of a policy statement on Scholarship at CSUS would be premature; therefore be it

Resolved, Each of these committees would submit a written report on their findings relative to the proposed consolidation of the two offices to the Senate by March 1, 1991; and, be it further

Resolved, The Academic Senate recommends that, if the offices are merged, priorities, functions and definitions of programs currently supported by the offices be maintained and that no permanent appointment to any newly created administrative position be made until the Senate has had the opportunity to act on the recommendations of the Faculty Professional Development Committee, the Research and Creative Activity Committee, the Graduate Policies and Programs Committee, and the ad hoc Committee on Scholarship.

+ amendmen+

FPDC 2/13/91

amed