

NOTE: YOU'LL NEED SEPTEMBER 13 AGENDA ATTACHMENTS

1990-91
ACADEMIC SENATE
California State University, Sacramento

AGENDA

Thursday, November 29, 1990
2:30 - 4:30 p.m.
Forest Suite, University Union

INFORMATION

1. Academic Senate Meetings, Thursdays, 2:30-4:30 p.m.:
December 6, Forest Suite, UU (Discuss WASC recommendations)
December 13, Forest Suite, UU (Regular Agenda)
2. Faculty Trustee Nominee: At its meeting of October 23 Chair Barrena informed the Executive Committee that she was in receipt of a petition in nomination of Professor Duane Campbell for the position of CSU Faculty Trustee. The Executive Committee directed the Chair to solicit the necessary documents from the nominee and to forward the nomination to the Statewide Academic Senate as specified in the "Criteria for Nominees for Faculty Trustee and the Procedures for Selecting Trustee Nominees." Documentation was forwarded November 14, 1990.
3. Alternate CSU Academic Senator: Senate By-laws specify that the Executive Committee shall designate an alternate if the Senate Chair cannot serve as the alternate representative to the CSU Academic Senate. Since Chair Barrena serves as an elected representative to the CSU Academic Senate, the Executive Committee, at its meeting of November 13, 1990, designated Charlotte Cook as the alternate.

CONSENT CALENDAR

AS 90-99/FA, Ex. DEPARTMENT CHAIRS, POLICY ON ROLE AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF [Amends PM 89-14]

In response to the Forum on Racism Panel's Recommendation 1.C
["We recommend to the President that the Academic Senate consider amending PM 89-14 to include the responsibility for implementing University educational equity programs, within the department, fostering the development of departmental educational equity programs, and coordinating department programs with school and University programs to the roles and responsibilities of Department Chairs."] , the Academic Senate recommends amending PM 89-14 "Policy on Role and Responsibilities of Department Chairs" in the "Responsibilities" section as follows [strikeover=deletion; underscore=addition]:

12. Initiate and provide for the ongoing effectiveness of a departmental educational equity program, and undertake to insure that this program is always consistent with, and coordinated with, the educational equity programs of both the department's school and of the University.

123. ...

AS 90-116/Ex. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS--SENATE

Affirmative Action Committee:

AJIT VIRDEE, E&CS, 1992 (repl. K. Ferrara)

Faculty Affairs Committee:

EDDIE CAJUCOM, A&S, 1992 (repl. G. Ramachandran)
CHARLOTTE COOK, At-large, 1991 (repl. H. Neal)
EDITH LEFEBVRE, At-large, 1991 (repl. S. Swanson)

General Education Committee:

ED CHRISTENSON, SBA, 1991

Graduate Policies and Programs Committee:

JAMES STRAUKAMP, Senator, 1991

Livingston Lecture Committee:

WILMA KREBS, At-large, 1992
JEAN TORCOM, At-large, 1992

Scholarship, ad hoc Committee on:

JEAN-PIERRE BAYARD, Member, Faculty Professional
Development Committee (E&CS)
THERESA ROBERTS, Member, Research and Creative Activity
Committee (Educ)
ROBERT JOHNSON, Member, Faculty Affairs Committee (A&S)
MALCOLM WHITE, Member, University ARTP Committee (SBA)
ROBERT CURRY, Member, Executive Committee (A&S)
CRISTY JENSEN, Member, Graduate Policies and Programs
Committee (A&S)
PHYLLIS MILLS, At-large (H&HS)
RICHARD CRABLE, At-large (A&S)

University Writing Committee:

JOAN BAUERLY, English Department Faculty, 1993
STEPHANIE TUCKER, English Department Faculty, 1992
GARY SHANNON, At-large, 1991
JOAN AL-KAZILY, At-large, 1992
PRISCILLA ALEXANDER, At-large, 1993

AS 90-117/Ex. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS--UNIVERSITYA.S.I. Appellate Council:

WALLACE ETTERBEEK, At-large, 1991

Campus Educational Equity Committee:

ROBERT BUCKLEY, E&CS, 1993 (repl. I. Ghansah)

Diversity Awards Programs, Committee for:

JEAN-PIERRE BAYARD, FPDC Member, 1991

MINA ROBBINS, GPPC Member, 1991

JOHN MAXWELL, CEEC Member, 1991

CHRIS HASEGAWA, AA Member, 1991

ESTELA SERRANO, At-large, 1993

MARJORIE LEE, At-large, 1992

CLOTEAL ISAAC, At-large--Student Service Prof., 1991

Energy Management Committee:

HOMER IBSER, At-large, 1992

Faculty Representative to A.S.I.:

SUE HOLL, At-large, 1991

Grade Appeal Procedural Appeals Board:

WILLIAM DILLON, At-large, 1991

ANN HARRIMAN, At-large, 1991

LUCIEN AGOSTA, At-large, 1991

Lottery Fund Allocation Committee:

FREDERICK BLACKWELL, E&CS, 1993

VIVIAN MILLER, Student Affairs, 1993

Meritorious Performance and Professional Promise Awards Committee:

JOHN CONEY, Unit 3 Faculty, 1991

ESTELA SERRANO, Unit 3 Faculty, 1991

JEAN TORCOM, Unit 3 Faculty, 1991

Persons with Disabilities, University Committee for:

FRED BALDINI, Instructional Faculty, 1993 (repl. A. Graves)

Student Academic Development Committee:

DAVID RASKE, At-large, 1991

JESUS TARANGO, At-large, 1991

NANCY TOOKER, At-large, 1991

MICHAEL FITZGERALD, At-large, 1991

Student Disciplinary Hearing Officers:

EDWARD BRADLEY, At-large, 1991
ROLAND DART, At-large, 1991
PAUL FALZONE, At-large, 1991
SUSAN GERINGER, At-large, 1991
ERWIN KELLY, At-large, 1991
PETER SHATTUCK, At-large, 1991

Student Economic Support, University Committee for:

CHARLOTTE COOK, Education, 1993
DAEHEE LEE, E&CS, 1993

University Alcohol and Drug Steering Committee:

CHRIS HASEGAWA, At-large, 1992
MARTIN ROGERS, At-large, 1991
JOEY ANDERS, At-large, 1992
EILEEN HEASER, Professional Services, 1991

University Center Board:

SUZANNE OGILBY, At-large, 1993

University Trust Foundation Board:

JUANITA BARRENA, At-large, 1993

University Union Board of Directors:

JOHN McCLURE, At-large, 1991

AS 90-118/FPDC, Ex. FACULTY PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE,
MEMBERSHIP (Revises AS 88-41B)
[See Attachment A for current membership.]

The Academic Senate approves expansion of the membership of Faculty Professional Development to include one senator and two at-large faculty members appointed by the Academic Senate. Further, the Academic Senate stipulates that no more than three of the faculty members serving on the committee, whether appointed, ex-officio, or liaison, shall be from the same school.

AS 90-119/CC, GPPC, Ex. CURRICULUM REVIEW--DEPARTMENT OF
MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS

[See Attachment B for "Commendations and Recommendations"; the complete Academic Program Review is available in the Academic Senate Office.]

The Academic Senate receives the commendations and recommendations of the Curriculum Committee and the Graduate Policies and Programs Committee on the program review for the Department of Mathematics and Statistics and recommends that the:

1. Bachelor of Arts degree program in Mathematics be approved for six years or until the next scheduled program review.
2. Master of Arts degree program in Mathematics be approved for six years or until the next scheduled program review.

AS 90-120/CC, GPPC, Ex. CURRICULUM REVIEW--DEPARTMENT OF BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

[See Attachment C for "Commendations and Recommendations"; the complete Academic Program Review is available in the Academic Senate Office.]

The Academic Senate receives the commendations and recommendations of the Curriculum Committee and Graduate Policies and Programs Committee on the program review for the Department of Biological Sciences and recommends that the:

1. Bachelor of Arts degree program in Biological Sciences be approved for six years or until the next scheduled program review.
2. Bachelor of Science degree program in Biological Sciences be approved for six years or until the next scheduled program review.
3. Master of Science degree program in Biological Sciences be approved for six years or until the next scheduled program review.

Further, the Academic Senate notes that several of the recommendations contained in the Biological Sciences program review pertain to issues of universitywide concern. The Academic Senate notes, in particular, that recommendations 1 and 2 to the School of Arts and Sciences ["It is recommended that the School of Arts and Sciences: 1. and Academic Affairs consult about (a) formulating a more precise definition of academic currency and devising ways of measuring currency; (b) finding ways of promoting academic currency; (c) establishing common qualifications for faculty teaching graduate courses. 2. specifically affirm its commitment to the principle of 'full and equal consideration of all qualified applicants' for faculty positions, and explain how hiring departments can pursue affirmative action goals in a manner consistent with the commitment to the full and equal consideration of all qualified applicants for faculty positions."], the recommendation to Academic Affairs ["It is recommended that Academic Affairs and the School of Arts and Sciences consult about (a) formulating a more precise definition of academic currency and devising ways of measuring currency; (b) finding ways of promoting academic currency; (c) establishing common qualifications for faculty teaching graduate courses."], and the recommendation to the President ["It is recommended that the president dispel the present confusion concerning affirmative action and hiring by personally providing an interpretation of the University's commitment to the principle of full and equal consideration of all qualified applicants for faculty and staff positions, and explain how hiring departments and other units can pursue affirmative action goals in a manner consistent with the principle of full and equal consideration of all qualified applicants for faculty and staff positions."] do not pertain to the program in Biological Sciences but to issues of universitywide concern. Therefore, the Academic Senate recommends that the issues addressed in recommendation #1 to the School of Arts and Sciences and the recommendation to

Academic Affairs be addressed within the context of the Senate's ad hoc Committee on Faculty Scholarship and that the issues raised in recommendation #2 to the School of Arts and Sciences and the recommendation to the President be considered by the Affirmative Action Committee.

AS 90-121/CC, GPPC, Ex. CURRICULUM REVIEW--DEPARTMENT OF
PHYSICS/PHYSICAL SCIENCE

[See Attachment D for "Commendations and Recommendations"; the complete Academic Program Review is available in the Academic Senate Office.]

The Academic Senate receives the commendations and recommendations of the Curriculum Committee and Graduate Policies and Programs Committee on the program review for the Department of Physics/Physical Science and recommends that the:

1. Bachelor of Arts degree programs in Physics and Physical Science be approved for a period of six years or until the next scheduled program review.
2. Bachelor of Science degree program in Physics be approved for a period of six years or until the next scheduled program review.

AS 90-122/Ex. TRUSTEES' OUTSTANDING PROFESSOR AWARD 1990-91

The Academic Senate reaffirms AS 89-103, as follows:

Whereas, The CSUS Academic Senate views the Trustees' Outstanding Professor Award Program as an inappropriate way to recognize superior teaching; therefore be it

Resolved: The CSUS Academic Senate reaffirms the campus policy of declining to participate in the Trustees' Outstanding Professor Award Program.

CONSENT--INFORMATION

AS 90-112/Ex. UNIVERSITY-WIDE ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEWS (Amends
AS 89-123)

The Executive Committee, on behalf of the Academic Senate, recommends the following substantive amendment of the policy on "University-Wide Academic Program Reviews." The recommended

location of the amendment and other editorial amendments are shown in the Attachment (Attachment E to this Agenda).

"It is the responsibility of the Review Team Chair to confer with as many team members as possible and to discuss the contents of the report with team members and the academic program faculty prior to final editing and subsequent submission of the draft report..."

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 [Attachment F to this 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?
2. 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.

REGULAR AGENDA

AS 90- DISCUSS OF AD HOC COM. ON SCHOLARSHIP (AS 90-114)

AS 90-95/ UNIVERSITY ARTP POLICY--AMEND SECTION 5.05.B
[refer to Attachments D-1 and D-2, September 13, 1990, Agenda]

Substitute motion: The following motion (AS 90-^a85A) was introduced as a substitute for AS 90-95 at the September 13 meeting and is subject to debate.

AS 90-95A/Flr. UNIVERSITY ARTP POLICY--AMEND SECTION 9.01.H

The Academic Senate reaffirms its action of AS 89-37A as follows [underscore=addition to current policy]:

5.05 Criteria for Retention, Tenure and Promotion

- B. The following criteria are the minimum set by the university for retention, tenure, and promotion. Each primary evaluation level shall establish a value for each criterion in relation to the values it establishes for the other criteria. It may do so by means of a qualitative or quantitative statement. The first criterion, "Competent Teaching Performance," shall be the primary and essential, but not sufficient, criterion in the evaluation process at each review level.

When making its substantive evaluation and final recommendation in a particular case, each secondary evaluation level shall apply the relative values established by the primary unit in which that case has arisen.

C. ...

*AS 90-95B
substitute
refer to
V. DR SP
for rewriting
covered*

Original motion:AS 90-95/UARTP UNIVERSITY ARTP POLICY--AMEND SECTION 5.05.B

The Academic Senate recommends amending Section 5.05.B of the University ARTP policy as follows [underscore=addition; bolded=Executive Committee amendment]:

5.05 Criteria for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion

A. ...

B. The following criteria are set by the university for retention, tenure, and promotion. Each primary evaluation level shall, and each secondary evaluation level may, establish a value for each criterion in relation to the values it establishes for the other criteria. It may do so by means of a qualitative or a quantitative statement. The first criterion, "Competent Teaching Performance," shall be the primary and essential, but not sufficient, criterion in the evaluation process at each review level.

When making its substantive evaluation and final recommendation in a particular case, each secondary evaluation level shall apply the relative values established by the primary unit in which that case has arisen unless it has previously established (by majority vote of the probationary and tenured faculty of the secondary unit acting in their own right in an election held for that purpose) and published its own values as provided above.

C. ... *RESOL. IN SUPPORT OF CAMPUS**AS 90-124 RECYCLING*AS 90-96/UARTP, Ex.

UNIVERSITY ARTP POLICY--AMEND SECTION 9.01.H
[refer to Attachment E, September 13, 1990,
Agenda]

Carried
The Academic Senate recommends amending Section 9.01.H of the University ARTP policy, as follows [underscore=addition]:

9.00 EVALUATION

9.01 In General

...
H. Written criteria, policies and procedures may incorporate other documents which have originated within the CSU system (e.g., collective bargaining agreements, university-wide policy documents) by reference. Documents from outside the CSU system or excerpted sections thereof (e.g., standards of professional organizations or accrediting agencies, or selected

portions thereof), that are specifically referenced in a department's or a school's ARTP policy statement shall be applicable only if these same documents, or specifically referenced sections thereof, are reproduced verbatim in or appended to the ARTP policy statement of that academic unit. In any instance of conflict or contradiction between the provisions of department or school ARTP documents and those parts of documents from outside the CSU system incorporated verbatim or by reference into department or school ARTP documents, the provisions of the department or school document shall govern.

revised
AS 90-97/UARTP, FA, Ex. UNIVERSITY ARTP POLICY--ADD SECTION 6.08
[refer to Attachment F, September 13, 1990, Agenda]

The Academic Senate recommends amendment of the University ARTP document by adding a new section as follows:

6.00 APPOINTMENT

6.08 Appointment to a Faculty Position with the Duties of Department Chair

A department may decide to recommend to the School Dean the appointment of a department chair from outside of the University. The department shall decide whether to recommend a search outside for a chair by a vote of the probationary and tenured members of the department, including those on the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) and those on leave.

For the purpose of searching for a chair outside of the University and recommending whom to appoint, a department may constitute itself a peer review committee of the whole in a manner consistent with University ARTP policy pertaining to such committees. (Please see the Note appended to Section 6.06.B.2 of this document.) If a department has not provided for doing so in its currently approved ARTP document, it shall ask the University ARTP Committee and the Vice President for Academic Affairs in writing to approve that departure from its ARTP policy. Its written request shall contain a description of its procedures for constituting a peer review committee of the whole and its screening committee, if any. The request shall be approved if the described procedures are consistent with the provisions of this document.

After screening applications initially for consistency with the department's published vacancy announcement, the department peer review committee shall make available to

every probationary and tenured member of the department in or near the department office each qualified applicant's resume and the materials which the committee is not required to keep confidential. It shall then invite those members to submit written, signed statements of evaluation based on those materials to the applicants' files before determining whom to interview.

The department peer review committee shall also invite every probationary member and those tenured faculty members, if any, who are ineligible to serve on the peer review committee to attend any classroom presentation or other event scheduled in connection with the committee's interview of each applicant selected for an interview. After the peer review committee has conducted its interviews and held events scheduled in connection with them, it shall invite each probationary and tenured member of the department, including those members on FERP or on leave, to submit to the file of the applicants interviewed written, signed statements of evaluation based on the portion of the file available to him or her for review and the events in which he or she and the subject of the statement have participated.

After permitting a suitable interval for the preparation and submission of these statements, the peer review committee shall review the files of the applicants interviewed, conduct its deliberations and make its recommendation to the appropriate administrator. The recommendation may take the form of a ranked list.

[Renumber existing sections: 6.09 - 6.11 as 6.10 - 6.12.]

Carried
 AS 90-98/FA, Ex. DEPARTMENT CHAIR, ROLE AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE--Amends PM 89-14 [refer to Attachment F, September 13, 1990, Agenda]

The Academic Senate recommends amendment of the policy on "Role and Responsibilities of Department Chair" (PM 89-14) by addition of a new section on "Outside Searches for Department Chairs," as follows:

NOMINATION PROCEDURES FOR PERIODIC SELECTION OF DEPARTMENT CHAIRS

...

OUTSIDE SEARCHES FOR DEPARTMENT CHAIRS

In order to recommend the appointment of a Chair from outside of the University, a department shall proceed as directed by Section 6.08 of the University ARTP Policy.

VACANCY

...

Carried
AS 90-100/AP, Ex. GRADE CREDIT FROM FOREIGN INSTITUTIONS,
POLICY ON

[Note: On October 2 the Executive Committee removed AS 90-100 from the October 11 Senate agenda to further address implementation issues. Amendments adopted at the October 9 Executive Committee meeting are shown in **bold**.]

The Academic Senate recommends revision of the policy on grade credit from Foreign Institutions (page 52, 1990-92 Catalog) for implementation in 1990.

Credit ~~is~~ may be granted from recognized overseas institutions. Awarding of letter grade credit or advanced standing varies depending on the educational system of the country and will be based on information obtained by the Evaluations International Admissions Office and the Office of International Center Programs about standards at the specific institution. ~~CSU students planning to attend overseas institutions should check acceptance of credit prior to departure. Letter grade credit for college level courses taken at overseas institutions will be awarded if the student receives prior approval from the Evaluations International Admissions Office and the Office of International Center Programs, with the concurrence of the Academic Standards Committee. If the courses are to be applied toward the major, approval of the major department is also required. A student who is interested in obtaining letter grade credit for overseas courses should obtain and file the appropriate form with the Evaluations International Admissions Office prior to departure¹.~~

Upon completion of the course, certified copies of transcripts, in English translation, and degrees must be submitted in English translation to the Evaluations International Admissions Office.

If a student fails to request prior approval, or if a student initially enrolls at CSUS after attending a foreign institution, then the student may petition and may receive letter grade credit if retroactive approval (as described above) is obtained.

¹Implementation Note: The Academic Senate recommends internal routing of the petition form (rather than student trekking) as follows: 1) The form is submitted by the student to the Evaluations International Admissions Office. 2) The Evaluator will note his/her approval/disapproval and forward the petition

to the International Center for consideration. 3) The director/designee of the Office of International Center Programs will note his/her approval and forward the petition to the academic department (if the course is to be applied to the major) or to the Academic Standards Committee. 4) The academic department will note its approval/disapproval and return the form to the Office of International Center Programs for forwarding to the Academic Standards Committee. 5) Approval/disapproval by the Academic Standards Committee shall constitute the final action.

AS 90-101/AP, Ex. DROP POLICY

The Academic Senate recommends revision of the drop policy (page 60, 1988-90 Catalog) for implementation in 1992:

No change in a student's original class registration will be recognized unless it is made on an official form and accepted by the Registrar's Office.¹ ~~Forms should not be left in academic department offices.~~ Students who are absent from class may be replaced on class rolls by students from a waiting list in accordance with individual instructor's policy. However, students will not always be "automatically" dropped if they do not attend a class for which they register. Add/drop practice varies among instructors, departments, and schools. You should inquire about the practice in each of your courses. Failure to drop a course according to University policy as stated below is likely to result in the assignment of a penalty grade of "U" in that course.

~~Within the first two weeks of instruction, students may submit a drop form signed by the instructor or department office. Unless approved drop forms are submitted to the Registrar's Office, students will receive a final grade of U or F in the course(s).~~ During the first two weeks of the semester, a student may drop a course by filing a drop form at the Registrar's Office.¹ Dropping a course during the first two weeks does not require the approval or acknowledgment signature of the instructor or the department. During the third and fourth weeks of the semester, students must inform the course instructor or the department of their intention to drop a course, and must obtain the instructor or department's acknowledgment signature on the drop form.¹ Students are responsible for submitting drop forms to the Registrar.¹ Forms should not be left in academic department offices.¹

All drops after the second fourth week and prior to the end of the twelfth week must have the approval of the instructor and Department Chair and are allowed only for "serious and compelling reasons." ~~(usually illness, change in employment schedule, etc.)~~. "Serious and compelling" reasons include (but

are not limited to) the following:

- a) illness or other medical or emotional problem,
- b) change in employment schedule (including the addition of job due to a significant change in financial situation),
- c) family problems, and
- d) situations that could have serious consequences for the eventual success of the student.

Poor academic performance, in and of itself, is not an acceptable reason for dropping. The instructor may require that the student obtain official written verification (e.g., physician's note) and/or the recommendation of the student's academic or major advisor. In addition to the drop form, the student must submit (to the Registrar's Office) a drop petition which includes a statement of the "serious and compelling reasons" and the necessary approvals.¹

Drops shall not be permitted during the final three weeks of instruction except in cases, such as accident or serious illness, where the cause of withdrawal is due to circumstances clearly beyond the student's control and the assignment of an Incomplete is not practicable. Ordinarily, drops of this sort will involve total withdrawal from the University, except that credit, or an Incomplete may be assigned for courses in which sufficient work has been completed to permit an evaluation to be made. All drops during the final three weeks of instruction must have the approval of the instructor, the Department Chair and School or Division Dean and are allowed only in extenuating circumstances.

Courses officially dropped during the first four weeks of instruction will not be recorded on the student's permanent record. A grade of W will be recorded for courses in which a drop has been authorized after the fourth week of instruction. The Schedule of Classes lists deadlines, dates, and procedures for each semester.

¹By Fall 1992, use of add/drop forms may be discontinued if telephone registration capability is available on the campus. If this should occur, the Academic Senate recommends that catalog copy be revised as necessary to provide appropriate direction to students on use of telephone registration.

AS 90-106/Flr. MINUTES

Approval of Minutes of the meetings of August 28 (#3) and September 13 (#4), 1990.

Carved

AS 90-115/Flr. MINUTES

Carried
Approval of Minutes of the meetings of September 27 (#5), October 4 (#6), October 11 (#7), October 18 (#8), November 1 (#9) and November 8 (#10), 1990.

AS 90-123/Ex.^{Flr.} MILITARY STUDIES ADVISORY BOARD

Carried
[Note: The membership and charge defined in this action replaces provisions of AS 89-14 and AS 82-27 named in those actions as the Faculty Board, Military Science Advisory Board, or Military Studies Advisory Board.]

Whereas, Since 1980 when the first ROTC program (Army) was established on the CSUS campus, and the original courses in Military Science were approved, (AS 80-14) the number of ROTC programs and courses have increased, and

Whereas, the programs are currently administered in the Office of Academic Affairs by the Dean of Regional and Continuing Education as opposed to the School of Arts and Sciences as recommended by the Senate in AS 82-26 in 1982, and

Whereas, the Military Studies Advisory Board was established by the Senate in 1980 as the "Faculty Board" (AS 80-14) with membership and reporting relationship revised in 1982 (AS 82-27) for secondary level faculty review of curriculum and to ensure compliance of the program with all University policies, including affirmative action policies, ARTP policies, academic policies, and policies on academic freedom as they pertain to students and faculty, and

Whereas, issues regarding the conflict between ROTC admissions policies and University policies have highlighted the need for a Board with a more clearly defined charge and a membership that is more closely tied to other Senate/campus bodies that develop and review University policies and procedures, therefore be it

Resolved, The Academic Senate adopts the following revision of the membership and charge of the Military Studies Advisory Board:

Membership:

Voting:

Five at-large faculty members, appointed by the Academic Senate to serve staggered three-year terms

The Vice President for Academic Affairs/or designee
One student, appointed for the academic year by A.S.I.

Non-voting:

agreed
One faculty representative from each authorized campus ROTC program, appointed for the academic year by each program *Vote: 20/10/10/10/10/10/10/10/10/10*
One student enrolled in ROTC appointed by A.S.I.

The Chair shall be elected by and from the voting membership.

Charge:

The Military Studies Advisory Board shall be a standing committee of the Senate with the following specific duties and responsibilities:

1. To orient ROTC faculty to the policies and procedures of the University and to assist ROTC faculty in developing ties with the campus community.
2. To function as a faculty secondary level review committee in matters of curriculum (e.g., course change proposals, new program proposals) Note: in this case as in the case of school secondary level committees, recommendations shall be made to the Dean responsible for program administration who shall forward recommendations to Academic Affairs for placement on the agenda of the appropriate Senate committee (i.e., GPPC or CC).
3. To review and monitor instructional and student support aspects of the program (e.g., student advising, grading standards, student grievances and grade appeal policies and practices).
4. To review and monitor ROTC policies and procedures (e.g., ARTF, academic policies, affirmative action, educational equity) for conformance to University policies and procedures. In cases of conflict, the Board shall recommend to the ROTC program

administrator changes necessary to achieve conformance and/or recommend to the Senate actions deemed appropriate in relation to non-conformance issues.

5. To advise the Senate on matters pertaining to Department of Defense policies and procedures that constrain the ability of ROTC programs to conform with University policy. In cases where non-conformance appears unresolvable at a local level, to recommend to the Senate actions deemed appropriate (e.g., granting a waiver, appeal to the Department of Defense, program discontinuation).

Report--Faculty Professional Development:
A CSUS Investment in Professional Growth

6

2. Membership

The FPD Committee would be appointed by the Academic Senate and consist of the following: One instructional faculty member each from the Faculty Affairs Committee and the Research and Scholarly Activity Committee appointed annually; at-large members, one from each of the schools and the Library, serving three-year staggered terms; the director of the Faculty Resource Center. The Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Dean of Faculty and Staff Affairs serve as ex-officio non-voting members.

IV. FPD PRIORITIES AND IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FOR 1988-89

While the definition and model of Faculty Professional Development given above is intended to be a permanent description, the ad hoc Committee also addressed the necessity, given limited resources, of targeting certain priorities for immediate attention. The following series of recommendations should be understood as responding to present needs for the 1988-89 academic year. The FPDC will review needs and recommend priorities annually.

A. Priorities

On-going Programs: A number of activities are already in place on the campus. We recommend their continuance both because they address important concerns and because they are in the process of being developed, refined, and evaluated.

Category Priorities: In addition to the above activities, extra efforts need to be made in the following specific categories: Currency and Career Enhancement, Curriculum Development, and Creative Pedagogy. Opportunities should be available at both the University and school levels, ensuring that all faculty have access to activities in all three categories.

Specific Suggestions: Given the time constraints which will make it difficult to get programs established by the fall semester, we recommend three specific programs which could respond to category priorities: Travel Grants, Mini-Grants, and Workshop Grants (using lottery funds). The guidelines for last year's Mini-Grants and Workshops could be revised and improved, and specific guidelines for the Travel Grants could be developed. These programs could award money instead of or in

After reviewing thoroughly the attached Academic Program Review Report for the Department of Mathematics and Statistics, prepared by the Review Team jointly appointed by our respective groups, the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee and the Graduate Policies and Programs Committee make the following responses in terms of commendations and recommendations, and directs these to the indicated units and administrative heads. (Page references refer to the documentation for the response in the Review Report.)

Commendations to the Department of Mathematics and Statistics:

The Department of Mathematics and Statistics is commended for

- its effective leadership and office staff;
- the high quality of its faculty, the faculty's devotion to teaching, its scholarly work, and the willingness of many faculty members to offer volunteer courses;
- the vitality of its Faculty Colloquium and Mathematics Union;
- the high quality of its wide range of service courses, so vital to the entire University;
- its efforts to maintain high quality major and graduate programs in the face of serious budget cuts;
- its well-executed Self Study and its professional cooperation with the Academic Review Team.

Recommendations to the Department of Mathematics and Statistics:

It is recommended that the Department of Mathematics

1. (1) have at least one section of Math 9 scheduled at a different time; (2) require that Math 9 students attend their tutorial sessions; (3) consult with the Dean of Arts and Sciences regarding the advisability of having separate sections of Math 9 reserved for students with special needs, e.g., students who have failed the course or the subsequent diagnostic examination. (p. 12)
2. consult with the natural science departments regarding the content and uniform adherence to published syllabuses in service courses, especially in 104 and 105. (p. 14)
3. and the Department of Physics consult with the Dean and the departments of the School of Engineering regarding (1) a review of the content of services courses and (2) the uniform covering of material included in service courses offered to programs in the School of Engineering. (p. 14)
4. consult with the Deans of Arts and Sciences and of Education regarding (1) greater cooperation regarding teacher training in mathematics, and (2) improved coordination of School of Education and Arts and Sciences' advising concerning Liberal Studies mathematics courses. (p. 16)
5. and the Dean of Arts and Sciences consult in an effort to agree on a plan which would allow the Department to carry the courses necessary to its new curriculum. (p. 19)
6. consult with the Department of Computer Science regarding future joint programs. (p. 22)

7. consider means to improve the technical writing abilities of its majors. (p. 23)
8. consider the adoption of a uniform attendance policy. (p. 23)
9. consider extending its classroom visitation policy to document the teaching effectiveness of tenured and full promoted faculty. (p. 25)
10. evaluate the importance of scholarly activity in maintaining the quality of the Department's faculty and consider whether the Department's current ARTP policy effectively encourages scholarly activity. (p. 25)
11. consult with the Dean of Arts and Sciences and the Dean of the School of Engineering regarding the possibility of mathematics majors using Engineering's Cooperative Education Program and Career Placement advising service. (p. 27)
12. (1) gather information concerning the various constituencies served by the Math Lab and (2) consult with the Dean of Arts and Sciences concerning proposals for an equitable sharing of the costs of the Math Lab. (p. 28)
13. consult with Academic Affairs and the Office of Institutional Research regarding the regular supplying of enrollment and student background information important to the Mathematics Department. (p. 28)
14. consult regularly with the Dean of Arts and Sciences, SPAM and the Executive Vice President regarding the design and allotment of future space for the Department. (p. 30)

Recommendation to the School of Arts and Sciences

It is recommended that the

1. Department of Mathematics and the Dean of Arts and Sciences consult in an effort to agree on a plan which would allow the Department to carry the courses necessary to its new curriculum. (p. 19)
2. School of Arts and Sciences should provide the Department of Mathematics with the computer equipment it has requested in this order: (1) computer equipment for instructional use; (2) computer equipment for faculty members. (p. 30)

Recommendations to the Academic Senate:

It is recommended that the

1. Bachelor of Arts degree program in Mathematics be approved for six years or until the next scheduled program review.
2. Master of Arts degree program in Mathematics be approved for six years or until the next scheduled program review.

After reviewing thoroughly the attached Academic Program Review Report for the Department of Biological Sciences prepared by the Review Team jointly appointed by our respective groups, the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee and the Graduate Policies and Programs Committee make the following responses in terms of commendations and recommendations, and directs these to the indicated units and administrative heads. (Page references refer to the documentation for the response in the Review Report.)

Commendations to the Department of Biological Sciences:

The Department of Biological Sciences is commended for its

- long-standing commitment to superior teaching as the primary mission of the Department;
- effective reorganization of its curriculum;
- vital contributions to the University's General Education Program and to other majors;
- vigorous pursuit of educational equity and affirmative action goals;
- faculty's many contributions to the School of Arts and Sciences and to the University;
- its faculty and staff for their professional cooperation in carrying out this Review.

Recommendations to the Department of Biological Sciences:

It is recommended that the Department of Biological Sciences

1. consult with Institutional Research regarding ways of tracking biology majors and concentrators during residence and after graduation. (p. 4)
2. join the other natural science departments in urging the Academic Council and the Dean to sponsor formal faculty discussions concerning the best organization of the School of Arts and Sciences. (p. 6)
3. consider a reform of its government, specifically a strengthening of the Executive Committee by 1) having its members elected to multi-year, overlapping terms; 2) having the members of the Executive Committee also serve on the Curriculum and Budget Committees; and 3) compensating members of the Executive Committee with assigned time. (p. 9)
4. consider reserving separate sections of its lower-division courses for majors. (p. 12)
5. evaluate the ability of its current lower-division courses to teach experimental method and consider ways to improve the teaching of that skill. (p. 12)
6. consult with the Department of Teacher Education regarding closer cooperation in the training of K-12 teachers. (p. 14)
7. evaluate its BS concentrations, especially to decide whether recommended changes in major requirements and prerequisites will require changes in the concentration curriculums. (p. 22)

8. (a) reevaluate its mathematics and statistics requirements, and (b) consult with the Dean of Arts and Sciences about hiring an expert on mathematical biology as a consultant on this issue. (p. 23)
9. (a) reevaluate its majors' needs for computer literacy and experience; (b) consult with the other science departments and the Dean of Arts and Sciences regarding the development of courses on the use of computer techniques in the sciences. (p. 24)
10. consult with the Dean of Arts and Sciences, the English Department and the Writing Across the Curriculum Program regarding the development of departmental writing requirements. (p. 25)
11. consider the development of a "capstone" course which will use the study of a general theme to integrate the knowledge learned in the several special areas of the Department's curriculum, and which will also provide a check on graduating majors' essential skills. (p. 26)
12. and the Department of Chemistry consult with the Dean of Arts and Sciences and other interested departments regarding the development of a certificate program in Biotechnology. (p. 28)
13. reevaluate its graduate core requirements, and consider replacing the current core courses with courses combining the study of the method and substance of the several areas of biology and report back to the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee and Graduate Policies and Programs Committee by March 1, 1991. (p. 31)
14. consider establishing formal joint graduate concentrations or degrees with other departments. (p. 31)
15. consider formally listing some courses from other departments as graduate electives. (p. 31)
16. consider the adoption of a Graduate Teaching Assistant Program. (p. 32)
17. meet with its part-time faculty as part of a consideration of ways to improve the Department's evaluation of part-time faculty. (p. 34)
18. explore ways of encouraging part-time faculty to participate in departmental activities. It should include the part-time faculty in any future Faculty Colloquium. (p. 34)
19. consider ways to increase faculty research and scholarly activities. (p. 40)
20. consider establishing a Faculty Colloquium to meet regularly for the discussion of recent work in biology and allied fields. (p. 42)
21. consider the establishment of an Advisory Board to increase community interest in the Department, to increase employment opportunities for graduates and to raise funds for equipment and scholarships. (p. 42)

22. up-date its Affirmative Action Plan and hiring procedures to (a) reaffirm its commitment to "full and equal consideration of all qualified applicants without regard to race, creed, marital status, national origin, sex, handicaps, age, or veteran status"; (b) specifically explain that its pursuit of faculty diversity shall not violate this commitment to the "full and equal consideration of all qualified applicants." (p. 46)
23. consider the establishment of a student club for all majors, and securing space to serve as a student lounge and meeting place. (p. 49)
24. consider the establishment of an Alumni Association. (p. 50)
25. consult with the Dean of Arts and Sciences and other science departments regarding application for external funds, especially matching grants, for equipment. (p. 52)
26. consult with Academic Affairs regarding its space, equipment and special design needs in Science II. (p. 52)
27. appropriately complete and submit in a timely manner an accurate self study for the next regularly scheduled program review.

Recommendations to the School of Arts and Sciences:

It is recommended that the School of Arts and Sciences

1. and Academic Affairs consult about (a) formulating a more precise definition of academic currency and devising ways of measuring currency; (b) finding ways of promoting academic currency; (c) establishing common qualifications for faculty teaching graduate courses. (p. 40)
2. specifically affirm its commitment to the principle of "full and equal consideration of all qualified applicants" for faculty positions, and explain how hiring departments can pursue affirmative action goals in a manner consistent with the commitment to the full and equal consideration of all qualified applicants for faculty positions. (p. 46)
3. require the Department of Biological Sciences to appropriately complete and submit in a timely manner an accurate self study for the next regularly scheduled program review.

Recommendation to Academic Affairs:

It is recommended that Academic Affairs and the School of Arts and Sciences consult about (a) formulating a more precise definition of academic currency and devising ways of measuring currency; (b) finding ways of promoting academic currency; (c) establishing common qualifications for faculty teaching graduate courses. (p. 40)

Recommendation to the President:

It is recommended that the President dispel the present confusion concerning affirmative action and hiring by personally providing an interpretation of the

University's commitment to the principle of full and equal consideration of all qualified applicants for faculty and staff positions, and explain how hiring departments and other units can pursue affirmative action goals in a manner consistent with the principle of full and equal consideration of all qualified applicants for faculty and staff positions. (p. 46)

Recommendations to the Academic Senate:

It is recommended that the

1. Bachelor of Arts degree program in Biological Sciences be approved for six years or until the next scheduled program review.
2. Bachelor of Science degree program in Biological Sciences be approved for six years or until the next scheduled program review.
3. Master of Science degree program in Biological Sciences be approved for six years or until the next scheduled program review.

10-3-90

After reviewing thoroughly the attached Academic Program Review Report for the Department of Physics/Physical Science, prepared by the Review Team jointly appointed by our respective groups, the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee and the Graduate Policies and Programs Committee make the following responses in terms of commendations and recommendations, and directs these to the indicated units and administrative heads. (Page references refer to the documentation for the response in the Review Report.)

Commendations to the Department of Physics/Physical Science

The Department of Physics/Physical Science is commended for

- its faculty, so well trained, dedicated to teaching and to research;
- the integrity of its Programs and its standards;
- its special efforts with students and especially in pursuit of educational equity;
- its many contributions to the School of Arts and Sciences and to the University;
- its current leadership; and
- its excellent self study and professional cooperation with the Academic Program Review Team.

Recommendations to the Department of Physics/Physical Science:

It is recommended that the Department

1. consult with the other natural science departments about common budgetary and curricular problems and about improvements in the current organization of the School of Arts and Sciences. (p. 9)
2. consider preparing a course proposal for participation in the Critical Thinking Program of General Education. (p. 17)
3. consult with the other natural science departments regarding the development of an interdisciplinary symposium course for elective credit. (p. 17)
4. consult with the Dean of Arts and Sciences regarding a School guarantee that courses important to the proposed major curriculums will be offered on a regular basis for at least six years. (p. 20)
5. provide formal means (e.g. through explicit statements in course descriptions or course syllabi) for adequate material in mathematical methods to be incorporated in the upper division curriculum in the event that a dedicated course on this subject is not offered. (p. 20)
6. change its name to the "Department of Physics and Astronomy." (p. 22)
7. consult with the Dean of Graduate Studies, the Dean of Arts and Sciences and the Dean of the School of Engineering regarding the possibility of a joint MS in Applied Physics. (p. 23)

8. consult with the Dean of Graduate Studies regarding the possibility of a Graduate Teaching Assistant Program as part of any prospective MS program. (p. 23)
9. consult with the Dean of Arts and Sciences and the Dean of the School of Engineering regarding Physics majors' access to Engineering's Cooperative Education and Career Placement Programs. (p. 27)
10. consult with the School of Arts and Sciences regarding the possibilities for outside funding to upgrade laboratory equipment. (p. 33)

Recommendations to the Dean of the School of Arts and Sciences:

It is recommended that the Dean of Arts and Sciences

1. and the Academic Council should, together or separately, sponsor formal faculty discussions evaluating the current organization of Arts and Sciences and alternative organizations of the School. (p. 8)
2. consult with the Dean of the School of Education regarding improved communications between the natural science departments and the Teacher Education Department. (p. 19)
3. provide a room in the Psychology Building to use as an equipment storage room for the astronomy observatory. (p. 32)
4. concentrate budgetary efforts on providing faculty computer workstations. Recognition should be given to the specialized equipment needs of faculty doing research. (p. 33)

Recommendation to the Academic Council:

It is recommended that the Dean of Arts and Sciences and the Academic Council should, together or separately, sponsor formal faculty discussions evaluating the current organization of Arts and Sciences and alternative organizations of the School. (p. 8)

Recommendations to Academic Affairs:

It is recommended that Academic Affairs

1. give space on either the first or second floor of the Science Building to Physics as a tutoring center. (p. 32)
2. if the current interdepartmental proposal to the Natural Science Foundation for a grant to create a science instructional computing laboratory is successful, provide a room in the Science Building for the new facility. (p. 32)
3. consult with the Physics Department to ensure that lecture rooms in the new classroom building have space for setup and storage of lecture demonstrations. In addition, Academic Affairs should consult with Physics regarding faculty offices freed in the Science Building by any moves to the new classroom building. (p. 32)

4. consult with the Physics Department regarding the distribution of space in Science II. (p. 32)

Recommendations for Academic Senate Action:

It is recommended that

1. the Bachelor of Arts degree programs in Physics and Physical Science be approved for a period of six years or until the next scheduled program review.
2. the Bachelor of Science degree program in Physics be approved for a period of six years or until the next scheduled program review.

5-17-90

UNIVERSITY-WIDE ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEWS

Board of Trustees regulations require that every academic unit be reviewed on a regularly scheduled basis. For this review each academic unit prepares a self study of its academic programs. These self studies are to conform to a common University format and utilize data supplied by the University for program planning and evaluation.

The self studies are forwarded to the School Dean who, according to school policy, examines them and, in consultation with appropriate school committees, makes recommendations concerning program offerings to both the academic unit and to the Vice President for Academic Affairs through the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs.

After the school has reviewed the programs, the self studies are forwarded to the Vice President's office for conveyance to the Academic Senate Curriculum and Graduate Policies and Programs Committees. These committees, through specially appointed review teams, conduct the University-wide-level academic program review.

The Team examines the unit's self study and other relevant materials, conducts interviews, gathers additional information including seeking expert opinion as necessary from outside consultants. As a result of this study, the Team prepares, originally in draft form and then in final form, a detailed substantive report reflecting both qualitative and quantitative aspects of all programs offered by the unit.

The Chair of the Review Team is responsible for the preparation, submission and interpretation of review reports, ~~together with any including minority findings.~~ It is the responsibility of the Review Team Chair to confer with as many team members as possible and to discuss the contents of the report with team members and the academic program faculty prior to final editing and subsequent submission of the draft report to the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee and the Graduate Policies and Programs Committee. ~~and~~ The Chair acts as a non-voting consultant when the Review Team's report is under consideration.

At the same time as the Review Team's draft report is submitted to the committees, it is also forwarded to the unit whose program(s) is being reviewed. The unit is given two weeks to respond to the report, correct inaccuracies in fact or data, and take reasoned exception to judgments or conclusions drawn. Likewise, the Academic Senate Curriculum and Graduate Policies

and Programs Committees, have the same period of time to study the report, make further investigation, and to instruct the Review Team as to suggested additions, deletions, or modifications to the draft report. After the Review Team receives the comments from the unit involved and the two committees, it prepares its final review report for resubmission to the committees.

After the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee and the Graduate Policies and Programs Committee receive the Team's final review report, each of these committees will move to adopt the report either fully or with reasoned exceptions. The committees' separate endorsement of the report will be attached to the Team's report before final distribution to the reviewed unit and others on the distribution list. Along with the Team's report, the committees' endorsement and reasoned exceptions, go the committees' commendations, recommendations and Senate action items. Departments who choose to do so, may a file response to be appended to the Review Team's final document.

Academic degree programs are scheduled for review at least once every six years, and summaries of program review findings must be forwarded annually to the Chancellor's Office. These recommendations become the basis for the preparation of the CSU Academic Master Plan which authorizes each campus to offer specific degree programs.

Revised by Academic Senate Curriculum Committee and Graduate Policies and Programs Committee: September 17, 1990
Revised by Academic Senate Executive Committee: October 23, 1990

| monitor compliance with this standard.

~~Finally, inasmuch as the Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee and the General Education Committee, in collaboration with the administrator for GE, are given broad, and at times final, power for determining the parameters of this program, great care should be taken to assure that these committees be truly representative of all major segments of the academic community.~~

STANDARDS FOUR AND FIVE: DEALING WITH RESEARCH AND FACULTY DEVELOPMENT.

Standards 4.D.1., 4.D.4., 5.C.2., and 5.C.3.

Within an institution research, scholarship and instruction are mutually supportive; research policies and practices are clearly communicated; faculty are encouraged to be active in scholarly and creative ways; and expectations of faculty research, scholarship and creative work are supported.

The 1985 WASC accrediting team report contained several recommendations related to the standards dealing with research and creative work. The university is to be praised for having made, in some instances, considerable progress in addressing the issues that compelled the committee to recommend changes.

1. The 1985 team recommended the expansion of programs for the allocation of positions for research, for the funding of travel, and for resources to support scholarly and creative activity. In response, the university has now allocated funds for a program of mini-grants for curriculum development, creative pedagogy, and career enhancement; for instructional development and technology; for attendance at summer institutes; for research travel; for research grant writing; for visiting scholars; and for both university-wide and college/school based grants specifically aimed at supporting scholarly and creative work. In addition, the university has established an office of Research and Sponsored Projects.

A number of faculty are now engaged in the writing of grant proposals. In 1989-90, for example, 72 faculty submitted 117 proposals for external support, and 40 of the 117 were funded and brought to the university 2.5 million for research. Internally, 74 of 128 applications to the campus Research Awards Program were approved. Additionally, through the internal Monetary Grant Program (supported by the university's foundation) 24 faculty out of 64 applicants were granted research awards. In the campus Mini-Grant Program for Creative Pedagogy and Career Enhancement, 76 out of 129 proposals were funded.

This team views these improvements as laudable, but encourage continued and even greater effort along the same lines, so that

an ever larger portion of the faculty begin to compete for both internal and external grants to sponsor its research.

2. The 1985 team also recommended that CSUS clarify its position on research and make clear that although it retained teaching as its primary mission, faculty research would be supported and rewarded. With the approval and encouragement of the System, CSUS has now formally expanded its mission to include research and now seeks funding to support it.

Commentary:

This team concludes that CSUS continues to harbor considerable confusion, and tension, and outright disagreement regarding the weight scholarship should be assigned in appointments, promotion, and tenure, and regarding the degree of passion that administrators and colleagues alike would and should consider appropriate in its pursuit. This lack of unity affects both tenured and non-tenured faculty, and might well result in eventual conflicts that could diminish the intellectual growth of the university. Therefore, the team recommends with some sense of urgency that the university address this issue as a matter of high priority. For every single decision linked to appointments and tenure determines as no other decision, and in often irreversible ways, the future of an institution. Hence, in such matters, time is always of the essence.

In deliberations surrounding this issue, administrators and faculty might consider the following suggestions:

1. Arriving at a definition of scholarship that would apply university-wide. A number of peer institutions have already come to accept scholarship so broadly defined as to include not only the advancement of frontier research, but the synthesizing of discoveries, the creative explications of texts, and the application of new knowledge.

2. Editing of university documents to avoid a rhetoric that keeps resuscitating myths that have already been demythologized and that now only serve to mask the issues and to encourage irrational discourse. Scholarship in and of itself has never been known to harm teaching; "teaching universities" are not the only universities that care deeply about teaching; an infinitesimal number of faculty confront the wrenching choice between teaching and research; there is no excellent teaching without scholarship --broadly defined. In the Preface to this institution's 40 year history, for example, the rhetoric that hampers happy solutions and that hardens prejudices is there in bold face: "Throughout its history, we have had to confront the role that research, as opposed [Italics added] to teaching, plays in the life of a regional university." This team suggests that new beginnings demand new language.

126 / | 3. Establishing a university-wide promotion and tenure review committee that would attempt to maintain uniformly high evaluative standards in all colleges/schools. The present policy, whereby departmental standards are not subject to peer review beyond its borders, might in time lead to divisiveness and militate against a strong identity of the whole.

4. Joining peer institutions across the country which are determined to seek a national identity for regional comprehensive universities that will leave no doubt in anyone's mind of what their mission will be in the 21st century. Such an effort has now been well conceptualized, well structured, and was inaugurated at a national conference at Wright State University in April, 1990. Its agenda is clear and ambitious: to envision the nature of metropolitan universities of this kind for the next century and to rethink the form and texture of the professional lives of their faculties. This team suggests that CSUS attach itself to this movement and keep abreast of its developments through its journal, Metropolitan Universities -- a quarterly designed specifically to debate such matters as the importance of scholarship in the lives of the professoriate.

127 / | 5. Extending opportunities for scholarly and creative activities beyond the faculty so as to include administrators. The life of inquiry is the life of any university. Hence, perhaps no one

should be exempt from its pain and its glory. Many universities now seek administrator/scholars, especially in its academic areas, and expect these individuals to spend some portion of their time engaged in the pursuit of scholarship shared in the traditional ways: publications, addresses at professional meetings, working as a consultant on national projects and for national boards etc. Some have already extended these expectations to administrators in student services, development and finance.

STANDARD SEVEN: DEALING WITH STUDENT SERVICES

Standards 7.A. and 7.B.

An institution supports a co-curricular environment that fosters the intellectual and personal development of students.

Comment
CSUS provides student services that are comprehensive in scope and appropriate to the needs of its increasingly diverse student body.

Comment
Professional staff reporting to the newly appointed Dean of Students, and their colleagues reporting to the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs are competent and dedicated to the well being of students. The team found enthusiasm and support among administrators, faculty, and staff for the new Dean of