

Jan

1995-96
ACADEMIC SENATE
California State University, Sacramento

AGENDA
Thursday, December 7, 1995
Forest Suite, University Union
2:30-3:45 p.m.

[Note: At 3:45 the Senate will adjourn for a reception at which the 1996 Faculty Merit Scholars will be recognized and honored.]

INFORMATION

Trustee Policy on Remediation - Update

CONSENT CALENDAR

AS 95-78/Ex. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS--UNIVERSITY

Instructionally Related Activities Committee:
ANNE-LOUISE RADIMSKY, At-large, 1996

AS 95-79/CPC, Ex. PROGRAM CHANGE PROPOSALS--UNDERGRADUATE

The Academic Senate recommends approval of the following program change proposals (the complete Program Change Proposals are available for review in the Academic Senate Office, SAC 254):

1. **B.A. in Humanities and Religious Studies:** Change required upper division core courses for the BA from HUM 105 and 137 to HRS 110 and 137; identify Humanities General Concentration requirements as Required Course (HRS 105) 3 units and Electives 21 units; identify Religious Studies Concentration requirements as Required Course (HRS 108) 3 units and Electives 21 units.
2. **B.S. in Human Resources Management:** Change title from Managing Human Resources to Human Resources Management; increase required Upper Division units from 3 to 15; decrease optional units from 15 to 3.
3. **B.S. in Nursing:** NURS 124 becomes NURS 24; course is deleted from Required Upper Division Courses and becomes prerequisite to the Nursing major.

AS 95-80/CPC, Ex. PROGRAM CHANGE PROPOSALS--GRADUATE

The Academic Senate recommends approval of the following program change proposals (the complete Program Change Proposals are available for review in the Academic Senate Office, SAC 254):

1. **M.A. in Psychology - Counseling Psychology Option:** Separate degree program from the State's requirements for eligibility for licensing as a Marriage, Family, Child Counselor; decrease the number of graduate units in the degree from 61 to 55; add a second semester of PSYC 228 and 229; delete PSYC 226, 236, 250, 252, and 295F from the degree program; PSYC 236, 250, 252, and 254 are required by the Board of Behavioral Science Examiners for students to be eligible for State licensing.
2. **M.A. in Public Policy and Administration:** Decrease in Program Requirements from 39 to 36-39; decrease in Elective Units from 9-12 to 9 units; PPA 295 only required of students without field experience.
3. **M.B.A. in Finance:** Addition of new Finance Concentration.
4. **M.B.A. in Marketing:** Addition of new Marketing Concentration.
5. **M.B.A. in Human Resources Management:** Addition of new Human Resources Management Concentration.
6. **M.B.A. in Management Computer Applications:** Addition of new Management Computer Applications Concentration.

AS 95-81/CPC, Ex. CONTINUOUS ENROLLMENT (Amends AS 93-22)

The Academic Senate recommends the following revision to the 1994-96 catalog, (p. 74) (underscore = addition):

CSUS students who are out of enrollment for one semester at CSUS and who do not enroll at another accredited college or university are granted an automatic leave of absence. This leave holds catalog requirements for undergraduates, maintains classification status for graduate students (exception: graduate students who have completed all their course work and have received a SP in their culminating experience are required to enroll for Continuous Enrollment--see page 102) and exempts students from the re-application fee.

AS 95-82/CPC, Ex. JOINT DOCTORAL PROGRAM: PUBLIC HISTORY--REQUEST TO NEGOTIATE

The Academic Senate recommends approval of the proposal to negotiate a joint doctoral program in public history between CSUS and the University of California, Santa Barbara.

REGULAR AGENDA

AS 95-77/Flr. MINUTES

Approval of the Minutes of the meetings of November 9 (#7), November 16 (#8) and ~~November 30 (#9)~~, 1995.

Agreed

[Note: AS 95-73 was the motion on the floor when the Senate adjourned on November 9, 1995.]

AS 95-73/Flr. RESOLUTION ON "OUTSOURCING" THE CSU, SACRAMENTO
BASIC WRITING PROGRAM

- WHEREAS, California State University, Sacramento, has developed a Basic Writing program to meet the needs of entering Freshman who score below the system-wide cutoff of 151 on the English Placement Test; and
- WHEREAS, the CSUS Basic Writing Program, supervised by the Basic Writing Coordinator, and jointly operated by the English Department and the Learning Skills Center, is a model program and highly regarded statewide; and
- WHEREAS, second language students receive developmental writing instruction through a highly successful ESL program, supervised by the ESL Coordinator and involving the English Department and the Learning Skills Center, which is also regarded statewide as an outstanding program; and
- WHEREAS, the CSUS remedial/developmental program is also a model of frugality, costing the University less than the .6 of 1% of the total budget that the program costs system-wide; and
- WHEREAS, information has reached this campus of a draft proposal developed on the American River College Campus, copies of which have been made available to the Academic Senate Executive Committee, which would "outsource" our Basic Writing and Developmental ESL programs, which are essential components of the University Writing Program, to American River College; and
- WHEREAS, ample evidence exists that the class size of "outsourced" courses, as well as the faculty preparation, selection, working conditions, compensation, and supervision--as evidenced by the program between Sacramento City College and U.C. Davis upon which the draft proposal is based--are not comparable to what exists in the CSUS program; therefore, be it
- RESOLVED: that the CSUS Academic Senate and faculty accept the moral obligation to provide students we have accepted as eligible to enroll in the State University system with University classes taught by University faculty, with University established and controlled curricula and academic standards.

*See
Substitute*

Happy New Year! !

DEC 01 1995

Academic Senate Receiver
413

AS 95-73

RESOLUTION
regarding "OUTSOURCING" of the CSUS Basic Writing Program

WHEREAS California State University, Sacramento, has developed a Basic Writing program to meet the needs of entering freshmen who score below the system-wide cutoff of 151 on the English Placement Test; and

WHEREAS the CSUS Basic Writing Program and ESL Program are carefully designed, sequenced, and administered and highly regarded throughout the CSU system; and

WHEREAS the CSUS remedial/developmental program costs the University less than the .6 of 1% of the total budget that the program costs system-wide; and

*detected
agreed*

WHEREAS a document has been drafted on the American River College campus proposing "outsourcing" our Basic Writing and Developmental ESL programs to American River College, and conversations have been conducted between CSUS and American River about the possibility of "outsourcing" and

~~WHEREAS the proposal is based on a current agreement between Sacramento City College and U.C. Davis, in which program ample evidence exists that the class size of "outsourced" courses, as well as faculty preparation, selection, working conditions, compensation, and supervision are not comparable to what exists in the CSUS program,~~

*the AS urges
that we*

This includes

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that CSUS continue its chartered obligation to educate students graduating in the top one third of their high school class with University writing courses which are part of a cohesive composition program administered and taught by qualified University faculty, with University established and controlled curricula and academic standards. *CSUS*

*agreed to substitute
agreed on substitute*



California State University, Sacramento

SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95819-6036

ACADEMIC SENATE



MEMORANDUM

DATE: December 1, 1995

TO: Academic Senators

FROM: Sylvia Navari, Chair
Academic Senate
278-6593; FAX 278-5358

SUBJECT: Senate Meeting--December 7th--Remediation and other, more fun, things: Merit Scholars and Reception [Meeting 2:30-3:45, Reception 3:45-5:30, Forest Suite, University Union]

Somehow it seems appropriate to be discussing Basic Skills preparation on the same day that we will be recognizing the four students selected as Faculty Merit Scholars. I recall last year, one of our Scholarship recipients started his college career here at CSUS in L.S. ?

So I think it is fitting that we begin our meeting with the scheduled agenda item--Resolution on Basic Skills (this is a carry-over from November 9th--attached is a substitute for AS 95-73 which will be introduced at the meeting.) and end our last meeting of this semester by recognizing our Faculty Merit Scholars and celebrating their academic excellence with food (Reception) and music--the music compliments of one of our Merit Scholars, who happens to be a music major. We will be presenting our scholars with Certificates of Achievement and promissory notes.

The discussion and disposition of the Basic Skills related agenda item is timely given the proposed changes to the Trustee Policy on Remediation. A draft proposal entitled, "PRECOLLEGIATE SKILLS INSTRUCTION IN THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY" received by me from the Statewide Academic Senate Office will be summarized and shared with the Senate at the beginning of this meeting.

A little work and a little celebration--see you on December 7th.

SN:j
Attachment
cc: Department Chairs (via E-mail)

12/7/95

Barrera Jensen

AS 95-83/Flr. TRUSTEE'S OUTSTANDING PROFESSOR AWARDS PROGRAM--1995-96

- WHEREAS, CSU, Sacramento faculty have voted to participate in the revised Trustee's Outstanding Professor Awards Program; and
- WHEREAS, The CSU criteria emphasize that the primary purpose of the award is to recognize teaching excellence; and
- WHEREAS, The deadline for notification to the CSU of our 1995-96 Outstanding Professor is February 11, 1996; therefore, be it
- RESOLVED: The Academic Senate recommends for 1995-96 only, that all previous recipients of the CSUS Outstanding Teacher Award be invited to submit applications for consideration as the 1996 CSUS Outstanding Professor. The Faculty Policies Committee will constitute the campus committee which will review and select the recipient of the 1996 CSUS Outstanding Professor Award.

Fitzgerald

AS 95-84/Flr. TRUSTEE'S OUTSTANDING PROFESSOR AWARDS PROGRAM--CSUS CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES

The Academic Senate requests that the Faculty Policies Committee develop and recommend campus criteria and procedures for selection of an Outstanding Professor for future years.

The Statewide Senate will be acting on this issue in January. Please forward any comments you may have to one of our three Statewide Academic Senators (Juanita Barrena, Cristy Jensen, or Sylvia Navari).

**ACADEMIC SENATE
of
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY**

Item 6

Academic Senate CSU
Page 2

AS-2304-95/F&GA
November 2-3, 1995

AS-2304-95/F&GA
November 2-3, 1995

Student Voter Registration and Participation

- 1 RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University urge the
2 Board of Trustees to support civic involvement, good citizenship and
3 political participation among CSU students by encouraging each
4 university president to:
- 5 1. distribute voter registration materials through campus infrastructure,
6 such as class schedules; and,
 - 7 2. supply Vote-by-Mail cards campus-wide through residential life and
8 other student oriented programs; and,
 - 9 3. implement steps to establish polling places on campus
- 10

11 **RATIONALE:** The demographics of CSU students (high mobility, low
12 wages, single status, etc.) act to depress voter registration and voter
13 participation. Studies suggest that when students can overcome these
14 barriers to registration, their voting rates approximate those of the general
15 population. Greater student voter registration and political participation
16 enhances civic involvement and good citizenship. It can facilitate political
17 education among students and enrich political discourse. It is consonant
18 with the 1985 mission statement of the Board of Trustees which supported

- 1 the goal of preparing "significant numbers of educated, responsible people
- 2 to contribute to California's schools, economy, culture and future." The
- 3 Governor has stated that governing boards, such as the CSU Board of
- 4 Trustees, "should retain the authority to determine their policy regarding
- 5 voter registration."

SECOND READING – January 18-19, 1996

Guidelines for the Spring, 1996 Visiting Scholars Program

On the recommendation of the CSUS Academic Senate, guidelines for grants from the Visiting Scholars Program have been redefined to offer the University community a more formal, structured activity directly related to teaching and learning. Beginning with the Spring, 1996 semester, the Visiting Scholars Program will create opportunities for interdisciplinary scholarly activity between the Visiting Scholar(s) and faculty, and to promote interdepartmental collaboration. The new guidelines will provide for support of programs which appeal to a broad segment of the University community and which focus on "cutting edge" knowledge. All funded programs will share the common theme of "What's New in . . .

Proposals are invited from Departments, Schools or coalitions of faculty. Individual faculty may apply for Visiting Scholar Program grants, but must provide clear evidence of a program's interdisciplinary appeal and interdepartmental collaboration. It is anticipated that between one and three proposals will be funded each semester. For Spring, 1996, a total of \$5,000 is available.

Application Procedures

Under the umbrella of the Center for Teaching and Learning and the Office of Research and Graduate Studies, Visiting Scholars proposals will be reviewed and funded based on the following criteria:

1. Complete a Visiting Scholars Program nomination form for each nominated scholar. The form must carry the signatures of the Chairs of the collaborating departments and/or the School Dean(s).
2. Provide a narrative of no more than five typed pages describing the proposed program and its value to the University community, including:
 - ▶ the extent to which the proposed program has broad appeal
 - ▶ its relationship to new "cutting edge" information
 - ▶ its interdisciplinary features, and
 - ▶ the scholarly activities participating campus faculty will engage in and how that activity will be integrated with the work and presence of the Visiting Scholar(s).
3. Attach a one-page budget summary identifying the total dollars requested and how the funds will be spent.
4. Submit proposal to the Center for Teaching and Learning, c/o the Office of Research and Graduate Studies [River Front Center 215], Mail Zip 6112, **no later than Friday, February 16, 1996**. It is intended that the review process will be completed by February 23, 1996.

Contact Dan Orey, Director of the Center for Teaching and Learning (ext. 5945) or Sylvia Navari, Academic Senate Chair (ext. 6593), if you have questions.

**President Gerth's Comments Regarding
Performance Salary Step Increases
November 16, 1995, Academic Senate Meeting**

A few of you have heard me say that the two issues that are before us now, pay for performance on the one hand and the change in the workload ground rules on the other hand, in other words Articles, I think it's 30 and 31, of the new M.O.U. when paired together represent probably the most significant change in the faculty culture of the California State University since the adoption of the Master Plan in 1960. I believe that because I think that we are at the front end of a process that will go on defined by the recent negotiations about the M.O.U.

First of all, let me comment procedurally. When I receive the recommendation from this Senate about how to handle pay for performance, I will study it to the point where I will understand it, on the one hand, and I will also forward it to the Vice Chancellor for Human Resources because most of the presidents have agreed that we are going to ask Vice Chancellor June Cooper, whom some of you know (she's been in the system a very long time), to review all of the proposed campus arrangements with respect to pay for performance or PSSI (Performance Salary Step Increase) because there is a determination on the part of the presidents and the Chancellor and his immediate colleagues that we move into this in a way that is consistent with the spirit and intent of the M.O.U. that has been negotiated and that we not have deviations along the way. And, so I will be doing that, and I want to make sure that everyone understands that. The responsibility for final adoption of the process on this campus is mine, there is no question about that, but it will be after comment by Vice Chancellor Cooper.

Sylvia raised with me a question about two weeks ago. You phrased the question "Am I going to use 'my own' criteria, separate from those ultimately agreed to by me on the basis of a Senate recommendation. If so, what might they be with respect to pay for performance decisions which are ultimately the responsibility of the president and his immediate colleagues?" and I didn't answer your question. It startled me, to be perfectly honest. I've thought about it a lot and in the context of more recent discussions that Sylvia and I have had on this matter, and my answer to it is "no" because it seems to me in dealing with something as fundamental as this we should all be reading from the same sheet of music. I don't see any reason why the president shouldn't use the same criteria that are generally being used so we know what the name of the game is that we are all involved in. I will, as always, exercise my judgment, after consultation with this body, in promulgating University rules and procedures.

Now the complementary issue to that question has to do with what I do about the Senate's recommendations with respect to criteria for pay for performance and my final action. That leads, I think, to your request that I chat with you today about pay for performance.

I have followed rather carefully, I've attempted at least to follow rather carefully, the deliberations in the select committee that Larry Takeuchi chaired and in the Faculty Policies Committee and onward with respect to pay for performance and I have some reactions. First of all I think what we are essentially dealing with is a whole human being, a whole faculty member, not a segment of a faculty member. And, so I'm puzzled in some ways about the segmentation, if you will, of a faculty member applying under one criterion, or another criterion, or a third criterion. It seems to me to be simpler, if I were applying or being nominated for pay for performance, for a decision to be considered in terms of everything that I do and how useful it is to my students and the university. Which gets me to a second point. I am also quizzical about the notion of a capacity of a faculty member to decide that I am going to apply in my own school or I'm going to apply someplace else in the university. I would have to admit I do not comprehend that. Because the faculty who know me the best are likely to be a bunch of social scientists, or they are likely to be the faculty in Arts and Sciences (and I'm using myself, it's safer, as an example. And I can't apply. I've been told administrators can't apply.) The faculty who know me the best and are most likely to be able to deal with a peer judgment, it strikes me, are the faculty in my department and my school.

In the conversations in which I've participated, and we've had quite a number of conversations, I have argued the position that if we really believe that the central mission of the California State University is teaching, then probably the single most important variable in pay for performance ought to have a lot to do with teaching and our relationships with students. And I would share that value with you since you've asked me to share where I'm coming from. And I'm inclined to think that whatever criteria are adopted ultimately by this institution ought to have a great deal to do with teaching and with the work that we do with students. We do a lot of other things that are very important and everybody in this room has heard me argue for the importance of community relations and all the things we do in the region and a lot of other wonderful things that help to define the character of this university. But if we're really getting down to bedrock values, without students we don't amount to much, and so that's why I'm sharing that value with you. In your deliberations, you've set the stage for this. We need to relate our criteria to the mission and goals of the university and the mission and goals find expression in a variety of forms, all the way from bland statements that sound like many others to rather more precise statements that are to be found in various pronouncements over the years--certainly the Strategic Plan of the University which has had life breathed into it by our behavior together over the recent years. So, as you deliberate today and thereafter on this really very important change, I would hope that you would take some of these values into consideration. And that completes what I feel compelled to say.



California State University, Sacramento

SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95819-6036

December 4, 1995

TO: Academic Senators

FROM: Robyn Nelson
Faculty Coordinator
WASC Self-Study

There are only 479 days until the WASC Accreditation visit (April 1, 1997 and that is not a joke!). The data collection process is almost complete. At the beginning of the Spring 1996 semester the last two surveys to faculty will be sent out--a survey on respect for diversity and on the learning community. This Summer and Fall we completed: 1) a survey of staff on the learning community, 2) faculty's views of effective teaching, 3) surveys of non-returning students, Spring 95 graduates, and Fall 95 entering Freshmen, 4) Critical thinking and Writing abilities of Advanced Study students, and 5) teaching experiences of students in a sample of GE courses and majors.

WASC has given us permission to do an innovative self-study and address our three themes selected by the Steering Committee: Student Outcomes, Teaching Effectiveness and the Learning Community. We will not be writing to the traditional standards. There will be additional "chapters" on the mission, planning, budgeting, and literacy and technology. Drafts of those chapters are being formed now and are to address how teaching and learning is promoted.

Over the intersession the data will be compiled and readied for distribution, review, discussion and recommendation during the Spring semester. As chapter drafts are completed they will be distributed to the appropriate committees and groups. The final document is due to WASC in October 1996. During one of the Senate meetings in February you will have an opportunity to discuss the findings. I look forward to your questions and comments. Please do not hesitate to give me a call at x7243 or x5560.

Happy Holidays!