

Jan

1995-96
ACADEMIC SENATE
California State University, Sacramento

AGENDA
Thursday, March 28, 1996
Forest Suite, University Union
2:30-4:30 p.m.

INFORMATION

1. Moment of Silence:

DOROTHY A. SEXTER
Professor of History Emeritus
CSUS 1967-1988

EDWARD C. (TED) BRITTON
Professor of Education Emeritus
CSUS 1950-1980

2. Spring 1996 Schedule of Meetings (tentative):

April 11, 18*, 25

May 2* (1996-97 Nominations), 9, 16* (1996-97 Elections), 23

CONSENT CALENDAR

AS 96-18/Ex. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS--University

Campus Educational Equity Committee:

Rhonda Rios Kravitz, Senator, 1996
Ruth Wang, SBA, 1996

Committee on Administrative Review:

STEVE GREGORICH, At-large, 1998 (repl. R. Rodriguez)

Selection Advisory Committee, Dean, School of Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies:

ANNE COWDEN, At-large
OLIVIA CASTELLANO, At-large (w/diversity expertise)

Selection Advisory Committee, Dean, School of Natural Sciences and Mathematics:

SUSAN HOLL, At-large
SAM RIOS, At-large (w/diversity expertise)

AS 96-19/Ex. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS--Senate

Academic Policies Committee:

THOMAS KANDO, Executive Committee Member, 1996 (repl. N. Ostiguy)

ad hoc Library Self Study Committee:

Mark Stoner

A. R. Gutowsky

Robert Kloss

AS 95-20/CC, GPPC, Ex. CURRICULUM REVIEW--DIVISION OF SOCIAL WORK

The Academic Senate receives the commendations and recommendations of the Curriculum Committee and the Graduate Policies and Programs Committee on the program review of the Division of Social Work (Attachment A) and recommends that: 1) the Bachelor of Arts and Minor programs be approved for a period of six years or until the next review, and 2) the Master of Social Work program be approved for a period of six years or until the next program review, conditional on University approval of the proposed revision of the program..

AS 95-21/Ex. CONVOCAION, REQUEST FOR

The Academic Senate requests that a convocation be called for the presentation "Cyberspace and Academic Freedom," to be given by Robert O'Neil, on Thursday, April 18, 4:00 p.m., in the University Theatre.

AS 96-22/UARTP, Ex. UNIVERSITY ARTP POLICY, AMEND SECTION 6.12
(ADJUNCT FACULTY)

The Academic Senate recommends that Section 6.12, Appointment of Adjunct Faculty, of the University ARTP policy document (Attachment B) be amended as shown below (strikeover = deletion; underscore = addition):

In addition, the Academic Senate recommends that 1) the Vice President for Academic Affairs review on an annual basis each school's compliance with Section 6.12.C of the policy, and 2) that during the fifth full semester following the approval of this policy, the Vice President for Academic Affairs shall report in detail to the Academic Senate and the University ARTP Committee on the circumstances, use and compliance with the authority created by Section 6.12.C of this policy.

6.12 Appointment of Adjunct Faculty

A. ...

B. ...

C. The University welcomes the participation of adjunct faculty as instructors of record in selected circumstances. Adjunct faculty may possess special and unique expertise not possessed by currently or recently employed part-time and full-time temporary faculty or currently employed full-time probationary and permanent faculty. Adjunct faculty may be appointed as instructors of record under the following conditions:

1. That appointees shall possess special and unique expertise directly and immediately related to all of the topics defining the course to be taught.
2. That each appointment shall in general be limited to a single class per semester during the year of appointment.
3. That each recommendation for an appointment shall be considered and adopted by the part-time hiring committee, if any, and the Chair of the primary unit in which the appointee will serve.
4. That prior to reappointment an evaluation of performance shall be conducted and the results reviewed, by the pertinent primary unit under the standards and procedures that the primary unit applies to the evaluation to part-time temporary faculty.
5. That the recommendations to appoint or reappoint shall be accompanied by a written statement of reasons, including an evaluation of performance in the case of subsequent appointment.
6. That the authority to appoint shall not be exercised in a way that results in the appointment as volunteers of persons whose qualifications are ordinarily available among those seeking part-time or full-time employment.
7. That appointments or reappointments shall be made to only those persons who cannot or will not accept a compensated appointment.

ED.

DE. ...

4. Except for appointments made pursuant to Section 6.12.C. Appointments may be made for terms ranging from one semester to a maximum of two years. Appointments will be renewed only after review and by mutual consent.

EE. ...

CONSENT - INFORMATION

AS 96-14/Ex. MISSION STATEMENT, CSU, SACRAMENTO (Amends AS 89-41)

The Executive Committee, on behalf of the Academic Senate, recommends approval of the reformatting (see Attachment C) of the CSU, Sacramento Mission Statement for inclusion in the 1997-99 Catalog.

AS 96-15/CPC. Ex. PROGRAM CHANGES--UNDERGRADUATE

The Executive Committee, on behalf of the Academic Senate, recommends approval of the following program change proposals:

1. B.A. in Communication Studies: Designate units for Area Requirements, Research Methods, and Electives in each area under the General Concentration, with specific lists of electives being deleted; designate units for Area Requirements, Research Methods, and Electives in each option under the Media Communication Concentration; designate Concentration Requirements as 6 units, Research Methods as 3 units, and Electives as 12 units for the Organizational Communication Concentration.
2. B.A. in Economics: ECON 140 alternate for ECON 145 as Required Upper Division Course.
3. B.A. in Home Economics - General Overview: Summary of program changes.
4. B.A. in Home Economics: Add new concentration in Apparel Marketing and Design.
5. B.A. in Home Economics: Addition of new concentration in Family and Consumer Sciences.
6. B.A. in Home Economics: Addition of new concentration in Nutrition and Food.
7. B.A. in Interior Design: Increase total units required for the major from 66 to 68;

- Required Lower Division Courses increased from 25 to 27 units as ART 20 increases from 2 to 3 units and the "one of the following" ART course increases from 2 to 3 units.
8. Subject Matter Program for the Single Subject Teaching Credential in the Sciences: Additional course work to Biology, Chemistry, Geosciences, and Physics Subject Matter Programs required by new standards.
 9. Minor in Human Resources Management: Addition of new minor.
 10. Minor in Real Estate and Land Use Affairs: Addition of new minor.
 11. B.S. in Business Administration - Real Estate and Land Use Affairs Concentration: Reduce upper division units from 21 to 18; increase lower division units from 0 to 3.
 12. B.S. in Physical Education - Exercise Science Option: Decrease required units from option from {83-84} to {80-81}; decrease Required Upper Division Courses from 35 to 32 units by deleting HUES 170 as a required course.

AS 96-16/CPC, Ex. PROGRAM CHANGES--GRADUATE

The Executive Committee, on behalf of the Academic Senate, recommends approval of the following program change proposals:

1. MBA in Urban Land Development: Increase Program requirements from 6 to 15 units; decrease concentration requirements from 12 to 9 units; decrease electives from 12 to 6 units; add Culminating Experience, 1-3 units.
2. M.S. in Counseling: Addition of Community Counseling Program.
3. Reading Specialist Credential Program: Decreasing required number of units for the program from 27 to 24 units by deleting EDTE 209 from Strand 1 of current program requirements.
4. M.S. in Computer Science: Changes to the following area requirements: Delete CSC 218 from Artificial Intelligence; delete Mathematical Applications and Robotics Systems options; add CSC 233 and 234 to Software Engineering; add CSC 250 to System Software; add Computer Engineering Area to MS program.
5. M.S. in Recreation Administration: Decrease units of Required Courses from 12 to 9 by deleting RLS 201; increase Elective units from {14-18} to {18-21}; change units for Culminating Requirement from {0-4} to {1-3}. Insert additional narrative information under Degree Requirements.

AS 96-17/CPC, Ex. MASTER PLAN PROJECTION--MASTER'S DEGREE IN PHYSICAL THERAPY

The Executive Committee, on behalf of the Academic Senate, recommends approval of the proposal to project a Master's Degree in Physical Therapy by converting the current B.S. Degree, effective Fall 1998.

REGULAR AGENDA

AS 96-13/Flr. MINUTES

Approval of the Minutes of February 15, 1996 (#11).

AS 96-23/Flr. PERFORMANCE SALARY STEP INCREASE POLICY (Amends Interim Policy AS 95-76; PM/FSA 96-01)

The Academic Senate recommends the following procedural modifications to the Interim CSUS Performance Salary Step Increase Policy (AS 95-76; PM/FSA 96-01) (refer to Attachment D, "CSUS Interim PSSI Policy Issues Identified by Departments as Needing Procedural Clarification":

A. Nomination Process:

44
An applicant may elect to submit a letter of nomination as part of his/her application package. If so elected, the letter shall then be counted as part of the appended materials and its length included in the calculation of the prescribed page limit. [Note: See "Instructions" page (Attachment E) "A" for change.]

B. Page Limit:

Include in item 2 on "INSTRUCTIONS:" page: "... (in three (3) typed, single spaced, single sided, pages or less) ..." [Note: See "Instructions" page (Attachment E) "B" for change.]

The department chair or equivalent shall review each application package for compliance with the three page limit on the narrative section and five page limit on supporting evidence. All pages exceeding these limits shall be physically removed from the application package and returned to the applicant. The "censored" application package shall then proceed, without prejudice, through the evaluation process. [Note: To be incorporated in policy and/or "Instructions," as appropriate.]

C. Incomplete Applications:

An application package must contain, at a minimum, a completed "Application and Nomination Form: Cover Page." The mere absence of a narrative and/or support materials, however, shall not disqualify an application from continuing through the review process. (The department chair or equivalent shall verify compliance with this minimum.) *[Note: To be incorporated in policy and/or "Instructions," as appropriate.]*

D. Abstentions:

Abstentions shall not be interpreted as either a "yes" or a "no" vote, or included in the voting base when determining a simple majority of the votes cast. *[Note: To be incorporated in policy and/or "Instructions," as appropriate.]*

E. Committee Formations:

All review or recommending committees shall be established normally by the end of each Spring semester. *[Note: To be incorporated in policy and/or "Instructions," as appropriate.]*

F. University Level Review Committees:

aff
The composition of a University level review committee (irrespective of the number of levels of review, and assuming that one exists) should be: 1 librarian, 1 SSP-AR, and 2 faculty from each school. *[Note: To be incorporated in policy as appropriate and the "Review Recommendation Page" (Attachment F).]*

G. Tie Votes: *[Note: 1 - 3, to be incorporated in policy and/or "Instructions," as appropriate.]*

1. A tie vote on "Outstanding/Meritorious" performance (Item 2. on the Review/Recommendation Page) shall be interpreted as "No Recommendation." In such instances of "No Recommendation," the committee shall proceed to vote on "NOT Recommended for a PSSI award" or "RECOMMENDED for a PSSI Award" (Item 3. on the Review/Recommendation Page). The form (Item 2) should be changed to read:

- Outstanding/Meritorious: NO (Requires a simple majority vote; Terminate process)
 YES (Go to Item 3 below)
 TIE Vote (Go To Item 3 below)

2. A tie vote on "Recommended for a PSSI award ..." (Item 3. on the Review/Recommendation Page) shall be interpreted as a negative recommendation for a PSSI award. The form (Item 3) should be changed to read:

- NOT Recommended for a PSSI award (Terminate Process)
- TIE Vote (Terminate Process)
- RECOMMENDED for a PSSI award---->
 - Level 1 (1 Step Increase)
 - Level 2 (2 Step Increase)
 - Level 3 (3 Step Increase)
 - Level 4 (4 Step Increase)
 - Level 5 (5 Step Increase)

3. If an applicant is recommended for a PSSI award but there is a tie vote on the "Level" of the award, i.e., "Level 1" and "Level 2," the committee shall indicate in its recommendation the levels where the tie had occurred, e.g., a tie vote occurred on/between "Level 1" and "Level 2."

H. Basis for Requiring Additional Information:

Modify PSSI Policy, provisions 6.4 and 8.4. "~~The members of a DLRC (ULRC) by a simple majority vote,~~ may request an applicant to provide additional information that directly supports and/or corroborates statements specifically made or referred to in the narrative section of an application."

AS 96-24/Flr. PERFORMANCE SALARY STEP INCREASE POLICY--LEVELS OF REVIEW (Amends Interim Policy AS 95-76; PM/FSA 96-01)

The Academic Senate recommends establishing a single Performance Salary Step Increase review/recommending committee (refer to Attachment G, "CSUS Interim PSSI Policy Issues Identified by Departments as Needing Substantive Clarification").

AS 96-24A/Flr. PERFORMANCE SALARY STEP INCREASE POLICY--SCHOOL REVIEW

The Performance Salary Step Increase review/recommending committee shall be established at the school level.

AS 96-24B/Flr. PERFORMANCE SALARY STEP INCREASE POLICY--UNIVERSITY REVIEW

The Performance Salary Step Increase review/recommending committee shall be established at the University level.

AS 96-25/Flr. FACULTY EVALUATION AND SELF-ASSESSMENT

Discussion item (see Attachment H).

March 28 Academic Senate Agenda

Add Moment of Silence for:

PASCHAL MONK
Professor of Music Emeritus
CSUS 1950-1974

After reviewing thoroughly the attached Academic Program Review Report for the Division of Social Work, prepared by the Review Team, the Academic Senate ad hoc Program Review Subcommittee makes 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 AND RECOMMENDATIONS
FOR THE DIVISION OF SOCIAL WORK
SCHOOL OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

COMMENDATIONS:

The Program Review Team commends the Division of Social Work for

- its dedicated and effective faculty;
- the extraordinary scholarly activity of many of its faculty;
- its vigorous leadership, effective in the management of the Division and the reorganization of its graduate curriculum;
- its professional and effective efforts to meet accreditation commission concerns;
- its dedicated and effective staff;
- its graduate students' high level of responses to graduation polls;
- the Division's dedication to providing off-campus programs for the CSUS region;
- and
- its frank and professional cooperation with the Program Review Team.

RECOMMENDATION TO THE DIVISION OF SOCIAL WORK:

1. The Division of Social Work should clarify its policy regarding General Education prerequisites for the Major and should consider requiring specific or limited choices of lower-division and upper-division as prerequisites or as requirements for the Major. (p. 14)
2. The Division of Social Work should consider measures to balance its current and anticipated resources with its academic responsibilities; measures considered should include:
 - A) increasing the Division's General Education offerings;
 - B) reducing the number of majors in one or both of its degree programs to reduce the number of course sections offered;
 - C) reducing the number of units required for the BA by at least 6 units;
 - D) the greater use of cross-listed courses and of interdisciplinary courses;
 - E) the development of an Advanced Standing program which allows significant numbers of applicants with Social Work BA's credit for the M.S.W. Foundation courses. (p. 28)
3. The Division should specify the procedures and the types of evidence used by the Peer Review Committee to judge faculty currency in the field. (P. 38)

RECOMMENDATION TO THE DEAN OF THE SCHOOL OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES:

1. The School of Health and Human Services should evaluate the possibilities of investing such capital in future off-campus programs as will permit the FTE for their programs to return to campus, to be credited to the unit providing the program. (p. 21)
2. The Dean of the School of Health and Human Services should consult with School unit chairs regarding the use of cross-listed courses and development of interdisciplinary courses which will improve the efficiency of the School without hurting the quality of its programs. (p. 26)
3. The Dean of Health and Human Services should, upon implementation of the new M.S.W. generalist curriculum and improvements in graduate student morale, review the priority ranking of the M.S.W. and, if appropriate, recommend reclassification. (p. 34)

RECOMMENDATION TO ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

Academic Affairs should consider a reordering of the program review schedule in order to review a school over a one to two-year period. Such review cycles should review units within the school and thereafter school governance, core programs, the interaction of units, research development and allocation, and the vitality of school relations with the community. (Program Review Team)

RECOMMENDATION TO THE DEAN OF GENERAL EDUCATION AND THE DIVISION OF SOCIAL WORK:

The Division of Social Work should consult with the Dean of General Education regarding measures which the Division might take to increase its General Education offerings and enrollments. The consultation should include consideration of the use of distance learning course offerings. (p. 23)

RECOMMENDATION TO THE DEAN OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, THE DEAN OF GENERAL EDUCATION, AND THE DIVISION OF SOCIAL WORK:

The Dean of the School of Health and Human Services, the Director of the Division of Social Work and the Dean of General Education should consult with the CSU, Chico Social Work program regarding opportunities for sharing classes. (p. 26)

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

1. The Academic Senate should investigate and make appropriate recommendations concerning an administration of off-campus programs which will allow the FTE for such programs to be credited to the unit offering the program. (p. 21)
2. The Academic Senate approves for a period of six years or until the next program review the Division of Social Work Bachelor of Arts and Minor programs.
3. The Academic Senate approves for a period of six years or until the next program review the Division of Social Work Master of Social Work program, conditional on University approval of the proposed revision of the program.

so long as the following standard is met: No CSU employee shall vote, make recommendations, or in any way participate in decisions about any personnel matter which may directly affect the selection, appointment, retention, tenure, compensation, promotion, termination, other employment status or interest of a close relative. For the purposes of this policy, "close relative" is defined as husband, wife, mother, father, son, daughter, sister, and brother.

6.12 Appointment of Adjunct Faculty

- A. When it is demonstrated that an individual in the community has particular competencies which will enhance and benefit the education program of the University, such person may be made a volunteer employee with the title of adjunct faculty.
- B. Adjunct appointments may be made for persons fulfilling the following roles:
 1. Collaborators in research and/or teaching: It is recognized that there may be professional scientists, scholars, creative artists, emeritus faculty, teachers, etc. in the community who have a close working relationship with the faculty of this university, and that in certain instances it would be valuable to the university to formalize that relationship by an appointment as an adjunct instructor or adjunct professor. When such appointments are made in connection with grant-supported research, the principal investigator for the project must be a member of the regular faculty.
 2. Assistants to Instructors:

Adjunct appointments may be made for a non-paid person to assist a regular, full-time instructor. In such cases, the regular employee must be the instructor of record and must assume the normal instructional responsibilities such as planning, determining requirements, and assigning grades.
 3. Field Work Supervisors:

Although field work and/or project supervisors are not generally considered eligible for adjunct professor status, it may be desirable occasionally to recognize certain key professionals in the community agencies who assist in student placement

and supervision with an appointment is contemplated, the school dean must investigate thoroughly and certify both the qualifications of the appointee and the value that the arrangement will have for the institution. Such supervisors must possess qualifications equivalent to those required for appointment to a university faculty position.

- C. Such appointees will be granted certain faculty privileges such as the issuance of a faculty identification card, use of the library, and eligibility to purchase a faculty parking sticker, and Worker's compensation coverage.

The use of laboratory facilities may be authorized when appropriate, and office space may be assigned when available. However, the use of campus facilities by such appointees must not interfere in any way with the instructional program or the teaching and research of regular faculty.

- D. The following guidelines will apply to appointment of adjunct faculty:

1. Each appointment must be to the mutual benefit of the appointee and the university.
2. Recommendations for appointment shall originate in the departments and receive the same review of qualifications as required for regular appointment.
 - a. A person appointed must have qualifications equal to those of regular faculty or must possess special and unique qualifications germane to the assignment. The appointment title should be appropriate to the individual's qualifications (e.g., Adjunct Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, etc.).
 - b. A request for an adjunct appointment must include a resume, a full explanation of duties to be performed during the time of appointment, and an explanation of the mutual benefit of the appointment.
3. Authority to appoint adjunct faculty is delegated to the deans of the schools by the President. Adjunct appointments must be carefully considered and must be fully justified in writing by the

school dean concerned. Overall supervision of such appointees will be the responsibility of the school dean.

4. Appointments may be for terms ranging from one semester to a maximum of two years. Appointments will be renewed only after review and by mutual consent.
- E. For official record-keeping purposes, copies of all adjunct faculty appointment letters will be sent to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Dean of Faculty and Staff Affairs.

7.00 PROBATION AND TENURE

7.01 Probation

- A. "The term probationary faculty unit employee refers to a full-time faculty unit employee appointed with probationary status and serving a period of probation." (M.O.U. 13.1)
- B. "A probationary period is the period of service, prior to the granting or denial of tenure, credited to a faculty unit employee who has received a probationary appointment." (M.O.U. 13.2)
- C. "The normal period of probation shall be a total of six (6) years of full-time probationary service and credited service, if any. Any deviation from the normal six (6) year probationary period shall be the decision of the President following his/her consideration of recommendations from the department or equivalent unit and appropriate administrator(s). This provision shall not affect the probationary period of faculty unit employees appointed prior to October 1, 1983." (M.O.U. 13.3)
- D. "The President, upon recommendation by the affected department or equivalent unit, may grant to a faculty unit employee at the time of initial appointment to probationary status up to two (2) years service credit for probation based on previous service at a postsecondary education institution, previous full-time CSU employment, or comparable experience." (M.O.U. 13.4)
- E. Such award of credit shall be considered a special condition of employment and shall be stated in writing to the employee at the time of initial employment.

UNIVERSITY MISSION

The mission of California State University, Sacramento--a regional comprehensive public university--is to preserve, communicate, and advance knowledge; cultivate wisdom; encourage creativity; promote the value of humankind; and improve the quality of life for its graduates and the people of the region. The education of students is the central mission of the University. Therefore, the University faculty's primary responsibilities are teaching and the creation of an active learning environment for students.

The University is committed to the principle that responsible and knowledgeable persons freely exercising reason in the pursuit of individual and community interests play a significant and beneficial role in addressing society's problems and enriching life. Education liberates individuals from ignorance, intolerance, and dogmatism, freeing them for critical and reflective thought, and for wise and effective action. The University is committed to helping students develop a sense of self-confidence and self-worth, respect for diverse cultures, awareness of important social and moral issues, and concern for others. The University strives to provide students with opportunities for active participation in academic and extracurricular activities which will contribute to their ability to function productively in a rapidly changing society.

We reaffirm the value of and need for education of the whole person in the tradition of a liberal undergraduate education. Building on the fundamental knowledge and skills acquired through a general education program, the University offers traditional liberal arts disciplines and professional studies which emphasize three critical curricular values--acquisition of knowledge,

the development of critical thought processes, and the synthesis of knowledge-hallmarks of an educated person.

The University further enhances the intellectual life of the campus through its graduate and post-baccalaureate program offerings and research centers. Masters, post-baccalaureate certificates, and joint doctoral programs advance students' educational achievements and prepare them for professional and leadership positions throughout the region and in society.

As a regional resource the University is committed to providing educational opportunities that contribute to the cultural and economic development of the region. The University strives to advance the public good through collaboration with government, social and cultural agencies, and businesses and industries within the region.

The University's mission is guided by fundamental values which reflect its identity as a public, regional, comprehensive, metropolitan university. Thus, California State University, Sacramento seeks to offer individuals the opportunity to realize their highest aspirations and become active and involved citizens for the good of the individual and society.

GOALS

In fulfilling its mission the University strives:

- To offer academic programs characterized by high quality, serious attention to outcomes, recognition of the interdisciplinary nature of knowledge, commitment to life-long learning and preparing an educated citizenry, and responsiveness to regional needs.
- To achieve excellence in teaching and learning.

- To build and support a university community whose excellence in teaching, learning, research, and public service is strengthened by scholarship.
- To develop a campus community whose diversity enriches the lives of all and whose members develop mutual respect and a strong sense of personal and community identity.
- To develop a sense of community and intellectual excitement among students, faculty, staff, and alumni through all aspects of the learning experience.
- To make the University a dynamic force that contributes significantly to the social, cultural, and intellectual vitality of the region and to its economic success.
- To establish interdisciplinary, collaborative partnerships between the University and the state capital community which enhance the teaching, scholarship, and service of the University.

**CSUS INTERIM PERFORMANCE SALARY STEP INCREASE POLICY
ISSUES IDENTIFIED BY DEPARTMENTS
AS NEEDING PROCEDURAL CLARIFICATION
(AS 95-76;PM/FSA 96-01)**

A. Nomination Process

The letter of nomination, if attached, should count in the five (5)-page total for submitted materials as a way to even out and equalize material provided by nominees and applicants.

B. Page Limit

Should the policy address what to do with applications which exceed page limits or doesn't follow other directions? One department accepted all applications even if they exceeded the prescribed number of pages while other committees decided not to read beyond the eight page of any application -- including supporting documentation. Another, agreed that any application exceeding the page limit was to be deemed ineligible and not recommended because the applicant did not follow directions -- not following directions was evidence of not being meritorious.

C. Incomplete Applications

One committee stated that it considered an application to be "incorrect" [incomplete] if either the narrative or cover page was missing.

D. Abstentions

How should abstention be treated? Two committees established that an abstention did not count as either "yes" or "no" vote.

E. Committee Formations

Need for review or recommending committees to be established by the end of the Spring semester.

F. University Level Review Committees

Composition of the University Level Review Committee (ULRC) should include one (1) representative total from Coaches, Librarians and SSP-AR's because of the extremely small size of the number of faculty represented.

G. Tie Votes

1. What does a tie vote mean? One committee established that an irreconcilable tie is considered to occur if three successive votes are taken to break the tie without

**CSUS INTERIM PERFORMANCE SALARY STEP
INCREASE POLICY ISSUES IDENTIFIED BY DEPARTMENTS
AS NEEDING PROCEDURAL CLARIFICATION**

Page 2

success. Similarly, an irreconcilable tie resulting from a vote taken on the level of recommendation and/or salary step was considered a vote for the lowest level of recommendation and/or salary step.

2. Given Item 3 on the DLRC and ULRC evaluation form provides for a recommendation of "NOT Recommended for a PSSI award" and "RECOMMENDED for a PSSI award ..." there is no reason to have either committee address item 2 -- rate each applicant as "Outstanding/Meritorious" or "Not Outstanding." There is no loss in information or dilution of the evaluation process by omitting item 2. Certainly if a faculty member needed help we could find a more positive way to suggest improvement than starting out with that label ["Not Outstanding"]. Try to remove "negative" labels from the form(s). *[Note: Since this comment pertains to the formatting of Item 2 of the Review/Recommendation Page, we've placed it here under "Tie Votes."]*

H. Basis for Requiring Additional Information

How many votes are required by a review committee to request extra support material? One department established a minimum of two votes, and several required a simple majority vote of the committee.

I. Applicability to Non-Full-Time Instructional Faculty

Part-time faculty assignments and evaluations have not included aspects of service or professional accomplishments. Is it fair to now require evaluation of one or both of these for receiving a PSSI?

After considering the equity issues involved in conjunction with the provisions contained in Article 31 of the MOU, the ad hoc team recommends no change to current CSUS PSSI policy in this regards.

J. Time Limits of Review Period

Does the three (3) year limit on material to be reviewed make sense? Should it be of longer duration?

No Recommendation: After a lengthy discussion of the merits and faults of extending or shortening the period of review, the ad hoc team could not find an optimal resolution to the issue.

**PERFORMANCE SALARY STEP INCREASE
1995-96 APPLICATION AND NOMINATION INSTRUCTIONS
California State University Sacramento**

INSTRUCTIONS:

1. Applicant shall provide the information requested on the attached cover page (Applicant Information). If this is a nomination, the nominator(s) should enter his/her name(s), signature(s), and give the application to the nominee for completion. While a letter of nomination is not necessary, one may be provided to the nominee for inclusion in the optional appendix (see item 3 below).
2. Applicant shall provide a narrative statement (in three (3), typed, single spaced, **single sided** pages or less) describing his/her meritorious activities, achievements and/or contributions, and their significance to the growth and development of students, the university and/or the applicant's discipline and/or profession. (Please use a print font size of ten-point or larger).

←←“B”

Please keep in mind that each application must stand on its own merit. It is the responsibility of the applicant to document and provide convincing evidence of his/her achievements and contributions (see reverse side for “*Basis for Evaluation and Criteria*”).

An applicant can, however, at the written request of a faculty review committee, be requested to provide additional evidence that supports or clarifies statements contained in the narrative section of his/her application, e.g., citations, nominations, letters, publications, and/or similar information specifically referenced in the application.

3. Applicant may include up to five pages **single sided** of materials that support and/or provide evidence of the applicant's performance and/or contributions, as an appendix to the narrative section of the application. A letter of nomination is **not** included in the five page limit. (Please use a print font size of ten-point or larger).
4. The completed “application package” must include, stapled together, 1) the cover page at the front of the application package, followed by 2) the narrative, 3) appended materials, if any, and 4) the “Review/Recommendation Page.”
5. Applicant shall submit the original “application package” to his/her department chair or supervisor and forward two (2) copies to the Office of Faculty and Staff Affairs on or before ***February 2, 1996***.
6. PLEASE BE ADVISED that assessment of satisfactory performance of all areas of responsibility (Sections 3.1 and 4.5 of PSSI Policy) will include a review of the Personnel Action File (PAF). Up-to-date PAFs are the sole responsibility of the applicant. PAFs that are not current may result in an applicant not qualifying for a PSSI.

←←“B”

←←“A”

**PERFORMANCE SALARY STEP INCREASE
UNIVERSITY LEVEL REVIEW COMMITTEE
REVIEW/RECOMMENDATION PAGE**

1. Assessment of satisfactory performance in all areas of responsibilities as defined in MOU Article 20 (refer to Sections 3.1 and 8.2 of the PSSI Policy):

Based on the applicant's Personnel Action File and PSSI application package of

_____ , it is our assessment that (please check one):

_____ Applicant's Name

- The applicant is performing satisfactorily in all areas of responsibility.
- The applicant is NOT performing satisfactorily in all areas of responsibility.

Justification for Assessment (attach additional page if necessary):

← 1. To be addressed at the next Senate meeting.

2. Meritorious/Outstanding Performance (refer to Sections 3.0 and 8.0 of the PSSI Policy):

Based upon a thorough review of the applicant's PSSI application package, the Committee's determination by a majority vote is:

- Outstanding/Meritorious:
- ~~NO (Requires a simple majority vote, terminate process)~~
 - ~~YES (Go to item 3 below)~~
 - ~~SUB-VOTE (Go to item 3 below)~~
 - ~~Not Outstanding~~

3. Faculty are eligible to receive a PSSI if they demonstrate meritorious or outstanding performance in teaching and learning as well as in at least one other area and are performing satisfactorily in all areas of responsibility. Based upon the assessments in 1) and 2) above, the Committee's recommendation by majority vote is:

- NOT Recommended for a PSSI award. ~~(terminate process)~~
- ~~TIE VOTE (terminate process)~~
- RECOMMENDED for a PSSI award →→→
 - ~~VERY HIGHLY Recommended~~ ~~Level 1 (1 Step Increase)~~
 - ~~HIGHLY Recommended~~ ~~Level 2 (2 Step Increase)~~
 - ~~RECOMMENDED~~ ~~Level 3 (3 Step Increase)~~
 - ~~Level 4 (4 Step Increase)~~
 - ~~Level 5 (5 Step Increase)~~

Number of Steps Recommended: _____

~~If Committee cannot agree as to a level, indicate levels over which disagreement is occurring:~~

Name of ULRC Committee Chair: _____

Signature of ULRC Committee Chair: _____ Date _____

**CSUS INTERIM PERFORMANCE SALARY STEP INCREASE POLICY
ISSUES IDENTIFIED BY DEPARTMENTS
AS NEEDING SUBSTANTIVE CLARIFICATION
(AS 95-76; PM/FSA 96-01)**

A. Number and Level of Faculty Review Committees: (Reference: "Section II: Criticisms Of Department Reviews")

1. Applications should go straight to the University; eliminate the DLRC's as they create tension, conflict, divisiveness and animosity among competing faculty (a commonly held view expressed by several DLRC's).
2. The DLRC. was divisive and time consuming. The role of individual departments should be minimized. There is too much bias (either pro or con) towards our closest colleagues.
3. Four out of five of the elected committee members were also applicants for the PSSI award. Therefore, the Committee unanimously agreed that the Committee members have a fundamental and direct conflict of interest. The Committee believed strongly that it is patently unethical and unprofessional to assess colleagues who are in direct competition for the PSSI award who are not members of the Committee. In light of this conflict, the Committee unanimously agreed that the Dean and the University Level Review Committee should evaluate the applicants.
4. Reduce the role of departments to going through the applicant's PAF and forwarding a list of potential problems in the candidate's past performance and consistency with the candidate's application package.

Date: March 14, 1996
To: Academic Senate
From: Working Group on Faculty Evaluation and Self-Assessment of the
Faculty Policies Committee
Subject: Interim Report

The observations and questions listed below result from (1) a review of the RTP policy and information about how each of the schools instructs faculty in the preparation of the Working Personnel Action File; (2) a comparison between the teaching component of the WPAF and the Teaching Portfolio method of self-evaluation used in some universities; and (3) the combined experience of the members of the Working Committee.

Observations and Assumptions:

1. Our particular past experiences with the RTP and PTR processes shape our views of what these processes are and what they ought to be.
2. Existing UARTP policy does not preclude alternatives to what is currently enacted, so long as standards are central to the process, and fairness is the guiding principle.
3. At least in theory, the "engine" of the RTP process is the use of criteria/standards by which to equitably measure an individual's fulfillment of his/her responsibilities as a teacher/and scholar.
4. Although there is some consistency among the schools as to the categories of evidence that might be offered to support a candidate for RTP, each school has a different requirement for the "look" of the WPAF. Even more significantly, there is no documentation at the school level as to precisely what standards the evidence must meet, expressed either in terms of quality or quantity of achievement. It is presumed that primary committees enact their standards in good faith, but these may or may not be documented anywhere in writing or revealed to candidates before an evaluation cycle begins. The fluidity of standards permits flexibility but it also engenders anxiety in those who are being evaluated, contributing to a sense of disempowerment and perhaps even desperation as candidates decide what evidence of their performance may match the unspoken expectation of their evaluators.
5. At the same time, the uncertainty of standards yields an irony. Absent agreed upon benchmarks of performance in the collection and interpretation of data in the WPAF, the system ends up encouraging in candidates and committee members a level of unsupported generalization that they would never permit in their own scholarly work.
6. Untenured faculty and those not at top rank must undergo evaluation that is far more rigorous than that for tenured full professors if they are to receive certain tangible rewards (e.g., retention, tenure and promotion). Such a system presumably motivates these faculty to make an active and continuing effort to sustain their performance. There is no similar motivation self-evident in the current PTR process for full professors.
7. A faculty evaluation process which is (1) summative [that is, one in which the focus is on evaluation, not growth, and is wholly focused on the past]; (2) involves colleagues only as evaluators; (3) culminates with a designation of rank or tenure, and (4) does not require the candidate to critically reflect on his or her own performance is not likely to motivate the candidate toward the maintenance of excellence nor encourage striving toward genuine future self-improvement.

*a fac face
a con
a certain*

8. Contradictory aims of the RTP process to be consistent yet flexible, to be firm but fair, to recognize and reward excellence but to also document and discourage mediocrity, and to provide defensible criticism and judgments but to also encourage improvement, can present dilemmas that make its interpretation, enactment and enforcement very challenging.

The following questions are clustered according to their relevance to philosophy or to procedures. They represent a rationale for critically scrutinizing the existing policy and processes, for if the answers to these questions were self-evident then there would be no need for making further inquiry.

Questions related to the philosophy underlying our discussions of a new Faculty Assessment model:

- A. How should the components of *evaluation* (the decision making about retention, tenure and promotion, and post-tenure review) and *professional development* (personal goal setting, self-directed self-improvement) be integrated in a desirable model of Faculty Assessment?
- B. How might we reconcile the sometimes conflicting goals of maintaining consistency of performance standards across the University with valuing the autonomy of schools and departments in establishing their own standards while at the same time empowering the individual faculty member in the RTP process?
- C. How will the RTP process of today meet the needs of faculty, departments, schools and the university envisioned five or ten years from now?
- D. To what extent will the University acknowledge an individual's commitment to self-improvement and commit to supporting his or her future professional growth, and what forms should such support take?

Questions related to revising the RTP and PTR processes:

- E. How might the perceived need for the development of more specific, measurable and usable standards/criteria/expectations be explored and verified?
- F. What is the difference in meaning between a "standard," a "criterion," and an "expectation"?
- G. What is being done already in the University, in the schools, and in departments to clarify and operationalize standards/criteria/expectations of performance? How can what works well in what we already practice in assessment help point the way toward maintaining a balance between quantitative and qualitative measures of performance?
- H. What is being done on other CSU campuses, and in other public or private universities, to involve faculty productively and positively in their own evaluation and self-improvement as teachers and scholars?
- I. Should the goals and uses of PTR be different from those of RTP?

If not, how might an evaluation system be applied fairly to both junior and senior faculty, when expectations of each may differ and rewards for each do differ?
- J. How will we satisfy ourselves as a committee that any proposed change in the process of faculty evaluation will have undergone the most careful scrutiny and adjustment before it might be implemented?