

Jan

1995-96
ACADEMIC SENATE
California State University, Sacramento

AGENDA
Thursday, May 9, 1996
Forest Suite, University Union
2:30-4:30

INFORMATION

1. CSUS Fact Finding Hearing Commission
TIME CERTAIN: Immediately following AS 96-39, but no later than 3:30 p.m. (See Attachment D for questions to be addressed)
2. 1996 Scholarly and Creative Activity Award recipients have been named by the Faculty Endowment Fund Committee. The are: **Robert Paul Furry, Chemistry**, whose faculty mentor is Linda M. Roberts, and **Jennifer L. Stevenson, Art**, whose faculty mentor is Catherine Turrill. Each student will receive a stipend of \$1,500 from the Faculty Endowment Fund.
2. Spring 1996 Schedule of Meetings (*=tentative):
May 16--3:00-4:00 [1996-97 Elections, 2:30-2:45; Outstanding Teacher Award Reception, 4:00]
May 23*

CONSENT CALENDAR

AS 96-41/Ex. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS--University

CSUS Foundation Board of Directors:

Nominees for appointment to a Faculty At-large position, 1996-2000, to be interviewed and appointed by President Gerth:

- NADEEN RUIZ (Bilingual/Multicultural Education) or
- DORAISWAMY RAMANCHANDRAN (Mathematics) or
- REGINALD GOODFELLOW (Organizational Behavior and Environment)

AS 96-42/Ex. CENTERS AND INSTITUTES (Amends AS 95-60 and PM 96-06)

The Academic Senate recommends approval of the proposed amendments to the campus policy on Centers and Institutes (PM 96-06), as shown in Attachment A.

AS 96-43/CPC, Ex. CURRICULUM REVIEW--BIOMEDICAL ENGINEERING PROGRAM

The Academic Senate receives the commendations and recommendations of the Curriculum Policies Committee's ad hoc Program Review Subcommittee for the Biomedical Engineering Program (Attachment B) and recommends 1) two-year approval of the M.S. in Biomedical Engineering due to the precarious position the program is in due to lack of faculty funding, and 2) that the program be reevaluated in two years, Spring 1996, to assess whether the program has received adequate faculty positions and program support.

AS 96-44/GEGR, Ex. GENERAL EDUCATION WAIVER--PHYSICAL THERAPY B.S.
(Revisits AS 94-63A)

The Academic Senate recommends approval of the General Education Program Waiver request for the Physical Therapy B.S. (see Attachment C). [Note: This waiver will cease to exist when the Physical Therapy Program becomes a Masters Degree program (tentatively scheduled for Fall 1998).]

Regular AgendaAS 96-40/Flr. MINUTES

Approval of the Minutes of the meeting of May 2, 1996 (#14).

Old Business*Carried* 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 May 2, 1996, Academic Senate Agenda 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).

PM 96-96

RESEARCH CENTERS AND INSTITUTES

Purpose

University-endorsed centers and institutes are approved by the President and formally reviewed by the University to ensure that they serve some or all of the following purposes:

1. enhance the conduct of faculty research and scholarship;
2. enhance and support the instructional programs of the university;
3. enhance the university's ability to obtain external funding; and
4. provide for and coordinate public service programs.

Endorsed centers and institutes do not have a primary purpose of offering instruction, although their activities may be related to the instructional program.

They differ in purpose, organization, reporting lines and formal review requirements from centers which support academic programs, faculty research and development in general, provide student services, or offer academic programs.

Procedures for the Establishment of a Center or Institute

Each center/institute shall:

1. have a clearly stated set of objectives;
2. have a clear relationship to the mission of an existing university program or of the university as a whole;
3. have a clear administrative reporting line.

Support

The amount, duration, and source(s) of funding required to establish and maintain a center or institute shall be included in the proposal for approval at the time of establishment and reviewed annually by the unit(s) which supplies support.

Types of Centers and Institutes

There are three types of university-endorsed centers and institutes: departmental, school and university. The three types differ in a) the criteria and procedures for their establishment and disestablishment; b) their reporting lines and the policies and procedures which govern their organization; c) requirements for fiscal support and the disposition of Research Incentive funds; d) the procedures for their formal, periodic review; and e) the scope of the academic discipline relevant to their activities.

Departmental Centers and Institutes

- a) Departmental centers and institutes may be proposed by one or more faculty or by a department. Faculty members' proposals require approval of the department faculty. Centers and institutes approved at the departmental level then require the school dean's approval after consultation with the Vice President for Academic Affairs, and the President's approval.
- b) Departmental centers and institutes report to the department which approved them. The director is appointed by the department for a term not to exceed three years and is subject to departmental, school and university centers and institutes policies and procedures. The department in turn reports at least annually on the center or institute to its Dean, who reports on the center or institute to the Associate Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies. Departmental centers and institutes are encouraged but not required to have a board or advisory committee.
- c) Departmental centers and institutes are self-supporting, but external funding is not required. Any earmarked research incentive funds go to the center or institute.
- d) Departmental centers and institutes undergo formal university review at the time of the program review of the department to which it reports.
- e) Departmental centers and institutes normally promote research or support academic programs in one academic discipline (or department) or use the expertise of one academic discipline (or department) for public service.

School Centers and Institutes

- a) School centers and institutes are proposed by faculty members or by a department directly to the dean of a school. The dean consults with affected departments and with the school faculty or appropriate school governance before approving (or disapproving) the proposal for the center or institute. The dean submits approved proposals to the Vice President for Academic Affairs who recommends approval or disapproval to the President.
- b) School centers and institutes report to the school dean, who appoints the director with the consultation of the school faculty (or appropriate school governance) to serve at the dean's pleasure. The director is subject to school and university center and institute policies and procedures. The school dean annually evaluates school centers and institutes for the Associate Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies. The school dean will report the results of the annual evaluation to the school faculty (or appropriate school governance). School centers and institutes may report to more than one school dean but one school dean must have final supervisory authority.

School centers and institutes must have an advisory committee comprising at least school and other on-campus members and also such off-campus members as the dean directs with consultation of the school faculty (or appropriate school governance). All off-campus advisory committee members are formally appointed by the President in consultation with the Dean.

- c) School centers and institutes normally receive a combination of school-generated and external funds. Earmarked research incentive funds go to the center or institute.
- d) School centers and institutes undergo formal university review at least once every six years.
- e) School centers and institutes must support research and other academic activities in more than one academic area (or department) and must be involved in service to a regional area.

University Centers and Institutes

- a) University centers and institutes are established by the President after consultation with appropriate deans, the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Academic Senate.
- b) University centers and institutes report to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. Directors serve at the pleasure of the President and are subject to university center and institute policies and procedures. University centers and institutes must have an advisory committee appointed by the President (with consultation with the Academic Senate on faculty appointments) and including off-campus members as the President may direct.
- c) University centers and institutes may be supported by the University and shall have a significant share of external funding.
- d) University centers and institutes undergo formal university review at the discretion of the President, but at least every six years.
- e) University centers and institutes sponsor research and service activities which are important to more than one school, serve the mission of the University and involve activities at the regional, statewide, national or international levels.

Reporting

~~All endorsed centers and institutes shall, in addition to reports required by deans, the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the President, annually submit a "short-form" report to the Associate Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies, who will alert the President, Vice President for Academic Affairs and, when appropriate, the deans and departments to any deficiencies indicated by the report filed.~~

At the end of each academic year, the director of each center and institute will report to the relevant dean and the Associate Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies about the activities of the year. That "short-form" report should include the number of students contributing to the center or institute's purpose; the number of faculty members involved; lists of publication and service records; sources and amounts of support; funds including income from service and product sales; expenditures; space and equipment utilization; and the like.

Reviews of Centers and Institutes

~~Periodic six year formal reviews of centers and institutes and any special reviews ordered by the President shall use the following procedures:~~

~~The Vice President for Academic Affairs will appoint up to two additional members for each review team from among administrators, staff, students, alumni, or community members as appropriate. The chair of the team shall be selected by and from the team.~~

~~The Vice President for Academic Affairs, in consultation with the director of the center or institute and the review team, will designate an individual from beyond the campus. This individual, normally from another university or comparable institute, would be one whose competence is in the field of the center or institute being reviewed, and who is associated with a unit having similar purposes. The individual can function as an adjunct member of the team or as a consultant.~~

~~The self-study prepared by the director of the center or institute will comprise a response to the following:~~

- ~~1. Describe the activities of the center or institute since the last review.~~
- ~~2. If the center or institute is associated with a department or departments, describe the distinction between departmental activities and the center or institute activities.~~
- ~~3. What have been the successes and failures of the center or institute in meeting the goals of the last six-year plan?~~
- ~~4. By what criteria should the center or institute be judged in its success over the next six years vis-a-vis the next six-year plan?~~

~~The community or off-campus advisory board or group to the center or institute will be asked to prepare a report to the review team, addressing the same questions (from the preceding paragraph) and others they may select. The director of the center or institute will have an opportunity to comment on this report.~~

Each review shall be made in consideration of the following:

1. ~~the self-study;~~
2. ~~the last six year plan;~~
3. ~~the year-end reports submitted since the last six year review;~~
4. ~~the report of the last six year review, and~~
5. ~~the next six year plan.~~

~~The review team shall conduct interviews with the director of the center or institute and others, as appropriate.~~

~~The result of the review will be a report. The report will be reviewed in its proposed final draft form (it may have been previously reviewed) with the director, and others as appropriate. In addition to a response to the issues of the self-study, the report should address the appropriateness of the budget and its use, and the appropriateness of the next six year plan. The report should include specific recommendations for action by appropriate campus entities, including a recommendation to the Academic Senate, the appropriate Academic Dean, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs for continuation or termination of the center or institute.~~

~~The report will be presented to the Academic Senate's Curriculum Policies Committee to be handled in the same manner as academic program reviews.~~

I. Responsibility

The Associate Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies is responsible for implementing reviews of endorsed centers and institutes concerned with research and public service. The Associate Vice President shall

- ▶ compile and update a list of relevant centers and institutes;
- ▶ recommend a review calendar to the Vice President for Academic Affairs;
- ▶ maintain the short-form annual reports of centers and institutes; and
- ▶ personally or through appointment conduct the first-level review of centers and institutes.

II. Purpose of the Review

Reviews shall determine:

whether the center or institute has programs and objectives important to the University;

whether those programs and the achievement of those objectives require a center/institute organization;

whether it is actively pursuing those objectives;

whether its activities over the past five years have pursued proper objectives at a level justifying continuing University endorsement, and whether it has involved other faculty and students and the office of Research and Sponsored Projects in its activities;

whether it has met proper standards for keeping financial and other records, submitted adequate short-form annual reports to the Associate Vice President, and met all University requirements for governance;

whether it has a realistic five-year plan for activities consistent with University objectives.

III. Review Procedures

A. First-Level Review

The Associate Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies should do a first-level review. The review will use the short-form annual reports and other relevant materials and interviews. The Associate Vice President will submit the first-level review to the Vice President for Academic Affairs, recommending (1) continuing University endorsement of the center or institute; (2) termination of the endorsement; (3) conditional endorsement requiring improvements in the center or institute within a specified period of time; or (4) a full University review of the center or institute. The Vice President for Academic Affairs will consult with the Academic Senate through its Curriculum Policies Committee and the

Executive Committee, and then accept the recommendations, direct the Associate Vice President to seek further information, or direct a full review of the center or institute.

When the center or institute is closely related to a department, the Vice President for Academic Affairs will also submit a copy of the first-level review report to the program review team for the department. The program review team will further evaluate the center or institute as part of its review of the department.

B. Full Review

If the Vice President for Academic Affairs directs a full review, the Center or Institute shall prepare a self study.

The review will ordinarily be conducted by a team consisting of at least three instructional faculty members appointed by the Academic Senate. The Vice President for Academic Affairs will appoint up to two additional members from among administrators, faculty, staff, students, alumni, or community members.

The review team chair will be selected using the normal selection procedures of academic program review team chairs. The review team will examine

- ▶ materials gathered during the first-level review;
- ▶ the last five year plan;
- ▶ the next five year plan;
- ▶ the annual short-form reports submitted since the last review;
- ▶ the report of any previous review;
- ▶ the self study, and
- ▶ any other materials relevant to the evaluation.

The self study will explain (1) how the center or institute has achieved and intends to achieve the objectives in section II. (2) It will identify all uses of University resources made or contemplated, and (3) when relevant, describe the distinction between the activities of the center or institute and related departments.

The review team will conduct formal interviews with the director of the center or institute, the Director of Research and Sponsored Projects and others persons relevant to its evaluation. The review team will also meet with any advisory group of the center or institute. The advisory group, or any member of the group, may also submit written reports and other materials to the review team.

The review team report will be submitted in draft form to the director and any advisory group for response. The review team will consider the responses and make any appropriate changes in its report. The team will then submit its report to the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Associate Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies and to the Curriculum Policies Committee.

The Committee will adopt, modify or reject the recommendations of the report, add any recommendations they consider necessary, and transmit the final report to the Academic Senate and to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Disestablishment

Centers and institutes shall be disestablished by the review and approval procedures described above, except that the process need not include outside peer review. Continuation of a center or institute beyond the three year developmental period does not guarantee continuation of university funding.

	Department C&Is	School(s) C&Is	University C&Is
Establish/Disestablish Criteria	Department Faculty Approval Dean's Approval VPAA Consultation President's Approval.	Department Consultation (affected departments). Consultation with the School Faculty (or appropriate school governance) Dean's Approval VPAA Approval President's Approval.	Established by the President Dean(s), VPAA, & Senate Consultation.
Reporting Relationship	C&I reports to Chair Consultation with Department Faculty Chair reports to Dean Dean reports to AVP/RGS.	C&I reports to Dean Consultation with the School Faculty (or appropriate school governance) Dean reports to AVP/RGS.	C&I reports to VPAA VPAA reports to President Consultation with the Senate.
Administrative Policy	C&I Director serves at the pleasure of the Department and is subject to established Department, School and University procedures.	C&I Director serves at the pleasure of the Dean(s) and is subject to established School(s) and University procedures.	C&I Director serves at the pleasure of the President and is subject to University procedures.
Board or Advisory Committee	Board or advisory committee desirable, but not required.	Board or advisory committee within the University (external members OK).	Board or advisory committee required and must have at least one external member.
Fiscal Support	Self Supporting (Funding from sources external to the campus encouraged but not required).	Normally a combination of school generated and non-campus sponsored funding (internal funds determined by School at a level reasonable to support activity).	Combination of support by university and external sponsorship.
Incentive Policies	Principal Investigator share goes to C&I.	P.I. & Department share of "research incentive funds" goes to C&I.	P.I. & Department share of "research incentive funds" goes to C&I. Dean's share to President.
Review Process	Part of Department or program review.	Reviewed as a separate entity (distinct program review) at least once every six years.	Reviewed at President's discretion (at least each six years).
Scope of Activity	Activities confined to single discipline or department.	Interdisciplinary or Interdepartmental resources and activities required. Involvement in regional service area required.	Interscholar resources and activity required. Activity identified as primary to the University mission. External involvement at multi-regional (statewide), national, or international level.

Note: CSUS University Manual listing of Research Centers and Institutes to be updated, if necessary since December 17, 1990, revision.

After reviewing thoroughly the attached Academic Program Review Report for the Biomedical Engineering Program, prepared by the Review Team, the Academic Senate ad hoc Program Review Committee 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 BIOMEDICAL ENGINEERING PROGRAM
SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING AND COMPUTER SCIENCE

COMMENDATIONS:

The Biomedical Engineering Program is commended for

- its high quality program which is central to the mission and goals of the University Strategic Plan;
- its dedicated, excellent and talented instructors and researchers with national recognition who are well regarded by students and foster high student involvement and commitment to Biomedical Engineering;
- its high standards of scholarship, close student-faculty collaboration, interdisciplinary instruction and research;
- its high levels of scholarly and creative activity among its faculty and students;
- its good working relationships among faculty;
- its excellent balance and alignment of coursework, examinations, and research; and
- its "good" to "excellent" ratings by students and faculty in course content and variety, quality of faculty and instruction, availability of faculty for consultation, advice and research, and maintenance of high student morale.

RECOMMENDATION TO THE VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS, THE DEAN OF ENGINEERING & COMPUTER SCIENCE, and THE BIOMEDICAL ENGINEERING PROGRAM:

Meet as soon as possible to evaluate the possibility of hiring at least one new faculty position. The Review Team urges the University to provide monetary assistance to the BME Program to replace faculty lost to retirements, resignations, etc. The Review Team and the outside reviewer (David Gough) agree that "survival of the BME Program depends on replacing faculty members ho have left. At present, the faculty size is clearly below critical mass."

RECOMMENDATION TO THE VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS and THE DEAN OF ENGINEERING & COMPUTER SCIENCE:

Give better recognition to the BME Program to support the outreach activities of the program such as an appropriate newsletter, brochure, a descriptive video, and opportunities to report achievements in local newspapers.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE DEAN OF ENGINEERING & COMPUTER SCIENCE:

1. Provide more technical and secretarial assistance in order to support thesis research and advising efforts, to enhance communication with the medical community and local industry, and to prepare extramural funding applications.
2. Clarify or modify the current administrative structure of the Biomedical Engineering Program, whose resources are currently drawn from the Mechanical and Electrical Engineering programs on an "as needed" basis, in order to eliminate uncertainty and difficulty in planning and provide a creative administrative arrangement which allows the Program more direct access to resources.

RECOMMENDATION TO THE DEAN OF ENGINEERING AND COMPUTER SCIENCE and
THE BIOMEDICAL ENGINEERING PROGRAM:

The Dean, in consultation with the Biomedical Engineering Program, continue to seek funding for up-to-date equipment essential to instruction and Program mission in order to enhance the quality of the BME Program.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE BIOMEDICAL ENGINEERING PROGRAM:

1. Establish a balance between teaching, research and service. The BME faculty devote a substantial portion of their effort to thesis supervision. The program should provide a system of accounting for faculty workload credit which will adequately recognize the effort involved in thesis direction.
2. Undertake vigorous action and affirmative plans to recruit and retain students with ethnic minority backgrounds.
3. Continue its efforts to actively recruit ethnic minority and women candidates whenever opportunities to acquire new faculty arise.
4. Continue to develop its ties with the community.

RECOMMENDATION TO ACADEMIC SENATE:

Recommend two-year approval of the M.S. in Biomedical Engineering due to the precarious position the program is in due to lack of faculty funding, and that the program be re-evaluated in two years, Spring 1997, to assess whether the program has received adequate faculty positions and program support.



California State University, Sacramento

SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95819-6016

FAX NUMBER (916) 278-7648

OFFICE OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

April 24, 1996

To: Sylvia Navari, Chair
Academic Senate

California State University, Sacramento
6000 J Street
Sacramento, California 95819-6036

From: *Cecilia Gray*
Cecilia Gray, Dean
General Education

APR 24 1996

Academic Senate Received
413

Re: AS 94-63A/Flr. Physical Therapy, B.S.

In the Spring of 1994 the General Education Committee approved a proposal permitting six upper division units in the Physical Therapy major to meet upper division General Education units. The Academic Senate tabled the Committee's recommendation in the Fall of 1994 (see attached). It was my understanding from the Senate meeting that the proposal was tabled because the identified courses, while appearing to meet GE objectives in AREAS D and E, had not been reviewed by the General Education Course Review Committee.

Since that time the Physical Therapy Department has submitted course proposals to the General Education Course Review Committee. Based on the Committee's recommendation I have approved the 6 unit overlap in General Education and the major. Since the Committee has approved the courses as meeting GE AREA objectives, I would like to request that AS 94-63A be placed on the Academic Senate's consent calendar.

Thank you very much.

cc: Stanley Geel, Chair
Physical Therapy

AS 94-63A/Flr. PHYSICAL THERAPY, BACHELOR OF SCIENCE DEGREE IN

The Academic Senate tables AS 94-63. [AS 94-63/GEGR, Ex., G.E. WAIVER--PHYSICAL THERAPY B.S.: The Academic Senate recommends approval of the General Education Program waiver request for the Physical Therapy B.S. (see September 22, 1994, Academic Senate Agenda Attachment C).]

Carried.

AS 94-63B/Flr. PHYSICAL THERAPY, BACHELOR OF SCIENCE DEGREE IN

The Academic Senate requests that the School of Health and Human Services provide the Senate with the information requested in AS 92-59 prior to the Senate taking any further action with regard to this program. [AS 92-59/FisA, CC, GPPC, Ex., PHYSICAL THERAPY, BACHELOR OF SCIENCE DEGREE IN: The Academic Senate recommends approval of the proposed Bachelor of Science Degree in Physical Therapy (5/21/92 Academic Senate Agenda Attachment B) with 1) the understanding that supplemental admissions criteria for the program will be developed in accordance with University policies and procedures, and 2) with the provision that in Spring 1993 the School of Health and Human Services report on progress in the area of fundraising with particular attention to sources of funding for the faculty positions and a specific statement on the portion of funding that will come from the School of Health and Human Services.]

Carried.

AS 94-76/Flr. MINUTES

Approval of the Minutes of the meeting of September 22 (#5), 1994.

Carried.

*AS 94-77/Ex. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS--University

Anthony J. Leones Scholarship Committee:
LINDA GOODRICH, At-large, 19997

Athletic Advisory Board:
KATHY STRAHAN, Faculty Representative (Coaching Staff), 1995

Campus Educational Equity Committee:
RITA CAMERON-WEDDING, At-large, 1997

CSUS Fact Finding Hearing Commission
Questions to be addressed by Academic Senate
May 9, 1996

1. What do you perceive to be the major problems of governance at CSUS?
2. Given that the Senate is a legislative body and representative group, do you have problems with your ability to represent faculty (or other constituency)?
3. Do you perceive problems with the methods by which policies are recommended to the President, or the President's responsiveness to actions of the Senate?
4. Are there adequate opportunities for faculty and other constituents to participate in academic governance? Do they?
5. Do you feel that CSUS is "over-governed" or "under-governed?"
6. Any other issues of governance you wish to identify?

**California State University, Sacramento
Fact Finding Hearing Commission**

The State of the University

During the Spring 1995 semester, a petition was circulated among the faculty which called for a referendum election to be conducted. The Faculty, in that referendum conducted between 15 November and 1 December 1995, decided:

"To establish a Fact Finding Hearing Commission whose charge is to conduct public hearings at which students, current and emeritus faculty, alumni, staff, and administrators would be invited to testify about the state of the University, in particular as it regards

- ▶ *the teaching and learning environment,*
- ▶ *the present structure of academic governance,*
- ▶ *and faculty rights and responsibilities.*

The Commission would be comprised of 5 tenured faculty, one from each School, nominated and elected by the University faculty at large.

The Fact Finding Commission will report its findings at a general Faculty meeting called for said purpose on or about April 1, 1996, but not later than the end of the Spring semester, 1996."

The Academic Senate collected nominations for the Commission from the faculty, and the Commission election was conducted between 20 February and 1 March 1996. The following were elected: Herbert Blake (BUS), Robyn Nelson (HHS), David Raske (EDUC), Donald Steward (ECS), Greg Wheeler (A&S). At its first meeting, March 11, 1996, Herbert Blake was elected Chair.

In accordance with the referendum, public hearings will be conducted as follows:

Wednesday, 24 April 1996, 8:30 - 10:00 a.m., Delta Suite, University Union
Monday, 29 April 1996, 12:00 - 1:30 p.m., Del Rio Room, River Front Center
Thursday, 2 May 1996, 8:30 - 10:00 a.m., Delta Suite, University Union

Additional hearings will be conducted with various groups specifically representing students, faculty, alumni, staff, and administrators on an opportunity basis.

In addition, the Commission has established an E-Mail Open Forum. Through this medium, you may present your thoughts so that others in the campus community who subscribe to this forum may review your ideas and respond to them via e-mail or in the public hearings. These messages will be entered into the testimony considered by the Commission. Instructions for subscribing to the E-Mail Open Forum may be obtained from Herb Blake (blakeh@csus.edu) or Don Steward (dvsteward@csus.edu).