

**NB: CHANGE OF MEETING ROOM**

1992-93  
ACADEMIC SENATE  
California State University, Sacramento

AGENDA  
Thursday, May 6, 1993  
ECS 1015  
2:30-4:30 p.m.

**INFORMATION**

1. Faculty allocations for 1993-94 (see Attachments 1 through 3 to Senate Chair's memorandum concerning today's meeting) TIME CERTAIN: 3:15 p.m.
- Postponed* 2. Report of ad hoc Committee on Senate Structure and Function (4/22/93 Agenda Attachment A)  
Sylvia Navari, ad hoc Committee Chair
3. Review and comment on CSUS Strategic Plan themes being developed by the Council for University Planning ("Capital Campus," "Diversity," "Enrollment Planning"--4/22/93 Agenda Attachments B-D)
4. Senate response to draft report of the Assembly Committee on Higher Education on the Master Plan for Higher Education (copy to be distributed at meeting)
5. Mark Your Calendars: Spring Schedule of Regular Senate Meetings, Thursdays, May 13 (2:30, 1993-94 elections; 3:00, 1992-93 Senate), 20 and 27 (finals week, if needed)

**REGULAR AGENDA**

*Carried* AS 93-29/Flr. MINUTES

Approval of the Minutes of meeting of April 15 (#11), 1993.

*Carried* AS 93-36/Flr. MINUTES

Approval of the Minutes of the meeting of April 22 (#12), 1993.

*Carried*

AS 93-37/Flr. MINUTES

Approval of the Minutes of the meeting of April 29 (#13), 1993.

AS 93-34/Flr. GRADE CHANGE/DELETION POLICY

*agreed A  
agreed B*

The Academic Senate objects to the President <sup>*approval in*</sup> overruling the action of the Academic Standards Subcommittee (which would have denied a request to change a "U" grade to "W") and requests a response from the President regarding his view of his role in cases of requests for grade change/deletion.

AS 93-38/FA, Ex. <sup>*Flr.*</sup> FACULTY PROFESSIONAL ETHICS, STATEMENT ON

Whereas, The "Statement on Faculty Professional Ethics" adopted by the campus in 1991 (PM:FSA 91-15, attached) does not speak to the specific faculty responsibilities addressed in the following statement; and

Whereas, The department chairs requested in 1988 that the Senate clarify these responsibilities; and

Whereas, Recent program reviews have raised questions regarding specific faculty responsibilities; therefore be it

Resolved: That the University adopt the following statement on faculty responsibilities and add it--as a second addendum--to the existing Statement on Faculty Professional Ethics.

STATEMENT ON FACULTY PROFESSIONAL ETHICS  
ADDENDUM

Statement of Faculty Responsibilities

I. Scope of this document

The purpose of this document is to define the duties and responsibilities of full-time tenured or tenure-track instructional faculty. No attempt is made to define unprofessional activities which are clearly delineated in the "Statement of Faculty Professional Ethics" (PM:FSA 91-15).

II. Primary areas of responsibility

A. A faculty member must meet all assigned classes as scheduled, unless prior arrangements have been made with the

Department Chair. A faculty member must also share the advisement responsibilities of the department, and hold office hours as scheduled. The primary criteria used in scheduling classes, office hours and advising should be based on serving the needs of the students.

- B. It is expected that faculty will regularly attend department meetings, and will, over the course of a career, provide significant service to a number of department, school or university committees to which they have been elected or appointed.
- C. Faculty are expected to remain current in their fields, as evidenced by such endeavors as research, creative/scholarly activity, curriculum development, participation in the professional life of their disciplines, dissemination of the results of research and scholarly activities, and performance in creative endeavors. *Swanson  
Chopjak  
jailed*
- D. Faculty membership presumes a position of leadership and service in the life of the society of which the University is a part. Discharge of these responsibilities may be evidenced by such activities as serving as a consultant for industry or government agencies, performing research supported by outside agencies, serving as an officer in professional groups, or other service that draws on the faculty's professional expertise. *more  
work  
strike  
D  
carried*
- E. Membership on the faculty is a full-time position. (Article 35 of the faculty bargaining agreement specifies regulations governing outside employment.) Meeting the responsibilities involved in being a faculty member requires that the major portion of the faculty member's time and energies will be devoted to University work.





# California State University, Sacramento

SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95819-6032

## MEMORANDUM

August 29, 1991

PM:FSA 91-15

TO: All Faculty

*D. L. Wagner*

FROM: David L. Wagner, Dean  
Faculty and Staff Affairs

SUBJECT: Statement on Faculty Professional Ethics.

As authorized by President Gerth, the attached Presidential Memorandum is being sent to all faculty at California State University, Sacramento. This "Statement on Faculty Professional Ethics" is the result of very careful consideration by the Academic Senate and recognizes the importance of education as a public service and a public trust. The purpose of this policy is "to affirm the tenets of ethical professional conduct for faculty at California State University, Sacramento and to provide guidance to faculty in following those tenets." Examples of situations which could be considered questionable professional conduct are also provided in this document. Incorporated as an addendum is the "1987 American Association of University Professors Statement on Professional Ethics."

Disciplinary action, if any, invoked for violation of professional ethics is subject to the procedure established in the Memorandum of Understanding between the Board of Trustees and the California Faculty Association as well as applicable provisions of Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations and the California Education Code.

DLW:mlk

Attachment

## STATEMENT ON FACULTY PROFESSIONAL ETHICS

It is the purpose of this document to affirm the tenets of ethical professional conduct for faculty at California State University, Sacramento and to provide guidance to faculty in following those tenets.

The academic community of faculty, students and staff at CSUS shares a dedication to and a responsibility for protecting the right to free inquiry and autonomy, stimulating intellectual growth, and protecting the well-being of all its members. At times, a faculty member may need to make a choice between fulfilling a responsibility to him/herself and fulfilling his/her responsibility to the academic community. The decision made in such a circumstance may cause the faculty member's professional ethics to be called into question.

This statement affirms three main tenets of professional conduct which provide the basis of assessment of an individual's professional ethics. First, a faculty member bases evaluations and judgments regarding students and colleagues on observable evidence and equitable applied standards. Thus, the faculty member avoids exploitation, harassment, or discriminatory treatment of members of the academic community. Second, a faculty member gives priority to the fulfillment of his/her obligation to the academic community over off-campus activities other than those associated with one's ordinary duties and responsibilities. Third, a faculty member honors his/her academic debt to the work of other scholars.

The responsibility for abiding by these tenets lies with the individual faculty member. It is the responsibility of the University to inform the faculty member if the perception has been created that a possible breach of ethics has occurred.

Listed below are some examples of situations in which the choice made by a faculty member could make him/her vulnerable to the accusation that he/she has committed a breach of professional ethics.

1. Making decisions regarding other members of the academic community with whom there is an intimate relationship or when there is unresolved conflict regarding scholarly, pedagogical or other matters between the faculty member and the other individual. Such decisions may include but are not limited to:
  - Evaluating or influencing the evaluation of performance;
  - Assigning or influencing the assignment of work, including faculty teaching loads, schedules, staff responsibilities, and student assignments;

1987 American Association of University Professors  
Statement on Professional Ethics

I. Professors, guided by a deep conviction of the worth and dignity of the advancement of knowledge, recognize the special responsibilities placed upon them. Their primary responsibility to their subject is to seek and to state the truth as they see it. To this end professors devote their energies to developing and improving their scholarly competence. They accept the obligation to exercise critical self-discipline and judgment in using, extending, and transmitting knowledge. They practice intellectual honesty. Although professors may follow subsidiary interests, these interests must never seriously hamper or compromise their freedom of inquiry.

II. As teachers, professors encourage the free pursuit of learning in their students. They hold before them the best scholarly and ethical standards of their discipline. Professors demonstrate respect for students as individuals and adhere to their proper roles as intellectual guides and counselors. Professors make every reasonable effort to foster honest academic conduct and to assure that their evaluations of students reflect each student's true merit. They respect the confidential nature of the relationship between professor and student. They avoid any exploitation, harassment, or discriminatory treatment of students. They acknowledge significant academic or scholarly assistance from them. They protect their academic freedom.

III. As colleagues, professors have obligations that derive from common membership in the community of scholars. Professors do not discriminate against or harass colleagues. They respect and defend the free inquiry of associates. In the exchange of criticism and ideas professors show due respect for the opinions of others. Professors acknowledge academic debt and strive to be objective in their professional judgment of colleagues. Professors accept their share of faculty responsibilities for the governance of their institution.

IV. As members of an academic institution, professors seek above all to be effective teachers and scholars. Although professors observe the stated regulations of the institution, provided the regulations do not contravene academic freedom, they maintain their right to criticize and seek revision. Professors give due regard to their paramount responsibilities within their institution in determining the amount and character of work done outside it. When considering the interruption or termination of their service, professors recognize the effect of their decision upon the program of the institution and give due notice of their intentions.

V. As members of their community, professors have the rights and obligations of other citizens. Professors measure the urgency of these obligations in the light of their responsibilities to their subject, to their students, to their profession, and to their institution. When they speak or act as private persons they avoid creating the impression of speaking or acting for their college or university. As citizens engaged in a profession that depends upon freedom for its health and integrity, professors have a particular obligation to promote conditions of free inquiry and to further public understanding of academic freedom.

- Awarding compensating time off to faculty and staff, including "assigned time";

- Distributing professional development funds, including travel money.

2. Persistently failing to honor obligations of the teaching profession, such as meeting classes, being accessible to students during office hours, providing a course syllabus for students and adhering to it, providing students with timely and relevant feedback, or violating existing campus policy such as giving a final examination during the last week of instruction.

3. Undertaking off-campus commitments other than those associated with one's ordinary duties and responsibilities when these commitments conflict with one's obligations to meet classes, hold office hours, and fulfill responsibilities to department and campus committees and projects.

4. Establishing a significant financial or contractual obligation with another member of the academic community when the possibility exists that one member may have influence over the other's evaluation.

5. Choosing whom to credit for significant contributions to one's research/scholarly activity.

6. Revealing confidential, sensitive or negative information regarding any member of the academic community.

A member of the faculty who is found, after an investigation, to be in violation of the tenets of professional ethics is subject to the appropriate disciplinary action as described in the Agreement Between the Board of Trustees of the California State University and the California Faculty Association, Unit 3-- Faculty.



# California State University, Sacramento

SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95819-6036

ACADEMIC SENATE



May 3, 1993

Hon. Marguerite Archie-Hudson, Chair  
Assembly Committee on Higher Education  
State Capitol  
P. O. Box 942849  
Sacramento, CA 94249-001

Dear Ms. Archie-Hudson:

The Academic Senate of California State University, Sacramento, has directed me to respond on its behalf to the draft report of the Assembly Higher Education Committee. First of all we would like to thank the members of the Committee for your recognition of the seriousness of the crisis confronting public colleges and universities, for your thoughtful study of the issues, and for your dedication to developing recommendations that will enhance higher education for California's citizens.

We would like to share our views on each of the ten recommendations contained in the report.

Recommendation 1: We agree with your statement regarding the mission of the state system of higher education, and like your special mention of the importance of enhancing diversity and equity. We are perplexed, however, by your emphasis on education of first time students in the same sentence that you cite occupational retraining as an essential function. In response to 1) the desire for California to be in the forefront of modern technology, and 2) the people's need to adjust to the state's changing economy, we believe that occupational retraining should be encouraged, not discouraged. Designating returning students as lower priority and requiring them to pay substantially higher fees sends the opposite message.

Your recommendation to focus lower division growth in the community colleges also concerns us. We believe that students are best served by entry into the highest segment of the educational system for which they qualify for three principle reasons: 1) In the CSU and the UC, lower division students have opportunities to interact with majors and graduate students who enrich the intellectual environment and serve as role models for academic achievement. 2) Faculty who teach upper division and graduate courses also are able to bring additional perspectives to the teaching of lower division courses, and often are more

aware of professional and graduate school opportunities in their respective disciplines than are faculty who provide instruction at the lower division level only. 3) Students in the CSU and UC have the opportunity to take upper division as well as lower division courses during their first two years.

In addition, we wish to note that lower division instruction is less expensive than upper division. A further decline in lower division enrollment would raise costs per student in the CSU. At CSUS, lower division enrollment now stands at 17%, and we believe that that figure is too low. One reason is that faculty involvement in designing, teaching, and evaluating lower division courses is a cornerstone of coherent major programs that build upon the lower division foundation. A complete disjunction between lower and upper division courses could seriously compromise the coherence of major programs, and thus do a disservice to students.

Recommendation 2: With respect to your recommendations on tuition and fees, we are again dismayed by your singling out of first time students for freedom from tuition. We also disagree with making a distinction between undergraduate and graduate students, since the graduate students whom we teach are often retraining, or are acquiring additional skills in order to advance in their professions. Very few are financially well-heeled; many are in human services professions such as social work and education, and will simply not be able to afford graduate education. Loans are not a solution either for many students, who will not achieve a high enough income level to be able to pay them back without additional severe financial hardship.

We are pleased with the recommendation that fees not rise more than 10% per year, and that six months notice be required. We also think that fee assessment based on financial means, and waivers in lieu of offsetting grant aid are good ideas.

Recommendation 3: We would like to point out that "normal" progress toward degree completion is greater than four years at our institution, and has been so for many years. The overwhelming majority of CSUS students work, many of them full-time. They are part-time students because of competing responsibilities, not because they are unable to enroll in specific courses.

Your suggestion (strategy 3.1) that curricula should be reconfigured when adequate numbers of course sections cannot be



scheduled strikes us as very dangerous: we believe that curricula must be grounded in academic standards of the various disciplines, and that California graduates must complete coursework comparable to that of graduates in other areas of the country. Anything less will mean that California degrees are substandard, and our graduates are disadvantaged in the market place.

The question of whether or not students should have to enroll in courses which they wish to challenge is a curricular matter which, we believe, should be left to the campuses. The time which faculty need to invest in evaluating challenges to course work is extremely variable. Paper and pencil tests are sometimes only a small part of these assessments. For example, when laboratory or field work competencies are involved, several one-to-one meetings with the student must be held.

Recommendation 4: We support these recommendations, with the exception of strategies 4.3 and 4.4. With respect to the former, we would not oppose a study of the feasibility of reducing the normal degree duration to three vs. four years. However, we maintain that this is a curricular issue, and should not be decided on the basis of fiscal exigencies. Students in California's public universities must receive an education that meets the standards of the discipline, and is comparable to that of students in other parts of the country. Otherwise this state will have an inferior workforce, and her graduates will not be able to compete.

We take vigorous exception to strategy 4.4, which recommends consolidation of basic skills education in the community colleges. Our specific concerns are the following:

1. The number of students involved: Fifty percent of regularly admitted students require at least one semester of precollege level coursework in math or English.
2. Need for precollege level work is usually in only one area: if students are able to meet CSUS standards of performance in every area except mathematics, or are highly successful in Engineering but have substandard writing skills, it is not appropriate to send them back to community colleges.
3. Small group vs. large class instruction: At CSUS we use carefully supervised teaching associates, graduate assistants and upper division student tutors to deliver basic skills instruction. For example, the Entry Level Math equivalency course for students who need only a short review is taught by

graduate students and student assistants; the entire pre-college level reading program is staffed by graduate student interns at no cost to the university. These models are extremely cost effective and have the additional benefit of providing part time employment to students.

4. Impact on diversity of the student body: 73% of entering freshmen enrolled in Intensive Learning Experience classes in Fall 1992 were underrepresented minority students; 88% of ESL transfer students need one or more semesters of ESL coursework in order to meet the Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement, and many of these students have successfully completed ESL and regular coursework at the community college which they attended.
5. Changing demographics of the region: The Sacramento Bee of April 28, 1993, included an article indicating that 32% of Californians now speak a language other than English at home. Many students from ESL households will continue to need support in the area of written English during their college years, as an integral part of their program. We strongly believe that those who can meet the challenges of other coursework in the CSU or the UC should receive this support.
6. Lack of mobility: There is no direct bus service between CSUS and the four community colleges in the area. Most of our students do not have time in their schedules to ride several buses between campuses, nor can they afford private cars in which to shuttle back and forth.

Finally, with respect to this matter, we would like to pass on to you some concerns expressed by the Chair of our Ethnic Studies Program, Professor Otis Scott:

"I am especially concerned that should the implementation of Strategy 4.4 become a fact, it will bring about a system of higher education where increasing numbers of students from lower economic levels and most students of color coming from urban based schools will be attending community colleges while students from higher income levels and school districts with greater resources will attend the CSU and the UC.

This eventuality becomes a certainty given the dire financial times confronting school districts having sizeable populations of underrepresented students. These students are likely not to receive adequate curriculum counseling and are likely not to have access to the classes necessary to fulfilling subject matter requirements for regular admission to the CSU and UC. I am not at all enthralled with a

proposal which will result in a CSU Sacramento serving only a select cohort of the public."

Recommendation 5: We agree that teaching is the primary mission of the CSU, but we would like to note that faculty must practice their disciplines in order to stay current, and for many of us that means engaging in scholarly activity, including research and curriculum development. We also believe that students ought to be involved in faculty-sponsored scholarly activity, so that they learn how knowledge is created.

California-trained doctoral degree holders are recruited with as much vigor as degree holders from elsewhere. Our recruitment problem is that our salaries and working conditions are not competitive enough to attract individuals trained in California, who frequently have offers of employment throughout the country.

With respect to teaching loads: the required teaching assignment for faculty in the CSU is four courses per semester. If a faculty member is not teaching four courses, it is because he or she is assigned to other teaching related activities, e.g., field work supervision, thesis supervision, part-time work in the academic advising center or educational equity programs. We also would like to point out that class sizes have risen dramatically for many of us, so that we are teaching the equivalent of five, not four courses per semester.

Recommendation 6: We are generally supportive of these recommendations and would especially like to commend you for proposing that the Trustees of the CSU be released from regulatory oversight and control by other state agencies. We believe that the system will benefit from greater independence and flexibility.

Recommendation 7: We heartily endorse these recommendations and commend you for your sensitivity to the shift from a manufacturing to a service economy, the need for defense conversion, and general economic revitalization. However, we again note the contradiction between this thrust and the increased fees and lower priority status proposed for non first-time students.

Recommendation 8: While we applaud the idea of community service for everyone, we think that requiring this of all students on all campuses is too restrictive. The average age of our undergraduates is 24. Many are working full time, going to college full time, and have family responsibilities in addition. Some are single parents.

A state support program for students who engage in public service employment or volunteerism after graduation is an intriguing idea, which we support. Tax breaks and loan forgiveness would both seem to be appropriate approaches.

Recommendation 9: Once again we commend you for your foresight in supporting expansion of our capacity to use innovative applications of new technologies. We would only note that large lectures and televised classes must be balanced with student involvement in discussion with both fellow students and professors. Our data on retention of underrepresented students indicate that formation of relationships with professors and with fellow students is a vital factor. Research also pinpoints talking about academic material as a key factor in learning, integrating and applying information, as well as retaining it over the long term.

Recommendation 10: We strongly agree with you on all points in this section. We would only add that the legislature needs to have control over a greater portion of the state budget, and that the entire budgetary process urgently needs reform.

We thank you for this opportunity to respond to your recommendations, and again, we express our gratitude for your concern about these issues which are so vital to the future of California's citizens. I would welcome your contacting me if I can provide you with additional information.

Yours sincerely,



Charlotte Cook, Chair  
Academic Senate

in consultation with the CSU Academic Senators from CSU,  
Sacramento: Professors Juanita Barrena, Erwin Kelly, and Arthur  
Jensen

CC:j

cc: Academic Senate Members, CSUS  
S. Wilcox, CSU Academic Senate Chair  
B. Munitz, Chancellor, CSU  
D. Gerth, President Gerth, CSUS