

Jan

1995-96
ACADEMIC SENATE
California State University, Sacramento

AGENDA
Thursday, May 16, 1996
Forest Suite, University Union
2:45-3:45 (immediately following 1996-97 Senate Elections)

4:00 p.m. Outstanding Teacher Award Reception

INFORMATION

- Spring 1996 Schedule of Meetings (*=tentative):
May 23*

CONSENT CALENDAR

AS 96-47/Ex. COUNCIL FOR UNIVERSITY PLANNING--MEMBERSHIP

The Academic Senate recommends that faculty membership on the Council for University Planning (CUP) continue as defined for 1995-96 (per AS 95-57), i.e.:

- two at-large faculty members, recommended by the Academic Senate, and appointed by the President, for staggered two year terms
- one member of the Senate Executive Committee recommended by the Executive Committee and appointed by the President, for a one year term
- one designee of the Faculty Policies Committee, appointed by the President, for a one year term
- one designee of the Academic Policies Committee, appointed by the President, for a one year term
- one non-instructional faculty member (student services professional or librarian) recommended by the Academic Senate, and appointed by the President, for a one year term.

AS 96-48/CPC, Ex. GRADUATE PROGRAMS: 200-LEVEL COURSES

[Note: See Attachment A for Curriculum Policies Committee's background.]

The CSUS Academic Senate recommends that:

CSUS graduate programs shall normally require that a minimum of 18 units in a 30-40 unit degree program and 36 units in a 60 unit degree program be earned in regularly

scheduled 200-level: courses requiring student participation (discussion) as the primary instructional method and seminar courses requiring formal presentations by students and student responses to presentations as well as formal evaluation by the instructor.

Seminar 200-level enrollments should ^{normally} whenever possible be limited to 15.

All 200-level courses shall require students to demonstrate writing and presentation abilities appropriate for thesis/project and professional work and provide opportunities for interaction among students and between students and the instructor.

AS 96-49/CPC, Ex. GRADUATE PROGRAMS: GRADUATE STUDENTS TAKING UNDERGRADUATE CLASSES

[Note: See Attachment B for Curriculum Policies Committee's background.]

The CSUS Academic Senate recommends that:

CSUS graduate programs shall ^{normally} require that graduate students taking undergraduate courses for degree credit shall do additional assignments demonstrating graduate-level skills. Academic Affairs may grant exceptions for required auxiliary skills courses.

AS 96-50/CPC, Ex. GRADUATE PROGRAMS: PART-TIME/TEMPORARY FACULTY SUPERVISION OF THESES AND PROJECTS

[Note: See Attachment D for Curriculum Policies Committee's background.]

The CSUS Academic Senate recommends that:

- I. Part-time and temporary faculty shall not ^{normally} serve as the first reader (supervisor) for a thesis or project except as an emergency measure under the following specific conditions:
- The department has no full-time faculty in the student's area of specialization.
 - The department develops a specific plan for the supervised completion of the thesis or project in the event that the part-time or temporary faculty member leaves the University.
 - The department secures a guarantee of regular supervisory compensation for the part-time or temporary faculty member.
 - The Associate Vice President for Research and Graduate Study certifies that the above conditions have been met.

- II. The Associate Vice President shall each year inform the Curriculum Policies Committee and the Vice President for Academic Affairs of the specific permissions granted under this policy.

REGULAR AGENDA

Carried

AS 96-46/Flr. MINUTES

Approval of the Minutes of the meeting of May 9, 1996 (#15).

Old Business

Carried

AS 96-40/Flr. MINUTES

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

New Business

A96-52/Ex. CSU AS 2330-96AA

see amendments

Carried

AS 96-51/Ex. PERFORMANCE SALARY STEP INCREASE

- Whereas, The California State University ,Sacramento (CSUS) Academic Senate views the Performance Salary Step Increase (PSSI) system as a reward structure for exceptional performance by a member of the Faculty; and
- Whereas, The CSUS Academic Senate believes that such reward structures, by definition, ought to be limited to a small group of faculty; and
- Whereas, The 1995-96 portion of the CSU compensation package directed into the PSSI system (4%) was a reasonable proportion to set aside for rewarding a select group of faculty; and
- Whereas, The CSUS Academic Senate acknowledges and endorses, in principle, the desire of the Trustees to create a reward system for exceptional performance; and
- Whereas, With the elimination of within rank ceilings, the existing systems of compensation and reward for faculty (service steps and promotional systems), while not perfect, allow for all meritorious faculty to be

compensated and rewarded over the course of their careers in a reasonable and less costly fashion than PSSI; and

Whereas, The new contract language tying service salary steps to "satisfactory performance," is a reasonable cost control structure tied to performance; and

Amended

Whereas, The Trustee "proposal on the table" to increase the proportion of new salary dollars that should go to PSSI to 40% is inconsistent with the stated intent of the PSSI program and suggests movement toward replacement of compensation through the promotional system with PSSI; and

Whereas, PSSI, as it is structured, is far less capable of holding faculty "accountable" on a continual basis and is absolutely not capable of providing incentive for, or insuring, increased faculty "productivity" as it pertains to the education and development of students; and

Whereas, Replacing the existing rank and salary advancement systems with PSSI will effectively impede the development of a healthy educational environment for students; therefore be it

Amended

Resolved: That the CSUS Academic Senate urges the CSU Trustees and the CFA to limit PSSI to no more than 4% of the compensation package as a means of rewarding faculty for exceptional performance; and, be it further

Resolved: That the CSUS Academic Senate urges the CSU Trustees, CSU Academic Senate, and the CFA to review and modify as necessary, the extant non-PSSI systems of rank and salary advancement to ensure that these systems support, promote, and sustain faculty productivity, particularly as it relates to the teaching mission of the CSU; and, be it further

Resolved: That the CSUS Academic Senate urges all campus Academic Senates and the CSU Academic Senate to support this resolution and notify both the CSU Trustees and CFA of their support.

AS 96-47
AS 96-48
AS 96-49

Have a Great Summer!

Attachment A : Requirements for 200-level Course work

Statement of the Problem

What are the general characteristics of sound 200-level courses? What proportion of course work toward a graduate degree should be regularly scheduled 200-level courses?

Evidence Consulted

Title V requires that a minimum of 50 percent of courses counted toward a graduate degree be courses "organized primarily" for graduate students. The requirement recognizes that sound graduate education requires courses with a level of instructional sophistication superior to that of undergraduate courses, assignments markedly more rigorous than those for undergraduate courses, opportunities for student presentations and interaction among students and the instructor.

The Dinielli Report (pp. 19-23) emphasizes the importance of 200-level courses as essential the achieving basic aims of graduate education such as the development of advanced **communication** and **critical thinking** skills. It recommends that the minimum share of 200-level courses credited toward a degree "should be increased from 50 to 70 percent." Like the University, the Dinielli Report also makes the regular and appropriate scheduling of graduate courses an essential characteristic of a sound graduate program.

CSUS policy currently recognizes the importance of *regularly scheduled* 200-level courses in its restriction of 299 work counted toward the degree to a maximum of 6 units and severe restrictions on the use of double-listed courses -- provisions which the Dinielli Report also supports. University policy also forbids counting culminating experience units to meet the minimum 200-level requirement. In practice, however, CSUS programs still differ widely in the proportion of 200-level courses required for the degree and in average enrollment ranges.

Many University **Program Reviews** have commented on the importance of the availability of 200-level courses and the enrollments appropriate for seminars.

Alternative Considered: The Status Quo

The Committee considered two key arguments in favor of the status quo: keeping the 50 percent minimum on 200-level courses, and not imposing any enrollment restriction on seminar 200-level courses:

- The current 50 percent 200-level course requirement is adequate to ensure a quality master's degree, and the imposition of a higher requirement would severely disadvantage smaller programs which have great difficulty in offering a sufficient number of 200-level courses.
- The enforcement of a higher 200-level course requirement and the proposed enrollment limit would be too expensive for the University's current budget.

The Committee appreciates the strength of these arguments, but believes that implementation of the Dinielli Report recommendation is crucial to sound graduate education. In fact, there seems to be a genuine consensus about the *desirability* of the recommended changes. The Committee knows of no other type of class which can

effectively duplicate the seminar's ability to promote the interaction among students and between students and instructor essential to intellectual maturity; and

effectively duplicate the seminar's ability to allow students to practice oral and written communication skills and critical thinking essential to doctoral work or professional competence.

At the same time, the Committee believes that the recommended limit on graduate seminar enrollments is necessary, for higher enrollments destroy the distinctive and essential features of the seminar.

The proposal recognizes that circumstances may make it impossible for a program to observe the minimum requirement of 18 units of regularly scheduled 200-level courses and the enrollment limit of 15. The Committee believes that it is nonetheless essential to adopt the standard and that program review teams and other evaluative procedures note a program's success in meeting those standards.

Attachment B: Graduate Student Work in Undergraduate Courses

Statement of the Problem

CSUS graduate programs vary greatly in the proportion of upper-division courses they permit students to count toward the degree. Title V requires that at least 50 percent of such course work be in regularly scheduled 200-level courses, but many programs rely on graduate students taking undergraduate courses. The problem is:

How can the University ensure that graduate students will have a learning experience in undergraduate courses similar to that which they would have in a 200-level course?

Evidence Consulted

The Dinielli Report's comments on the dangers of double-listing courses (already greatly restricted by CSUS policy) apply generally to the use of undergraduate courses:

Students interviewed for this study have expressed disappointment about the lack of opportunity to enroll in genuine graduate courses with other graduate students. The graduate seminar is indeed a critical and unique part of the graduate program and remains one of the key means of introducing students to scholarly discourse and professional values. (p. 20)

The Report adds that upper-division courses should "be permitted only when it benefits the student's graduate program ..."

Program Review Faculty and Graduate Student poll comments support the Dinielli Report's conclusion that graduate students learn less in undergraduate courses *unless* special provision is made for them to work at a higher level than that expected of undergraduate students.

Alternatives Considered

Alternative I: Impose restrictions on degree credit for undergraduate courses **beyond** that imposed by the minimum 200-level unit requirement in AS 96/.

Alternative II: Have no University or school standards regarding the level of work required of graduate students in undergraduate courses.

Committee Conclusion

The Committee believes that raising the required proportion of 200-level courses beyond 18 (in a 30-40 unit program) is pedagogically desirable but impossible under the current -- or any anticipated -- budget. At the same time, the Committee believes that the implementation of the Dinielli Report standards requires a University-wide standard regarding undergraduate courses for graduate degree credit. The Committee emphasizes that the requirement for special assignments for graduate students in undergraduate classes applies only to courses counted for degree credit. The requirement would not apply to other courses (e.g. prerequisites), and the recommendation provides for exemptions for required, degree-credit auxiliary skills courses.

Attachment C: Part-Time/Temporary Faculty as Supervisors of Theses and Projects

Statement of the Problem

Under which circumstances may part-time and temporary faculty serve as supervisors of theses or projects?

Alternative Considered

Alternative I: Forbid part-time/temporary faculty supervision of theses and projects.

Alternative II: Allow supervision at departmental discretion.

Alternative III: Allow supervision with the permission of the dean of the school and Academic Affairs.

Committee Conclusion

The Committee considered a number of arguments against permitting part-time/temporary supervision:

- Part-time and temporary faculty, however qualified, lack the secure tenure which may be necessary to supervise the completion of the work;
- The proposed policy fails to give students a guarantee that they will have consistent procedural and content guidance throughout their thesis/project work;
- It will be difficult to guarantee proper compensation to the part-time and temporary faculty involved, partly because some departments do not properly compensate even full-time faculty and partly because part-time and temporary faculty may not be rehired and will hence be unavailable to use any planned compensation.

On the other hand, the Committee recognized that there are several programs which must use part-time/temporary supervision in order to provide thesis/project culminating experience. It therefore recommends a restricted authority.

compensated and rewarded over the course of their careers in a reasonable and less costly fashion than PSSI; and

Whereas, The new contract language tying service salary steps to "satisfactory performance," is a reasonable cost control structure tied to performance; and

Whereas, ~~The Trustee "proposal on the table" to increase the proportion of new salary dollars that should go to PSSI to 40%~~ To allocate a substantial proportion of new salary dollars to PSSI is inconsistent with the stated intent of the PSSI program and suggests movement toward replacement of compensation through the promotional system with PSSI; and

Whereas, PSSI, as it is structured, is far less capable of holding faculty "accountable" on a continual basis and is absolutely not capable of providing incentive for, or insuring, increased faculty "productivity" as it pertains to the education and development of students; and

Whereas, Replacing the existing rank and salary advancement systems with PSSI will effectively impede the development of a healthy educational environment for students; therefore be it

Resolved: That the CSUS Academic Senate urges the CSU Trustees and the CFA to limit PSSI to ~~no more than 4% of the compensation package as a means of rewarding faculty~~ an amount sufficient to reward no more than five percent (5%) of the Unit 3 members each year for exceptional performance; and, be it further

Resolved: That the CSUS Academic Senate urges the CSU Trustees, CSU Academic Senate, and the CFA to review and modify as necessary, the extant non-PSSI systems of rank and salary advancement to ensure that these systems support, promote, and sustain faculty productivity, particularly as it relates to the teaching mission of the CSU; and, be it further

Resolved: That the CSUS Academic Senate urges all campus Academic Senates and the CSU Academic Senate to support this resolution and notify both the CSU Trustees and CFA of their support.

Have a Great Summer!

RESOLUTION OF COMMENDATION
for JUANITA BARRENA

- WHEREAS In 1990, the faculty of CSU, Sacramento, sent the Academic Senate of the CSU a street fighter from Brooklyn, and
- WHEREAS "Dr. B.", as her students call her, has brought a much needed element of Brooklyn PIZZ-AZZ to our deliberations, and
- WHEREAS Juanita Barrena has been a role model for "telling it like it is", and
- WHEREAS Juanita Barrena is unusually deft at couching inflammatory ideas in eloquent, resolution-appropriate language, and
- WHEREAS Juanita Barrena's commitment to the undergraduate teaching mission of the CSU and access to that education is extraordinary and furthermore articulately argued, and
- WHEREAS Juanita Barrena's commitment to the integrity of faculty governance and the role of the Academic Senate in that shared governance is unparalleled, and
- WHEREAS Juanita Barrena has shown a unique blend of political insight and parliamentary maneuvering to advance her positions (which she purports are always right and true), and
- WHEREAS Juanita Barrena has not only fought for high principles related to the academy, but has distinguished herself by also living by them, and
- WHEREAS Juanita Barrena has taught us, and the Academic Affairs Committee, in particular, the true biological distinction between sharks and guppies, to the awe of those trying to navigate the "sea-change", and
- WHEREAS anticipation of what Juanita Barrena might ask the Chancellor, when she does not move to delete him from the Senate's agenda, energizes our plenary sessions, and
- WHEREAS her passion for students whose educational attainment has been persistently obstructed by institutional racism is unchallenged, and
- WHEREAS her mentoring of junior Sacramento Senators is greatly appreciated, and
- WHEREAS Juanita Barrena has "marked" the Sacramento Dais for all time, be it
- RESOLVED that the Academic Senate of the CSU, and particularly her Sacramento juniors and her colleagues from the Academic Affairs Committee, will sorely miss her presence and wisdom, and be it further
- RESOLVED that the Academic Senate of the CSU wishes Juanita Barrena well in her continued pursuit of the education and development of students, her efforts to sustain access and opportunity for underrepresented students, and her pursuit of the values of the academy, and be it further
- RESOLVED that the Academic Senate of the CSU wishes the street fighter from Brooklyn the best of health, happiness, and the joys of living.

..... Adopted May 10, 1996, by CSU Academic Senate