

Jan

1995-96
ACADEMIC SENATE
California State University, Sacramento

AGENDA
Thursday, May 2, 1996
Forest Suite, University Union
2:45-4:30 (immediately following 1996-97 Senate Nomination of Officers)

INFORMATION

Spring 1996 Schedule of Meetings (*=tentative):

May 9--2:30-4:30

May 16--3:00-4:00 [1996-97 Elections, 2:30-3:00; Outstanding Teacher Award
Reception, 4:00]

May 23*

CONSENT CALENDAR

AS 96-34/Ex. MEETING TIME--ACADEMIC SENATE

Beginning 1996-97, the Academic Senate shall meet on Thursdays from 3:00-5:00 p.m., to coincide with the time blocks in the synchronized schedule (Attachment A).

AS 96-35/ConC COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS--Senate 1996-97

Academic Policies Committee:

JEAN PIERRE BAYARD, At-large, 1999

DORIS BEARD, At-large, 1997 (repl. M. Goodart)

LINDA BUCKLEY, At-large, 1999

DORIS FLORES, At-large, 1999

Curriculum Policies Committee:

NICK BURNETT, At-large, 1999

ELIJAH CHRISTIAN, At-large, 1999

CIRENIO RODRIGUEZ, At-large, 1999

SHERIFA ZUHUR, Senator, 1997

Elections Committee:

LYDIA CRUZ, At-large, 1997
JOE KILPATRICK, At-large, 1997
CHEVELLE NEWSOME, At-large, 1997
NANCY OSTIGUY, At-large, 1997
BETTE POLKINGHORN, At-large, 1997

Faculty Endowment Fund Committee:

LINDA BUCKLEY, At-large, 1999
BONNIE WALKER, At-large, 1999

Faculty Policies Committee:

MARGARET CLEEK, At-large, 1999
CHRISTINE MILLER, At-large, 1999

General Education Policies/Graduation Requirements Committee:

JIM CHOPYAK, At-large, 1999
MARY ANN REIHMAN, At-large, 1999
JOHN HENRY, At-large, 1999

Livingston Annual Faculty Lecture Committee:

ERWIN KELLY, At-large, 1998
JOANNE MARROW, At-large, 1998

AS 96-36/Ex. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS--Senate 1996-97

Faculty Policies Committee:

HAROLDENE WUNDER, At-large, 1999

AS 96-37/Ex. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS--University

Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs--Undergraduate Academic Programs.

Selection Advisory Committee for:

ESTELLE EKE, At-large
PETER JOHNSON, At-large
LINDA PALMER, At-large
DORAISWAMY RAMANCHANDRAN, At-large
MIKI VOHRYZEK-BOLDEN, At-large

Cost Recovery Committee:

JAMES HILL, Teaching Faculty At-large, 1997

Director of Intercollegiate Athletics, Selection Advisory for the:
CECIL CANTON, At-large

Director of the Multi-Cultural Center, Selection Advisory Committee for the:
RHONDA RIOS KRAVITZ, At-large

Regional and Continuing Education, Self-Study Questions Committee:

LITA WHITESEL, School of Arts and Sciences
OTIS SCOTT, School of Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies
MARCUS MARSH, School of Natural Sciences and Mathematics
CHARLOTTE COOK, School of Education
CANDELARIA PEREZ DAVIDSON, School of Health and Human Services
MERLE MARTIN, School of Business Administration
JAMES KHO, School of Engineering and Computer Science
LINDA SOFFA ~~RHONDA RIOS KRAVITZ~~, Library
JERRY TOBEY, Research and Graduate Studies

Additional Members:

Rina DeRose-Swinscoe, Regional and Continuing Education
George Condon, Regional and Continuing Education
Nancy Lewis, Admissions and Records
___, Academic Advising
___, Student

AS 96-38/Ex. CSUS FOUNDATION BOARD OF DIRECTORS--APPOINTMENT OF FACULTY MEMBERS

The Academic Senate, in accordance with Article II, Section 1. of the "Bylaws, Hornet Foundation, Inc. CSUS (copy received by Academic Senate, August 1995), recommends four members of the CSUS faculty for appointment to the Foundation Board. The Executive Committee shall nominate faculty members who can best carry out the responsibilities of a representative of the faculty to the Foundation Board, i.e.:

- ▶ to assure, as best one can, that the activities of the foundation enhance the learning/academic environment on the campus
- ▶ to assure, as best one can, that the activities of the foundation enhance and support the diversity of cultures within the campus community
- ▶ to represent the best interests of the faculty of CSUS, as a collective body
- ▶ to contribute expertise, particularly as it relates to grants and contracts.

Regular Agenda*Approved*
AS 96-33/Flr. MINUTES

Approval of the Minutes of the meeting of April 18, 1996 (#13).

Old Business

[Note: At its meeting of April 23, 1996, the Executive Committee agreed to recommend substitution of AS 96-31 below for: 1) AS 96-23B.1 (pulled from Consent on 3/28/96; see text below), 2) AS 96-30B (which was amended by the Senate on 4/18/96 and was still under discussion; see text below) {new AS 96-31, item 2}, and 3) AS 96-31 (which was on the 4/18/96 agenda, but still required introduction from the floor) {new AS 96-31, item 7}.]

AS 96-23B.1/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):

A. Nomination Process:

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.

AS 96-30B/Ex., Flr. PERFORMANCE SALARY STEP INCREASE POLICY (Amends Interim Policy AS 95-76; PM/FSA 96-01)

In addition, the Academic Senate recommends that, in addition to completing the current application, applicant's submit as part of the application package, a two-page vita (single-spaced, single-sided pages) that lists by RTP category the faculty member's activities or outcomes over the relevant time period. The vita must clearly delineate the RTP categories of "Teaching" or "Professional Competencies" (librarians and counselors), "Scholarly and Creative Activities," "Service to the University," and "Service to the Community." The category of "Teaching" must include the number and courses taught, the average score on student evaluations, and advising/mentoring activities.

divided into 7 items
AS 96-31/Ex.

PERFORMANCE SALARY STEP INCREASE POLICY (Supersedes Interim Policy AS 95-76; PM/FSA 96-01)

The Academic Senate recommends the following revisions to the PSSI Policy that accomplish the following [shown in Attachment B as strikeover = deletions, underscore = additions; modifications adopted in AS 96-23A have been incorporated] :

approved
 1. rescind the action requiring the DLRC and the ULRC to recommend specific salary step increases; re- establish the requirement of the DLRC and ULRC to differentiate among those applicants recommended for a PSSI using a scale of Very Highly Recommend to Recommend (sections 6.5 and 8.5, respectively). [*Note: rescinds AS 96-23A (G.2) adopted on 3/28/96*]

approved
 2. create a new section 4.3 that requires, as an addition to the current application package, "an abbreviated vita listing activities and/or outcomes directly related to his/her areas of professional responsibilities (as defined in the MOU Article 20) over the relevant time period. The vita is limited to 2 single-sided single-spaced pages (an example of what is expected for respective faculty is provided in the policy).

approved
 3. establish the abbreviated vita as the primary document reviewed by the DLRC and ULRC for purposes of determining "satisfactory performance," but provide the committees authority to request review of the applicant's PAF and or request "additional information that supports or clarifies statements contained in the abbreviated vita..." (sections 6.2 and 8.2).

amended approved
approved
 4. delete the requirement of the DLRC and ULRC to indicate, in writing, "whether or not an applicant is performing satisfactorily in any areas of responsibility"; instead require that both committees provide written justification ONLY for applicants whose performance is found to be unsatisfactory in any area of responsibility (sections 6.2 and 8.2, respectively).

amend-app
 E.1.5. *@ approved*
 clarify the right of the ULRC, and the conditions under which the ULRC, may request additional information from an applicant (section 8.4).

E.2 *of B failed*
 6. modify section 2.1 to allow students and staff to nominate Faculty Unit employees as defined in Article 2 of the MOU (section 2.1).

7. editorial changes in the criteria have been made to achieve clarity and inclusion (section 3.1).

The Academic Senate directs the Executive Committee to reformat the PSSI policy to ensure that all revisions adopted by the Academic Senate (shown in Attachment B) are incorporated into a readable, coherent, and easy to use document.

New Business**AS 96-39/GEP/GRC, Ex. G.E.--GRADUATION WRITING REQUIREMENTS**

(Note: Amends "Policies Pertaining to the General Education Program and Course/Proficiency Requirements for Graduation with the Baccalaureate Degree," August 1991; actions adopted by the Senate on February 15, 1996, have been incorporated)

The Academic Senate adopts the following recommendations on revision of University Policy on "Course/Proficiency Requirements in Writing" as shown in Attachment C that accomplish the following:

1. deletes reference to the English Equivalency Exam that is no longer is offered (pg. 1, l. 7-9 and l. 19-20; and pg. 3, l. 25-26).
2. changes the minimum number of times (from once to twice) that the WPE must be offered each semester (pg. 3, l. 18).
3. deletes section B. 8. of the Policy as approved at the February 15, 1996 meeting of the Academic Senate (pg. 4, l. 18-22).
4. codifies current practice of allowing students whose first language is a language other than English to have an ESL reading of the WPE and additional time if the student takes the EDT; and requires that students electing an ESL reading must take the EDT no later than the beginning of their junior year. (pg. 3, l. 32-35; pg. 4, l. 8-9).
5. identifies courses that must be taken by students who do not achieve a passing score on the WPE after two attempts; provides that successful completion of the designated courses with a C- grade or better will satisfy GEAR; specifies that successful completion of the course shall require satisfactory completion of all course requirements and achieving a passing score on a group graded common exit exam; and provides for portfolio assessment for students who do not achieve a passing score on the common exit exam (pg. 4, l. 30-40; pg. 5, l. 1-12).
6. makes editorial changes to accommodate policy changes specified in items 4 and 5 above, and to improve clarity of the document (pg. 2, l. 37-42; pg. 3, l. 1-2, l. 9, l. 16-22, and l. 30-31; pg. 5, l. 14).
7. rescinds AS 94-40 and permits "certification" of English 20 by CSUS evaluators for transfer students fulfilling G.E. Area A.3 with an English 20 equivalent course (pg. 1, l. 27-29).
8. deletes the requirement that the second semester composition course be taken prior to taking the WPE, in light of the requirement that entering transfer students who may not have taken the second semester composition course take the WPE upon entering (pg. 3, l. 24-27).

**CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO
SYNCHRONIZED SCHEDULING PLAN**

DAY CLASS PERIODS

Scheduling Blocks		3 Unit Classes		2 Unit Classes
		3 Day Classes (MWF)	2 Day Classes (MW, MF, WF, TR)	2 Day Classes (MW, WF, MF, TR)
7:00 - 8:00	or 7:30 - 9:00	7:00 - 7:50	7:30 - 8:45	7:00 - 7:50 or 7:30 - 8:20
8:00 - 9:00		8:00 - 8:50		8:00 - 8:50
9:00 - 10:00	or 10:30 - 12:00	* 9:00 - 9:50	*† 9:00 - 10:15	9:00 - 9:50
10:00 - 11:00		* 10:00 - 10:50	*† 10:30 - 11:45	10:00 - 10:50 or 10:30 - 11:20 TR only
11:00 - 12:00		* 11:00 - 11:50		11:00 - 11:50
12:00 - 1:00	or 1:30 - 3:00	* 12:00 - 12:50	*† 12:00 - 1:15	12:00 - 12:50
1:00 - 2:00		* 1:00 - 1:50		1:00 - 1:50 or 1:30 - 2:20 TR only
2:00 - 3:00		* 2:00 - 2:50	*† 1:30 - 2:45	2:00 - 2:50
3:00 - 4:00	3:00 - 4:30	3:00 - 3:50	3:00 - 4:15	3:00 - 3:50
4:00 - 5:30	or 4:30 - 6:00	4:00 - 4:50 or 4:00 - 5:15 MW,MF,WF	4:30 - 5:45	4:00 - 4:50 or 4:30 - 5:20
Total Class Periods:		10	7	10

* PRIME TIME HOURS (DO NOT EXCEED ALLOCATIONS)

† MW, WF or MF may be scheduled with school approval only. During the unscheduled day (M, W or F), classes must be scheduled 9:00 - 11:50 a.m., 12:00 - 2:50 p.m. and/or 3:00 - 5:50 p.m., inclusive of a 20 minute break, in the same classroom and scheduling block.

EVENING CLASS PERIODS

3 Unit Classes		2 Unit Classes
Meeting Once A Week	Meeting Twice A Week	Meeting Once A Week
4:00 - 6:50 (20 minute break)	5:30 - 6:45	5:30 - 7:20 (10 minute break)
5:30 - 8:15 (15 minute break)	6:00 - 7:15	6:00 - 7:50 (10 minute break)
5:30 - 8:20 (20 minute break)	7:00 - 8:15	7:30 - 9:20 (10 minute break)
5:30 - 8:40 (40 minute break)	7:30 - 8:45	8:00 - 9:50 (10 minute break)
6:00 - 8:50 (20 minute break)	8:30 - 9:45	
6:00 - 9:10 (40 minute break)	9:00 - 10:15	
7:00 - 9:45 (15 minute break)		
7:00 - 9:50 (20 minute break)		
Total Class Periods: 8	6	4

CSU, SACRAMENTO, ACADEMIC SENATE PROPOSAL
Performance Salary Step Increases: Interim 1996/97 Policy
Revised Spring 1996

1.0 Performance Salary Step Increase (PSSI)

- 1.1 The purpose of the PSSI is to recognize and reward faculty unit employees for their outstanding or meritorious performance and/or contributions in the areas of teaching & learning, professional accomplishments, and/or service that enhances the mission of the university (Ref: Provision 31.17, MOU).
- 1.2 All applications for PSSIs shall be reviewed by an appropriate campus committee(s) of tenured faculty unit employees, and academic administrators and/or the President (Ref: Provision 31.21, MOU).
- 1.3 The recognition of outstanding or meritorious performance and/or contributions of a faculty unit employee shall be in the form of a permanent increase to the base salary of the individual, in one or more steps on the applicable salary schedule for that faculty unit employee. However, no faculty unit employee shall be awarded or receive more ~~than four (4) PSSIs during the academic year 1995/96 award period or more than five (5) PSSIs~~ in any subsequent year in which the PSSI has been negotiated (Ref: Provision 31.18, MOU).
- 1.4 The effective date of all PSSI shall be January 1 of each year that there are negotiated PSSIs (Ref: Provision 31.28, MOU).
- 1.5 There is no requirement to expend all funds dedicated to the PSSI program in any given fiscal year. Any portion of the funds not expended in any fiscal year shall automatically carry forward to the PSSI pool in the next fiscal year. In the event that the PSSI program is eliminated in the future, all accumulated funds in the PSSI pool shall be used for the professional development opportunities identified in Provision 25.1 of the MOU (Ref: Provision 31.33, MOU).
- 1.6 The decision to grant or deny a PSSI shall not be considered during deliberations regarding the granting of reappointment, promotion or tenure. This shall not preclude the consideration of any facts during RTP deliberations which are also considered during the PSSI deliberations (Ref: Provision 31.35, MOU).
- 1.7 The decision to grant or deny an increase for meritorious performance and/or contributions, and the number of steps to be granted, shall not be subject to the

grievance procedure as provided in Article 10 of the MOU (Ref: Provision 31.28, MOU).

- 1.8 For each year in which PSSI awards are made, the President or designee shall prepare a report listing by schools and units identified in ~~provision section~~ 5.1 of this policy, the number of faculty that submitted an application for a PSSI award, the number of faculty units receiving PSSIs, and a frequency of the number of steps awarded, i.e., number of faculty receiving one (1), two (2), three (3), four (4) and five (5) step increases. In addition, the report shall identify the total number of applicants that received a positive recommendation by the University Level Review Committee, and the number of applicants from within this group that received a PSSI award. This report shall be maintained for a period of five (5) years, and shall be readily available for public review.

2.0 Eligibility

- 2.1 All Faculty Unit employees defined in Article 2 of the MOU who apply or are nominated by ~~another faculty unit employee or academic administrator~~ members of the campus community (faculty, academic administrators, students and staff), are eligible for a PSSI (Provision 31.19, MOU). ~~Nominations from students and staff members that are supported by a faculty unit employee or academic administrator will also be considered.~~
- 2.2 To be considered for a PSSI, an application or nomination must be submitted in accordance with the procedures and format prescribed by the President or designee (Ref: Provision 31.19, MOU).

3.0 Basis for Evaluation

- 3.1 To be recommended for a PSSI award Applicants and nominees are expected to be performing satisfactorily in all areas of responsibility as defined in MOU Article 20, and shall demonstrate meritorious or outstanding performance and/or having made a significant contribution(s) in teaching & ~~and~~ learning, as well as in at least one (1) other area; professional accomplishments, and/or service which enhances the mission of the university. The evaluative categories for outstanding and/or meritorious performance shall be:
 - A. Teaching and learning - ~~To include but is not limited to m~~Meritorious or outstanding professional performance and/or contributions ~~that has in teaching and learning; may include but is not limited to:~~

- i) ~~Enhanced~~ing the academic, intellectual and/or personal development of students to lead productive roles in society.
- ii) ~~Fostered~~ing within students the desire to pursue knowledge and develop tools for intellectual inquiry, and nurture a commitment to learning as a serious, lifelong endeavor.
- iii) ~~Improved~~ing the abilities and effectiveness of faculty as teachers and/or learners.
- iv) Facilitating the instructional activities of the university.

B. Professional accomplishments - Meritorious or outstanding professional performance and/or professional contributions to one's discipline, profession and/or the university. ~~To~~ may include but is not limited to:

- i) Scholarship, research and/or creative activities that enhanced the body of knowledge in one's discipline and/or profession.
- ii) Professional accomplishments that enhanced the teaching mission of the university and/or has enriched the learning community.

C. Service which enhances the mission of the university - ~~To include but is not limited to - m~~Meritorious or outstanding performance and/or contributions that ~~has helped to~~ enhanced the mission of the university may include but is not limited to:

- i) ~~Developing~~ a sense of community and intellectual excitement outside the classroom among students, faculty, staff and/or alumni.
- ii) ~~Make~~ing the university a dynamic force that contributes significantly to the social, cultural and intellectual vitality of the region and/or to its economic success.
- iii) ~~Establishing~~ interdisciplinary, collaborative partnerships between the university and the state capital community which enhances the teaching, scholarship and service of the university.
- iv) ~~Developing~~ a campus community whose diversity enriches the lives of all and whose members develop a strong sense of personal and community identity as well as mutual respect.

v) Developing a culture of faculty leadership and/or university citizenship.

~~3.2 The period of consideration shall be up to the three years immediately preceding submission of the application or nomination, or since the time of appointment to CSUS, whichever is shorter.~~

~~3.3 The period of consideration shall be based on the lesser of either the applicant's or nominee's cumulative record over the three (3) years immediately preceding the year in which the application or nomination is made or the applicant's or nominee's cumulative record since the time of receiving his/her last PSSI award.~~

3.2 The period of consideration shall be based on the lesser of: up to three (3) years immediately preceding the year in which the application or nomination is made; time since the applicant or nominee received his/her last PSSI award; or time since the applicant's or nominee's appointment to CSUS.

4.0 Application and Nomination Process

4.1 All nominations must be signed and delivered to the nominee. It is the responsibility of the nominee, however, to prepare and submit an application for a PSSI award.

4.2 Unless specific reference is made to such, hereafter, the term "application" shall include to mean "nomination," and "applicant" shall include to mean "nominee."

4.3 Each applicant shall provide, as part of his/her application package, an abbreviated vita listing activities and/or outcomes directly related to his/her areas of professional responsibilities (as defined in the MOU) over the relevant time period. The abbreviated vita shall not exceed two single-spaced, single-sided pages. An example of the form and information expected is provided below:

A. Instructional Faculty

i) Teaching

- a. Teaching assignment(s), e.g., number and courses taught, including supervisory activities, e.g., 500's, 199's.
- b. Summary of student evaluations.
- c. Conclusions reached by a periodic performance evaluation committee(s), e.g., RTP Committee, Post-Tenure Review Committee.
- d. Student advising and/or mentoring activities.
- e. Activities to improve student learning within the classroom.

- ii) Research, scholarship and/or creative activities which contribute to currency in one's discipline and/or teaching.
- iii) Service to the University, profession, and community.

B. Library Faculty

- i) Professional Competencies
 - a. Primary assignment(s), e.g., service area(s), teaching in library subject matters.
 - b. Summary of evaluation(s) relevant to primary assignment(s).
 - c. Conclusions reached by a periodic performance evaluation committee(s), e.g., RTP Committee, Post-Tenure Review Committee.
- ii) Activities that foster professional growth, including creative activity and research.
- iii) Service to the CSU System and University.
- iv) Other activities expected of librarian faculty to qualify for RTP, and, following tenure, activities expected of librarian faculty in order to maintain their role as contributing members their school and university.

C. Counselor Faculty

- i) Professional Competencies
 - a. Primary assignment(s), e.g., counseling areas(s), consultation/referral, intern training, teaching, supervision.
 - b. Summary of evaluation(s) relevant to primary assignment(s).
 - c. Conclusions reached by a periodic performance evaluation committee(s).
- ii) Activities that foster professional growth, including creative activities and research.
- iii) Service to the CSU System and University.
- iv) Other activities expected of counselor faculty to qualify for RTP, and, following tenure/permanency, activities expected of counselor faculty in order to maintain their role as contributing members of the campus.

D. Coaching Faculty

- i) Coaching
 - a. Primary assignment(s), e.g., coaching and related duties, teaching, student advising.
 - b. Summary of evaluation(s) relevant to primary assignment(s).
 - c. Conclusions reached by a periodic performance evaluation committee(s).
 - d. Service to the system, campus and public.

E. Part-Time Instructional Faculty

i) Teaching

- a. Teaching assignment(s), e.g., number and courses taught, including supervisory activities, e.g., 500's, 199's.**
- b. Summary of student evaluations.**
- c. Conclusions reached by a periodic performance evaluation committee.**
- d. Student advising and/or mentoring activities if part of one's assignment.**
- e. Activities to improve student learning within the classroom.**

4.34 Each application must stand on its own merit. As such, documentation that supports and/or provides evidence of the applicant's performance and/or contributions may be appended to the application form. Such additions shall not, however, exceed five pages in length.

4.4.5 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 (AS 96-23:C).

4.45 At the written request of a faculty review committee, an applicant shall provide additional evidence that supports or clarifies statements contained in the abbreviated vita and/or the narrative section of his/her application, e.g., citations, nominations, letters, publications, and/or similar information specifically referenced in the application.

4.56 Applicants shall provide the department chair or supervisor equivalent with the completed, original, signed application, and shall provide the President with one copy (in accordance with Article 31.19 of the MOU). The department chair or supervisor equivalent shall forward the application to the Department Level Review Committee (defined in section 5.0). *Note: Remainder of paragraph moved to section 6.2*

4.7 The department chair or equivalent shall review each application package for compliance with both section 4.3.5 of this policy (AS 96-23:C), and the page limits on the application package:

A. Three page limit on the narrative section.

B. Three page limit summarizing the activities and/or outcomes directly related to the applicant's primary area of professional responsibilities over the relevant time period.

C. Five page limit on support materials/evidence.

All pages exceeding the above 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 (AS 96-23:B).

5.0 Department Level Review Committee (DLRC)

5.1 Full-time faculty unit employees in each academic department/program shall establish a Department Level Review Committee (DLRC) normally by the end of each Spring Semester (AS 96-23:E). Full-time faculty unit employees with appointments as librarians, coaches, or counselors shall establish comparable Department Level Review Committees for peer review of PSSI applications from individuals holding appointments in these classifications by individuals with appointments in the same classifications.

5.2 Each Department Level Review Committee (DLRC) identified in ~~provision~~ section 5.1 of this policy shall consist of at least five (5) elected tenured faculty from that department/unit. A member of the committee who is also an applicant shall not participate or be present during the deliberations of his/her own application (Ref. Provision 31.25 MOU). If there is an insufficient number of tenured faculty unit employees available within a department/unit to constitute a DLRC, the department/unit faculty may elect tenured faculty from other departments/units to form or complete such a committee (Ref: Provision 31.26, MOU). Beyond these stipulations, the department/unit faculty shall determine the method of election, number, composition, and terms of their DLRC.

6.0 Department Level Review

6.1 The first order of business at the first meeting of each DLRC shall be to elect a chair.

~~6.2 Prior to consideration of the merits of each application for a PSSI, the DLRC shall, in conformance with section 4.5 of this policy, assess whether each applicant's performance in all areas of responsibility is satisfactory.~~

- 6.2 ~~The Department Level Review Committee (DLRC) shall assess whether or not the individual is performing satisfactorily in all areas of responsibility as defined in MOU Article 20. For the purpose of conducting this assessment, the DLRC shall review the individual's personnel action file. The DLRC shall indicate, in writing, whether or not the individual's performance in all areas of responsibility is satisfactory and shall provide written justification for its assessment. The DLRC's written assessment shall become part of the application package as defined in MOU Article 20. For the purpose of conducting this assessment, the DLRC shall review the individual's Personnel Action File and material submitted as part of the application package: applicant's abbreviated vita. The DLRC may request the applicant to provide additional evidence that supports or clarifies statements contained in the abbreviated vita (as provided in section 4.3 of this policy) and/or consult his/her Personnel Action File. In the case of a DLRC finding an applicant "not satisfactory" in any area of responsibility, the DLRC shall provide written justification for its assessment. The DLRC's written assessment shall become part of the applicant's applicaiton package.~~
- 6.3 Each DLRC shall review and assess the merit of each application using the criteria and standards specified in ~~provisions~~ sections 3.1 through 3.3 of this policy.
- 6.4 ~~The members of a DLRC by a simple majority vote, (AS 96-23:H)~~ 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.
- 6.4.5 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 (AS 96-23:D).
- 6.5 The recommendations of a DLRC shall be made in accordance with the following process and procedures. First, each application shall be placed in one of two major categories: "Recommended," and "Not Recommended." Those applications assigned to the "RECOMMENDED for a PSSI award" category shall then be ~~reassigned into one of three subcategory award levels: "Very Highly Recommended," "Highly Recommended," or "Recommended."~~ differentiated using a scale of "Very Highly Recommended to Recommended." The recommendation to assign an application to a particular ~~category~~ rating must be supported by a simple majority vote. If there is a tie vote on a rating, the committee shall indicate in its recommendation the ratings where the tie occurred. Finally, ~~for those applications assigned to any one of the three "Recommended" subcategories the DLRC shall include in its recommendation the number of steps to be awarded (Ref: Provision 31.25 and 31.27, MOU).~~

6.6 The DLRCs shall forward all applications, its ~~written~~ assessment of the individual's performance in all areas of responsibility, and its PSSI recommendation on each application to the University Level Review Committee (Ref: Provision 31.24, MOU). ?

6.7 The DLRCs shall inform all applicants of their recommendations no later than ten working (10) days after its recommendations have been forwarded to the University Level Review Committee. Upon receiving a request from an applicant, a DLRC shall inform the applicant of the reasons for its recommendations.

6.8 All deliberations and discussions relating to the review and recommendation of a specific application shall be confidential. All written recommendations shall become part of the application package.

6.9 In the event that a DLRC fails to meet the established deadline for completing its recommendation, then all application shall be automatically forwarded, without recommendation, to the University Level Review Committee (Ref: Provision 31.25, MOU).

7.0 University Level Review Committee (ULRC)

7.1 The ULRC is the "highest level faculty review committee" in that it shall be the last faculty review committee that makes its recommendation to the President or designee (Ref: 31.31, MOU).

7.2 The ULRC shall be established normally by the end of each Spring semester (AS 96-23: E), and consist of a total of ten (10) elected tenured faculty members elected by the full-time faculty of each of the following electing units:

Natural Science and Mathematics
Social Sciences
Humanities and Fine Arts
School of Education
School of Engineering and Computer Science
School of Health and Human Services
School of Business Administration
Library Faculty Electing Unit
Coaching Faculty Electing Unit
Counseling Faculty Electing Unit

- 7.3 The faculty of each school/unit or appropriate faculty governance body shall determine the method of electing a school/unit faculty member to serve on the ULRC. Each school/unit will notify the results of its election to the President or designee and the Academic Senate Chair.
- 7.4 A member of the University Level Review Committee (ULRC) who is also an applicant shall not participate or be present during the deliberations of his/her own application (Ref. Provision 31.25 MOU). Faculty serving on DLRCs may not serve on the ULRC. Each member of the ULRC shall serve a one year term. This term limit, however, does not preclude the reelection of a faculty member to a newly constituted ULRC in subsequent years.

8.0 University Level Review

- 8.1 The President shall call the first meeting of the ULRC during which the first order of business shall be to elect a chair.
- 8.2 Prior to consideration of the merits of each application for a PSSI, the University Level Review Committee (ULRC) shall assess whether or not the individual is performing satisfactorily in all areas of responsibility as defined in MOU Article 20. For the purpose of conducting this assessment, the ULRC shall review the ~~individual's personnel action file. The ULRC shall indicate, in writing, whether or not the individual's performance in all areas of responsibility is satisfactory and shall provide written justification for its assessment. The ULRC's written assessment shall become part of the application package as defined in MOU Article 20. For the purpose of conducting this assessment, the ULRC shall review the individual's Personnel Action File and material submitted as part of the application package:~~ applicant's abbreviated vita. The ULRC may request the applicant to provide additional evidence that supports or clarifies statements contained in the abbreviated vita (as provided in section 4.3 of this policy) and/or consult his/her Personnel Action File. The ULRC shall provide written justification if it finds an applicant "not satisfactory" in any area of responsibility. The ULRC's written justification shall become part of the application package as defined in section 4.6 of this policy.
- 8.3 The ULRC shall review each application for meritorious or outstanding performance using the criteria and standards consistent with ~~provisions sections~~ sections 3.1 through 3.3 of this policy. Further, the ULRC shall consider in its deliberations the recommendations of the DLRCs.

- 8.4 ~~The members of a ULRC by a simple majority vote, (AS 96-23:H)~~ 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.
- 8.4.5 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 (AS 96-23:D).
- 8.5 The recommendations of a ULRC shall be made in accordance with the following process and procedures. First, each application shall be placed in one of two major categories: "Recommended," and "Not Recommended." Those applications assigned to the "RECOMMENDED for a PSSI award" category shall then be ~~reassigned into one of three subcategory award levels: "Very Highly Recommended," "Highly Recommended," or "Recommended."~~ differentiated using a scale of "Very Higherly Recommended to Recommended." The recommendation to assign an application to a particular category rating must be supported by a simple majority vote. If there is a tie vote on a rating, the committee shall indicate in its recommendation the ratings where the tie occurred. Finally, ~~for those applications assigned to any one of the three "Recommended" subcategories the DLRC shall include in its recommendation the number of steps to be awarded~~ (Ref: Provision 31.25 and 31.27, MOU).
- 8.6 The ULRC shall forward all applications, any and all operational criteria and standards developed and used to evaluate the applications, its reasons, if applicable, for deviating from the recommendations of the DLRCs, a well as its recommendation on each application to the President or designee.
- 8.7 The recommendation of the ULRC shall be forward to the President or designee no later than ~~March 15, 1996, and no later than~~ December 1 of each year in which negotiated PSSIs are awarded ~~in the future~~. Failure to meet these deadlines shall automatically result in the forwarding of all applications without recommendation and all materials received from the DLRCs to the President or designee for his/her award of PSSIs (Ref: Provision 31.25 and 31.27, MOU).
- 8.8 The ULRC shall inform all applicants of their recommendations no later than ten (10) working days after its recommendations have been forwarded to the President or designee. Upon receiving a request from an applicant, the ULRC shall inform the applicant of the reasons for its recommendations.
- 8.9 All deliberations and discussions relating to the review and recommendation of a specific application shall be confidential. All written recommendations shall become part of the application package.

9.0 Review by Academic Administrators and/or the President or Designee

- 9.1 The President may elect to have academic administrators review the applications submitted for a PSSI award (Ref: Provision 31.21, MOU). If so elected, the Academic Senate shall be informed of the procedure governing the review process conducted by academic administrators.
- 9.2 The President or designee shall review all of the applications which have been submitted, and select the recipients of the PSSI from among this candidate pool by ~~April 1, 1996, and~~ no later than January 1 of each year in which negotiated PSSIs are awarded ~~in the future~~. The President or designee shall determine the appropriate number of steps to be granted, consistent with the limitations provided in provision section 1.3 of this policy (Ref: Provision 31.28, MOU).

10.0 Special Provisions Governing PSSI Awards

- 10.1 At least fifty percent (50%) of the candidates receiving a PSSI must have received a positive recommendation from the ULRC provided that (Ref: Provision 31.29, MOU):
- A. The ULRC makes a positive recommendation for enough candidates to fully expend the pool for PSSIs in that fiscal year, and
 - B. The ULRC meets the time requirement for the review and recommendation of all candidates to the President by the date specified in provision section 8.6 of this policy (Ref: Provisions 32.25 and 3.27, MOU).
- 10.2 If the ULRC submits fewer than the minimum number of positive recommendations needed to expend fully the pool for PSSIs in any fiscal year, then the percentage of candidates receiving a PSSI that must also have received a positive recommendation from the ULRC shall be reduced proportionately from fifty percent (50%). The percentage of candidates receiving a PSSI and with a positive recommendation from the ULRC must be at least fifty (50%) of the number of positive recommendations received divided by the minimum number of recommendations required (Ref: Provision 31.30, MOU).

11.0 Peer Review of Salary Step Denials

- 11.1 A candidate who has received a favorable recommendation from the ULRC and who subsequently fails to receive a PSSI, shall be eligible to have the increase denial reviewed by a University Peer Review Panel (UPRP) constituted for that purpose. The

UPRP shall be the sole forum for any reconsideration of any denial of a PSSI (Ref: Provision 31.36, MOU).

- 11.2 The UPRP shall consist of three (3) voting members and one (1) alternate. All members of each panel shall be selected by lot from among the pool of all full-time tenured faculty excluding those (Ref: Provision 31.38, MOU):
 - A. Serving on the DLRC that reviewed the application under reconsideration or ULRC during the current PSSI review/award cycle.
 - B. Having submitted or intending to submit a request of reconsideration of a denial of a PSSI during the current review/reward cycle (Ref: Provision 31.37, MOU).
- 11.3 All requests for reconsideration by the UPRP must be submitted in writing to the Vice President for Academic Affairs no later than ~~April 15, 1996, and no later than~~ January 15 of each year in which negotiated PSSIs are awarded. ~~in the future~~ (Ref: Provision 31.36, MOU).
- 11.4 The UPRP shall begin to review the specific PSSI denial within fourteen (14) day of its selection by lot. The panel's review shall be limited to a reconsideration of the PSSI denial of the nominee; and the Employer's written response to any allegations made by the affected faculty employee. Except for presentations of the complainant and if so elected, by that of an administrator, the peer review shall be made from the documents identified in ~~provisions~~ sections 6.5, 8.5 and 9.1 of this policy (Ref: Provision 31.39, MOU).
- 11.5 The proceedings of the UPRP shall not be open to the public and shall not be a hearing (Ref: Provision 31.40, MOU).
- 11.6 No later than thirty (30) days after its selection, the UPRP shall submit to the President and complainant a written report of its findings and recommendations. All written materials considered by the panel shall be forwarded to the President. The panel shall be automatically disbanded upon the completion of its duties as identified in this section (Ref: Provision 31.42, MOU).
- 11.7 The President shall consider the UPRP's recommendations and all forwarded materials and, no later than fourteen (14) days after receipt of the panel's report, notify the affected employee and the members of the panel of his/her final decision, including the reasons therefor. Notification to the faculty employee of the President's decision

concludes the peer review procedure and such decision shall not be reviewable in any forum (Ref: Provision 31.42, MOU).

11.8 All written materials pertaining to the review of salary step denials including a written record of the President's final decision shall become part of the application package.

12.0 Final Disposition of All Documents Pertaining to PSSI Applications

12.1 At the conclusion of a PSSI cycle, all documents pertaining to an individual's PSSI application (referred to as an application package) which shall include: letter(s) of nomination, if any; the individual's application; the DLRC's assessment of performance and PSSI recommendation; the ULRC's assessment of performance and PSSI recommendation; the President's action on the PSSI recommendation; and all written materials, if any, pertaining to a review of salary step denials shall be: 1) for those applicants awarded a PSSI: returned to the administrative custodian of the applicant's Personnel Action File (PAF) for inclusion in the PAF, or 2) for those applicants not awarded a PSSI: returned to the applicant.

AS 96-39

1 B. ~~COURSE/PROFICIENCY REQUIREMENTS IN WRITING~~
2 GRADUATION WRITING REQUIREMENTS

3
4 1. First Semester Composition

5 All students must complete a first semester college composition course (English IA
6 or equivalent) with a grade of C- or higher. ~~This requirement may also be met with~~
7 ~~English IA credit earned by a passing score on the English Equivalency~~
8 ~~Examination.~~ Courses meeting this requirement also satisfy the Area A-2
9 requirement of the CSUS G.E. Program and the IGETC English Communication
10 Subject Area requirement.
11

12
13 2. Second Semester Composition Requirement

14
15 a. Course Requirement

16 All students, including students who have completed the IGETC shall be
17 required to complete a second semester composition course with a C- grade or
18 better. ~~This requirement may also be met with course credit earned with a~~
19 ~~specified score on the English Equivalency Examination.~~ The requirement is
20 a graduation requirement, not a G.E. requirement. Composition/critical
21 thinking courses taken to satisfy CSU G.E. Breadth Requirements or IGETC
22 requirements do not necessarily satisfy the requirement. Second semester
23 composition courses taken at other institutions may satisfy the requirement if
24 they are determined by the CSUS English Department to be equivalent. ~~If a~~
25 ~~course is used to satisfy the second semester compositions requirement then it~~
26 ~~may not also be used to satisfy a G.E. Requirement.~~ Students satisfying the
27 A.3 G.E. requirement with a course articulated with CSUS English 20 will be
28 “certified” as having met the second semester composition requirement.
29

30
31 b. Criteria for Courses Satisfying the Requirement

32 Courses meeting the requirement shall normally be lower division courses and
33 shall focus on composition writing and on reading. Generally, the course shall
34 continue instruction and practice in the kinds of writing tasks introduced in
35 English IA and shall include readings in and writings based on multicultural
36 literature. ~~The~~ ~~courses~~ grades shall be assigned primarily on the student's
37 demonstrated writing ability. The curriculum of the course shall emphasize
38 the following:

- 39
40 · a review of composition principles
41 · continued work on the thesis, organization, development
42 · continued work on revision

- 1 · close reading of texts
- 2 · summarizing texts in writing
- 3 · reviewing texts in writing
- 4 · evaluating texts in writing
- 5 · constructing an argument, marshaling evidence, persuading
- 6 · research techniques
- 7 · writing longer papers than are required in English 1A
- 8 · refining style
- 9 · writing precisely and concisely
- 10 · improving use of language

11
12 e. 3. Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement (Writing Proficiency
13 Examination)

14
15 1) a. **CSU System Policy (Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement,**
16 **E.O. 514)**

17
18 Under the provisions of E.O. 514^a (Competency in Student Writing
19 Skills), effective date November 6, 1987, "All students subject to the
20 degree requirements of the 1977-78 or subsequent general catalogs
21 must demonstrate writing skills at the upper division level as a
22 requirement for graduation and as a prerequisite to classified standing
23 in graduate programs." While the requirement is a systemwide
24 requirement (identified by the appellation "Graduation Writing
25 Assessment Requirement" (GWAR)), campuses are provided some
26 latitude in determining how the requirement is to be met.

27
28 E.O. 514 specifies the following: "Certification of graduation writing
29 proficiency is an all-campus responsibility. Certification may rely on
30 evidence of writing ability in written course work, essay examinations
31 or other measures of student writing competence. Measures may be
32 developed which best fit individual campus needs. However,
33 certification by examination shall be at the campus level and shall
34 include a common essay examination written and evaluated under
35 controlled conditions and graded by at least two faculty readers."

36
37 2) b. **CSUS Campus Policy Pertaining to the Graduation Writing**
38 **Assessment Requirement (Writing Proficiency Examination)**

39
40 ~~CSUS has chosen the examination option for certification of writing~~
41 ~~proficiency. The CSUS Policy on Writing Proficiency is provided~~
42 ~~below. At CSUS, certification of graduation writing proficiency shall~~

1 be conducted in accordance with the CSUS Policy on Graduation
2 Writing Proficiency provided below:
3

4 **CSUS POLICY ON GRADUATION WRITING PROFICIENCY**

5
6 **A. Graduation Writing Proficiency Requirement**

- 7
8 1. Candidates for the baccalaureate degree^a will be required to demonstrate
9 proficiency in writing in accordance with provisions B and C of this policy.
10
11 2. The requirement applies to all students subject to the degree requirements of
12 the 1977-78 or subsequent catalogs.

13
14 **B. Writing Proficiency Examination (WPE)**

- 15
16 1. ~~Students must satisfy the requirement by passing the Writing Proficiency~~
17 ~~Examination.~~ All matriculated CSUS students must take the CSUS Writing
18 Proficiency Exam (WPE). The examination will be offered at least once twice
19 each semester (see Class Schedule for times offered). Achieving a passing score
20 on the WPE satisfies the Graduation Writing Proficiency Requirement.
21 Students passing the WPE must then take an Advanced Study course to
22 complete CSUS General Education Requirements.
23
24 2. ~~Completion of the second semester composition course requirement with a C-~~
25 ~~grade or higher (or earning equivalent course credit through the English~~
26 ~~Equivalency Examination) shall be prerequisite for the Writing Proficiency~~
27 ~~Examination.~~
28
29 3. The Writing Proficiency Examination must be taken no later than the end of the
30 first semester of the junior year (i.e., upon completion of 60 units) (see Class
31 Schedule for times offered); or, if a student enters CSUS at a later stage in his
32 or her career, in the first semester of attendance. Students whose first language
33 is a language other than English (ESL) who wish to have an ESL reading of
34 their WPE and extra time on the exam must take the English Diagnostic Test
35 (EDT) no later than the beginning of their Junior year. Students who have not
36 met ~~this~~ these requirements will be subject to a registration hold. The hold will
37 be removed when the student registers to take the WPE.
38
39 a. Students who do not pass the WPE the first time must retake the
40 examination no later than the following semester or enroll in the
41 appropriate writing course(s). Students not meeting this requirement will

1 be subject to a registration hold. The registration hold will be removed
2 only when the student registers for the next available WPE.

3
4 b. Students not passing the WPE the first time are advised to retake the
5 examination no later than the BEGINNING of the following semester.

6
7 ~~53.~~ Each student taking the examination will have two and a half hours to write a
8 single essay. (ESL students who meet the requirements specified in section B.3
9 of this policy shall be provided additional time). Essay topics can be dealt with
10 on the baseis of common knowledge.

11
12 ~~64.~~ Each essay will be evaluated by two readers, and by a third if the first two
13 disagree.

14
15 ~~75.~~ The readers will be full- and part-time faculty members chosen by the English
16 Composition Committee.

17
18 ~~8.~~ Any student who fails the examination may meet with one of the examination
19 readers to seek advice regarding appropriate instruction in composition and/or to
20 ask for a reevaluation of the student's examination essay (Reevaluation
21 procedures will be designed and supervised by the Coordinator of Writing
22 Proficiency Examinations).

23
24 ~~46.~~ Students not successful in passing the WPE after two attempts must enroll in an
25 appropriate ~~WPE designated English writing course(s)~~ (see section C of this
26 policy). Students not meeting this requirement will be subject to a registration
27 hold. The hold will be removed when the student registers for an appropriate
28 ~~WPE English writing course.~~

29
30 **C. Designated English Writing Courses**

31
32 1. Students who do not achieve a passing score on the WPE after two attempts
33 must register in English 109. ESL students who qualified for an ESL reading
34 of the WPE must register in English 109E (based on EDT placement scores,
35 ESL students may be required to take a designated course prerequisite to
36 English 109E and must satisfactorily complete the prerequisite prior to
37 enrollment).

38
39 2. English 109/109E shall be letter graded courses with a group graded common
40 exit exam. Successful completion of English 109/109E with a C- grade or better
41

1 satisfies the Graduation Writing Proficiency Requirement. Students satisfying
2 the requirement must then take an Advanced Study course to complete CSUS
3 General Education requirements.

4
5 3. Successful completion of English 109/109E shall require satisfactory
6 completion of all course requirements and a passing score on a group graded
7 exit exam. Students may submit a course portfolio for group evaluation in cases
8 where a passing score on the exit exam is not achieved.

9
10 4. Students who do not complete English 109/109E with a C- grade or better in
11 their first attempt, may repeat the course. Enrollment after two attempts
12 depends on space availability and requires permission of the Instructor.

13
14 **ED. Implementation of the Graduation Writing Proficiency Requirement**

15
16 1. Responsibility for administering the graduation writing proficiency
17 requirement shall be assigned to the English Department. Necessary
18 budgetary support for the operation of the program shall be included in the
19 budget of the English Department.

20
21 ~~D. The English Department shall recommend to the Academic Senate further policies to~~
22 ~~ensure the effectiveness of the CSUS writing proficiency requirement.~~

23
24
25 ^aThe writing proficiency requirement also applies to candidates for a second
26 bachelor's degree and graduate students.