

1997-98  
FACULTY SENATE  
California State University, Sacramento

AGENDA

Thursday, September 11, 1997  
Forest Suite, University Union  
3:00-5:00 p.m.

**INFORMATION**

1. Moment of Silence:

**RICHARD E. HILL**  
Professor of Management Emeritus  
CSUS 1963-1986

**BAXTER M. GEETING**  
Professor of Theatre Arts Emeritus  
CSUS 1948-1974

**RICHARD A. CARPENTER**  
Professor of Music Emeritus  
CSUS 1952-1983

**STEPHEN L. WALKER**  
Academic Vice President Emeritus  
CSUS 1947-1967

2. Tentative Fall 1997 Faculty Senate Meeting Schedule:

September 18--Orientation for Senators and New Faculty Members  
September 25--No meeting.  
October 2--  
October 9--John C. Livingston Annual Faculty Lecture  
October 16--  
October 23--CSU Merit Pay Task Force  
October 30--  
November 6--  
November 13--  
November 20--  
November 27--No meeting—Happy Thanksgiving!  
December 4--  
December 11--  
December 18--

3. Summary of CSUS 50<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Celebration Events - Office of University Affairs

4. Cornerstones Calendar--August 1997 Draft can be accessed on the Internet (see "**Current Issues**" link from Senate Home Page [item 5.]). Also, background materials regarding Cornerstones are now on two-hour reserve for faculty in the Library's Reserve Book Room (listed under Cornerstones 1).
5. Senate Home Page (<http://www.csus.edu/acse/> or CSUS Home Page then Departments then Faculty Senate) - Vice Chair Arthur Jensen

## CONSENT CALENDAR

### FS 97-08/Ex. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS—UNIVERSITY

Administrative Review, Committee on:  
DON TAYLOR, At-large, 2000

AIDS Advisory Committee:  
JOANNE MARROW, Senate Chair/designee, 1998  
MARY BRAHAM, At-large, 1999

Alcohol and Drug Steering Committee:  
MARY BRAHAM, Faculty At-large, 2000

Athletics Advisory Board:  
MARCUS MARSH, Faculty Representative, 1998

Anthony J. Leones Scholarship Committee:  
LINDA GOODRICH, Faculty At-large, 2000  
HAROLD MURAI, Faculty At-large, 2000

ASI Appellate Council:  
MARGARET CLEEK, Faculty At-large, 1998

ASI Board, Faculty Representative:  
ROBYN NELSON, Faculty At-large, 1998

ASI Elections Complaint Committee:  
TIM HODSON, Faculty At-large, 1998

Campus Cooperative Education Advisory Committee:

CRAIG KELLEY, At-large, 1998

Campus Educational Equity Committee:

SATSUKI INA, Education, 2000

XIN REN, At-large, 2000

Cost Recovery Committee:

JAMES HILL, Consumer/Teaching Faculty, 1999

Council for University Planning:

ARTHUR JENSEN, Executive Committee, 1998

ANNE-LOUISE RADIMSKY, At-large, 1999

JERRY TOBEY, Curriculum Policies Committee, 1998

*Pending*, Faculty Policies Committee, 1998

*Pending*, Academic Policies Committee, 1998

JENNIFER WARE, Non-Instructional Faculty, 1999

LINDA BUCKLEY

Diversity Awards, Committee for:

MARINA OSHANA, At-large, 1999

Energy Management Committee:

KARL STOFFERS, Faculty At-large, 1999

Financial Aid Satisfactory Progress Appeals Board:

SIMON SLAK, At-large, 2000

Grade Appeal Procedural Appeals Board:

ANN MOTEKAITIS, At-large, 1998

WILLIAM DILLON, At-large, 1998

Honorary Degrees Committee:

TOM KRABACHER, Senate Chair, 1998

CHERYL OSBORNE, Faculty At-large, 1999

Institutional Scholarship Committee:

XIN REN, At-large, 1999

Instruction-Related Activities Committee:

MICHAEL FITZGERALD, At-large, 1998

[Note: This committee historically has been referred to as the "Instructionally-Related Activities Committee." The Senate recommends that CSUS make a grammatical change to "Instruction-Related Activities Committee."]

Lottery Fund Allocation Committee:

FRED REARDON, E&CS, 1999  
ANN MOTEKAITIS, NS&M, 2000  
EILEEN HEASER, Library, 2000

Multicultural Center Advisory Board:

DANA FERRIS, At-large, 1999  
RHONDA RIOS KRAVITZ, At-large, 1999

Persons with Disabilities, Committee for:

PAT HARRIS (F'97 only), Instructional Faculty, H&HS, 1999  
SUSAN EDMOND (fm S'98), Instructional Faculty, H&HS, 1999

Public Safety Advisory Board:

SUSAN BEELICK, At-large, 2000

Student Academic Development Committee:

LINDA BUCKLEY, Instructional Faculty, 1999  
MARY ANN REIHMAN, Instructional Faculty, 1999  
FRANCISCO REVELES, Instructional Faculty, 1998

Student Complaint Hearing Panel:

SATSUKI INA, At-large, 2000  
VINCE PANTALONE, At-large, 2000

Student Disciplinary Hearing Officer:

BONNIE WALKER-RAINGRUBER, At-large, 1998  
PAUL FALZONE, At-large, 1998  
ROBIN REESE, At-large, 1998  
MARGARET CLEEK, At-large, 1998  
ROLAND DART, At-large, 1998

Student Health Advisory Committee:

J. ANN MOYLAN, At-large, 1998

University Copyright and Patent Committee:

SUZANNE SUTHERLAND, Faculty At-large, 2000

University Union Board of Directors:

JOSEPH KILPATRICK, Faculty At-large, 1998



FS 97-09/Ex. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS--SENATEResearch and Creative Activities Committee:

SALLY PERKINS, At-large (*committee has staggered three-years terms; initial term to be determined by lot at first F'97 committee meeting*)

FS 97-10/Ex. 1997-98 FACULTY SENATE PARLIAMENTARIAN

William Dillon, Professor of Government, shall serve as Parliamentarian for the 1997-98 Faculty Senate.

FS 97-11/CPC, Ex. <sup>FIR</sup> PROGRAM REVIEW--LIBRARY

The Faculty Senate receives the commendations and recommendations of the Curriculum Policies Committee on the program review of the University Library (Attachment A) and recommends <sup>further</sup> consideration of the following:

1. The Faculty Senate and Academic Affairs should consider the inclusion of formal consultation with the Library concerning resources which proposed new programs will require.
2. Academic Affairs and the Faculty Senate should include Library Personnel on all committees and task forces studying the development of Information Competence standards and the implementation of those standards.
3. The Senate should consider recommending that
  - a) G.E. Basic skills classes include programs for the development of Information Competence;
  - b) majors include programs for the development of discipline-specific Information Competence.
4. The Faculty Senate should establish a Library Committee reporting to the Academic Policies Committee.

++

FS 97-12/Ex. RESEARCH AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE--TERMS

In creating the Research and Creative Activities Committee (RCAC) [AS 97-12], a subcommittee of the Faculty Policies Committee, no terms were specified for the committee membership. Senate Standing Rules state that subcommittee members serve two-year terms. Unlike other subcommittees, RCAC is elected. This is to conform with the CSU requirement for the State Funded Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities Programs, that the committee consist of a majority of elected faculty members. Elections for members were held in Spring 1997 with no terms specified. There are nine members, eight elected and one

appointed at-large. To provide continuity from year to year, the nine members shall serve three-year terms (determined by lot and staggered in this initial year so that three will be elected each year).

## **CONSENT CALENDAR—INFORMATION**

### FS 97-03/Ex. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS—UNIVERSITY

#### Selection Advisory Committee, Vice President for Administration:

LOUISE TIMMER, Faculty At-large

DENNIS HUFF, Faculty At-large

JENNIFER WARE, Faculty At-large

#### Selection Advisory Committee, Associate Vice President for Student Affairs:

DAVID RASKE, Faculty At-large

ROBYN NELSON, Faculty At-large

### FS 97-04/Ex. PERFORMANCE SALARY STEP INCREASE POLICY (Rev. PM FSA: 97-02)

The Executive Committee, on behalf of the Faculty Senate, endorses and recommends Presidential approval of revisions to the campus' Performance Salary Step Increase (PSSI) Policy (PM FSA: 97-02) necessitated by revisions to the Unit 3 Memorandum of Understanding (with the exception of the footnotes added on pages 8 and 11, all changes are highlighted in Attachment B).

### FS 97-05/FEFC, Ex. FACULTY MERIT SCHOLARSHIP AWARD PROGRAM (Amends AS 96-07)

So that the letters can go out to students at the beginning of the semester, the Executive Committee, on behalf of the Faculty Senate, approves revisions to the Faculty Merit Scholarship Award Program shown in Attachment C (strikeover = deletion; underscore = addition).

### FS 97-06/FPC, Ex. FACULTY EVALUATION

The Faculty Senate endorses and directs the Senate Chair to distribute to all schools and departments the Final Report of the Working Group on Faculty Evaluation (Attachment D).

### FS 97-07/FPC, Ex. FACULTY SOCIALIZATION PROGRAM

The Faculty Senate endorses in principle the Faculty Socialization Proposal (Attachment E)

the Office of Faculty and Staff Affairs has distributed an information copy of the Faculty Policies Committee to all departments.]

## REGULAR AGENDA

FS 97-01/Flr. MINUTES [AS 97-38 referred by 1996-97 Senate.]

Approval of the Minutes of the meeting of May 8 (#14), 1997.

FS 97-02/Flr. MINUTES

Approval of the Minutes of the meeting of May 15 (#15), 1997.

FS97-13/Flr. Resolution on the Qualifications and Search Process  
for New CSU Chancellor

FS97-14/Flr. Resol. to News Media

FS97-04 - NO ACTION INITIATED

FS 97-11 - REVISED



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO  
OFFICE OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

MAY 22 1997

Academic Senate Received  
413

May 21, 1997

MEMORANDUM

TO: Charles Martell  
Dean and University Librarian

FROM: *Cecilia Gray*  
Cecilia Gray  
Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs

SUBJECT: Academic Program Review

Enclosed is a copy of the Academic Program Review for the University Library as completed by the Academic Senate Program Review Team. It is being forwarded to the Academic Senate.

On behalf of the Subcommittee and the Review Team, I want to thank you and the Library faculty and staff for their cooperation. In the areas where recommendations for changes are made, I direct your attention and request your continued cooperation in responding to these concerns.

Enclosure

- cc: Donald R. Gerth, President
- Jolene Koester, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
- Howard Harris, Assistant Vice President, Facilities
- Mernoy Harrison, Vice President for Administration
- Robert Jones, Vice President for University Affairs
- Ric Brown, Associate Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies
- Shirley Uplinger, Vice President for Student Affairs
- David Wagner, Dean, Faculty and Staff Affairs
- Michael Fitzgerald, Chair, Academic Senate
- Jerry Tobey, Chair, Program Review Subcommittee
- Members, University Library Program Review Team



TO: Cecilia Gray, Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Studies

FR: T. Hodson, N. Tooker, C. Wang, Panel for the Evaluation of the Draft Program Review of the University Library

May 21, 1997

The Panel has completed its evaluation of the draft Program Review. The Panel accepts the recommendations of the Program Review with the following qualification regarding the recommendation 19 (p. 38) concerning reference desk organization:

The Panel has serious reservations regarding the recommendation. We are, however, aware of the importance of having a completed Program Review before the arrival of Dean Larson and of bringing closure to the reference desk and other urgent questions, goals which an appeal to the Program Review Subcommittee would preclude.

We therefore **strongly** advocate a procedure consistent with the recommendation, whereby Dean Larson and Provost Koester will use the extensive materials *already* gathered to reach an early decision concerning the organization of reference desks.

## COMMENDATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE REVIEW TEAM FOR THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

### COMMENDATIONS TO THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

1. Library personnel, administrators, faculty and staff, are unfailingly courteous and professional in relations with library users. The Program Review Team commends the Library for this preeminent virtue.
2. Library administrators, faculty and staff meet formidable responsibilities to the University and the community in spite of an inadequate and declining budget. The Review Team especially commends their high ranking in CSU service comparisons.
3. Library administrators, faculty and staff have made major progress in providing the University with access to electronic information.
4. The Library has begun development of an external fundraising program essential to the Library's future.
5. Library administrators, faculty and staff have cooperated in a frank and professional manner with the Schaffer consultants and with this Program Review. The Program Review Team especially recognizes the high quality of the Library's Self Study and the work already done to address complex issues raised by the Schaffer Report.
6. The Program Review Team further commends Library personnel for their development of clear Mission and Vision statements.

### RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

1. The Library should *immediately* contract with a specialist in Conflict Resolution within Organizations to work with staff and faculty in efforts to resolve differences between them and to improve their cooperation and ability to collaborate in their work. The Dean should report to the Provost on these efforts by December 1, 1997 (p. 21)
2. The Library should evaluate the current and prospective impact of technology on Library operations, staffing needs and governance. (p. 21)
3. The University Librarian should evaluate the current number and responsibilities of Associate University Librarians. (p. 22)
4. The Library should evaluate the advantages of having one Division reporting to a single Associate University Librarian and assigning other important duties to a second Associate University Librarian. (p. 23)

5. If the Library retains two Divisions, it should shift Access Services and Government Documents to the Public Services Division. (p. 23)
6. The Library should make permanent funding for four Systems positions a high budget priority. (p. 24)
7. The Library should reduce the number of its administrative units. (p. 25)
8. The Library should consider consolidating its curriculum, reference and instructional units into one department. (p. 25)
9. All Library departments should provide equal rights for faculty and staff. [See discussion of equal departmental and committee rights below.] (p. 25)
10. The Library should reduce the number of its standing committees. (p. 28)
11. The Library should review the jurisdiction and the effectiveness of its committees. (p. 28)
12. The Library should make significantly greater use of ad hoc committees. (p. 28)
13. Library committees should provide equal committee rights for faculty and staff members, except that a faculty member should chair any curriculum, reference and instruction committees. (p. 29)
14. The University Librarian should consult with the Library staff regarding Library job classification policies and actions. The consultation should clarify the Library's position on employee applications for reclassification, the reclassification of positions and Library provision of equitable opportunities for employees to compete for reclassified positions. (p. 31)
15. The Library should seek University approval of a fee to cover the cost of students' printing of materials from Library computers. (p. 32)
16. The Library should consider the advantages of contracting with off-campus firms to provide for the installation and/or maintenance of copying machines in the Library. (p. 32)
17. Upon the recommended conversion of two temporary Systems positions into permanent positions, the University Librarian should direct the Systems Department to complete the installation of equipment already purchased, to establish an effective program for equipment maintenance, and to recommend the acquisition of computer equipment necessary to the Library's effective operation. (p. 33)
18. The University Librarian should, in light of the Consultants' recommendations and critiques of those recommendations, reorganize the first floor of the Library. (p. 35)

19. The new Dean shall evaluate the relative cost-effectiveness of centralizing the Humanities, Science and Social Science/Education reference desks, and maintaining the current decentralized system. The Dean shall prepare a report for the Provost detailing those relative costs, and evaluating the effect of the alternative systems on the quality of Library service and on the Library budget. The Dean shall submit the report to the Provost by December 1, 1997. The Provost and the Dean shall consult concerning the conclusions of the report and determine whether to centralize the reference desks, maintain the current reference desk system or adopt another reference desk system. (p. 38)

[Program Review Panel qualification regarding recommendation 19:

The Panel has serious reservations regarding the recommendation. We are, however, aware of the importance of having a completed Program Review before the arrival of Dean Larson and of bringing closure to the reference desk and other urgent questions, goals which an appeal to the Program Review Subcommittee would preclude.

We therefore **strongly** advocate a procedure consistent with the recommendation, whereby Dean Larson and Provost Koester will use the extensive materials *already* gathered to reach an early decision concerning the organization of reference desks.]

#### RECOMMENDATIONS TO ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

1. The Academic Senate and Academic Affairs should consider the inclusion of formal consultation with the Library concerning the Library resources which proposed new programs will require. (p. 8)
2. Academic Affairs and the Academic Senate should include Library personnel on all committees and task forces studying the development of Information Competence standards and the implementation of those standards. (p. 12)
3. The new Dean shall evaluate the relative cost-effectiveness of centralizing the Humanities, Science and Social Science/Education reference desks, and maintaining the current decentralized system. The Dean shall prepare a report for the Provost detailing those relative costs, and evaluating the effect of the alternative systems on the quality of Library service and on the Library budget. The Dean shall submit the report to the Provost by December 1, 1997. The Provost and the Dean shall consult concerning the conclusions of the report and determine whether to centralize the reference desks, maintain the current reference desk system or adopt another reference desk system. (p. 38)

#### RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE ACADEMIC SENATE

1. The Academic Senate and Academic Affairs should consider the inclusion of formal consultation with the Library concerning the Library resources which proposed new programs will require. (p. 8)



2. Academic Affairs and the Academic Senate should include Library personnel on all committees and task forces studying the development of Information Competence standards and the implementation of those standards. (p. 12)
3. The Senate should consider recommending that
  - (1) GE basic skills classes include programs for the development of Information Competence;
  - (2) majors include programs for the development of discipline-specific Information Competence. (p. 12)
4. The Academic Senate should establish a Library Committee reporting to the Academic Policies Committee. (p. 29)

PM FSA: 97-02  
Revised August 1997

**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. Faculty unit employees whose performance does not include assignments in all of the above areas shall nonetheless be eligible for a Performance Salary Step Increase on the basis of their performance in the individual areas of their assignment. (Ref: Provision 31.14, 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 31.18, 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, or shall be in the form of a bonus (not a permanent increase in the base salary of the individual) of no more than the equivalent of an annual salary increase of two and four-tenths percent (2.4%) in the case of faculty unit members who have reached top step of his/her rank or classification in the salary schedule. However, no faculty unit employee shall be awarded or receive more than five (5) PSSIs in any year in which the PSSI has been negotiated (Ref: Provision 31.15, MOU).
- 1.4 The effective date of all PSSI shall be July 1 of each year that there are negotiated PSSIs (Ref: Provision 31.25, 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 31.30, 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 31.32, MOU).

- 1.7 The decision to grant or deny an increase for outstanding or 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 ~~31.25~~, 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 section 7.2 of this policy, the number of faculty who submitted an application for a PSSI award, the number of faculty receiving PSSIIs, 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 who received a positive recommendation by the Department Level Review Committee (DLRC) and the University Level Review Committee (ULRC), and the number of applicants from within each group who received a PSSI award. The report shall also identify the number of applicants assigned to each point on the rating scale by each DLRC, and by the ULRC. Finally, the report shall identify the number of applicants who applied in each category (i.e., professional accomplishments, service, or both), and the number of awards made in each category. 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 a member(s) of the campus community (faculty, academic administrators, students and staff) are eligible for a PSSI.
- 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 31.16, MOU), and the "minimum" requirements set forth in section 4.3 of this policy.

## **3.0 Basis for Evaluation**

- 3.1 A PSSI award will be given for work undertaken as part of the faculty member's responsibility as a member of the faculty at CSUS. 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. Applicants who apply in two areas (besides teaching and learning) will be judged separately in each area--at least one of which must be found to be meritorious or outstanding. Faculty unit employees whose performance does not include assignments in all of the above areas,

(i.e. part-time faculty), shall nonetheless be eligible for a Performance Salary Step Increase on the basis of their performance in the individual areas of their assignment.  
The evaluative categories for outstanding and/or meritorious performance shall be:

- A. Teaching and learning** - Meritorious or outstanding professional performance and/or contributions in teaching and learning; includes but is not limited to:
- I) Enhancing the academic, intellectual and/or personal development of students to lead productive roles in society.
  - ii) Fostering 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) Improving the abilities and effectiveness of faculty as teachers and/or learners.
  - iv) Facilitating the instructional activities of the university.

Contributions to teaching and learning need not be linked solely to classroom instruction.

- B. Professional accomplishments** - Meritorious or outstanding professional performance and/or professional contributions to one's discipline, profession and/or the university; includes 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 enhance the teaching mission of the university and/or enrich the learning community.
- C. Service which enhances the mission of the university** - Meritorious or outstanding performance and/or contributions that enhance the mission of the university; includes 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) Making 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 enhance 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) Contributing to a culture of faculty leadership and/or university citizenship.

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. Application packets will be available in the office of Faculty and Staff Affairs or an FSA web site.
- 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 An application package must contain, at a minimum, a completed "Application and Nomination Form: Cover Page," abbreviated vita and a narrative section described in sections 4.4 and 4.5 of this policy respectively. The package may include supporting documentation (as specified in 4.5), however the mere absence of support material, shall not disqualify an application from continuing through the review process.
- 4.4 For purposes of assessing satisfactory performance, 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 Article 20) over the relevant time period as defined in section 3.2 of this policy. The abbreviated vita shall not exceed two single-spaced, single-sided pages. For each Unit 3 faculty employee, an example of the form and information expected in the abbreviated vita 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 periodic or performance evaluation committees, 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 periodic or performance evaluation committees, e.g., RTP Committee, Post-Tenure Review Committees.
- 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 of their school and the 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 periodic or performance evaluation committees.
- ii) Activities that foster professional growth, including creative activity 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 university.

#### **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 periodic evaluation committees.
- ii) 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 periodic evaluation committees.
  - d. Student advising and/or mentoring activities if part of one's assignment.
  - e. Activities to improve student learning within the classroom.

- 4.5 For purposes of assessing outstanding or meritorious performance, each applicant shall provide, in addition to the abbreviated vita, a narrative statement (in three (3), single-spaced, single-sided pages or less) describing his/her meritorious activities, achievements and/or contributions in accordance with section 3.1 of this policy. Further, 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 single-sided pages.
- 4.6 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 five (5) page limit.
- 4.7 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 the application. e.g., citations, nominations, letters, publications, and/or similar information specifically referenced in the application.

- 4.8 On behalf of the departments and the President, FSA will receive from each applicant an original and two copies of the completed, signed application package (reference Article 31.16 of the MOU). FSA shall forward the application to the department chair for review by the Department Level Review Committee (defined in section 5.0).
- 4.9 Before forwarding the application package to the department chair, FSA shall review each application package for compliance with both section 4.3 of this policy, and the following page limits on the application package:
- A. Three single-sided, single spaced page limit on the narrative section.
  - B. Two single-sided, single-spaced page limit (abbreviated vita) summarizing the activities and/or outcomes directly related to the applicant's primary area of professional responsibilities over the relevant time period.
  - C. Five single-sided 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. This application package shall then proceed, without prejudice, through the evaluation process.

## **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) early in the Spring Semester. 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 section 5.1 of this policy shall consist of at least three elected tenured faculty from that department/unit plus one alternate. The alternate will attend meetings, but will vote only if a member is absent. Departments may exclude from DLRC membership faculty members who are applicants for a PSSI. In cases where a department permits applicants to serve, 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 31.22 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 31.23, 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 Immediately after it is constituted, the DLRC shall meet to elect a chair, and to formalize and adopt the procedures it will use. It will publish these no later than May 1 so that potential applicants will have time to formulate their applications over the summer.
- 6.2 When the review process begins in the fall, 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 applicant's abbreviated vita. The DLRC may, by a simple majority vote, request the applicant to provide additional evidence that supports or clarifies statements contained in the abbreviated vita (as provided in section 4.7 of this policy) and/or consult his/her Personnel Action File. The DLRC shall indicate, in writing whether or not the applicant's performance in all areas of responsibility is satisfactory (checking a box is sufficient). In those specific cases where the DLRC finds 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 application package.
- 6.3 Each DLRC shall review and assess the merit of each application using the criteria and standards specified in sections 3.1 and 3.2 of this policy. For purposes of conducting this assessment the DLRC shall review the applicant's narrative.
- 6.4 The DLRC, by a simple majority vote, may request an applicant to provide additional information that directly supports and/or corroborates statements specifically made or referred to in the narrative section of an application. (See section 4.7 of this policy.)
- 6.5 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.
- 6.6 The recommendations of a DLRC shall be made in accordance with the following process and procedures:
  - A. The DLRC shall decide, by a simple majority vote, if an applicant is "Outstanding/  
Meritorious" in the category of "Teaching and Learning" and at least one other category.<sup>1</sup> A "NO" or "TIE" (which shall be interpreted as "No Recommendation") vote on "Outstanding/Meritorious" performance shall end the DLRC's evaluation of

---

<sup>1</sup>Faculty unit employees whose performance does not include assignments in all of the above areas. i.e. part-time faculty, shall nonetheless be eligible for a Performance Salary Step Increase on the basis of their performance in the individual areas of their assignment.

the applicant. The DLRC shall proceed with its recommendation for a PSSI award (B below) only on those applications receiving a "YES" vote.

B. Each application receiving a "YES" vote on "Outstanding/ Meritorious" shall be differentiated using a rating scale of "Recommended" to "Very Highly Recommended." The recommendation to assign an application to a particular 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 (Ref: Provision 31.22 and 31.24, MOU).

6.7 The DLRCs shall forward all applications, its written assessment, if any, of the individual's performance in all areas of responsibility, and its PSSI recommendation on each application to FSA for review by the University Level Review Committee (Ref: Provision 31.21, MOU).

6.8 The DLRCs shall inform all applicants of its recommendations no later than ten (10) academic work days after its recommendations have been forwarded to the University Level Review Committee. Upon receiving a written request from an applicant, a DLRC shall inform the applicant, in writing, of the reasons for its recommendations. Such a request must be received no later than ten working days of receipt of the recommendations.

6.9 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.

6.10 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 31.22, 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: 31.28, MOU).

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

Athletics  
Counseling Faculty Electing Unit

Library  
School of Arts and Letters  
School of Business Administration  
School of Education  
School of Engineering and Computer Science  
School of Health and Human Services  
School of Natural Sciences and Mathematics  
School of Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies

- 7.3 The faculty of each school/unit shall determine the method of electing a school/unit faculty member to serve on the ULRC. Each school/unit will report the results of its election to the Dean of Faculty and Staff Affairs.
- 7.4 Faculty members applying for the award may not serve on the committee. 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 Dean of Faculty and Staff Affairs shall call the first meeting of the ULRC immediately after it is constituted. The committee will elect a chair, then formalize and adopt the procedures it will use. The Faculty Policies Committee will provide it with the procedures worked out by the previous year's ULRC as a proposed model, and the current ULRC, after making changes where appropriate, will then publish same no later than May 1 to the campus community so that potential applicants will have time to formulate their applications over the summer.
- 8.2 When the review process begins in the fall, the ULRC shall first 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 applicant's abbreviated vita. The ULRC may, by simple majority vote, 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 indicate, in writing whether or not the applicant's performance in all areas of responsibility is satisfactory (checking a box is sufficient). In those specific cases where the ULRC finds an applicant "not satisfactory" in any area of responsibility, the ULRC shall provide written justification for its assessment. The ULRC's written justification shall become part of the applicant's application package.
- 8.3 The ULRC shall then review each application for meritorious or outstanding performance using the criteria and standards consistent with sections 3.1 and 3.2 of this policy. For purposes of this assessment the ULRC shall review the abbreviated vita and the

applicant's narrative. Further, the ULRC shall consider in its deliberations the recommendations of the DLRCs.

- 8.4 The ULRC by a simple majority vote, may request an applicant to provide additional information that directly supports and/or corroborates statements specifically made or referred to in the narrative section of an application.
- 8.5 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.
- 8.6 The recommendations of the ULRC shall be made in accordance with the following process and procedures:
  - A. The ULRC shall decide, by a simple majority vote, if an applicant is "Outstanding/Meritorious" in the category of "Teaching and Learning" and at least one other category.<sup>2</sup> A "NO" or "TIE" (which shall be interpreted as "No Recommendation") vote on "Outstanding/Meritorious" performance shall end the ULRC's evaluation of the applicant. The ULRC shall proceed with its recommendation for a PSSI award (B below) only on those applications receiving a "YES" vote.
  - B. Each application receiving a "YES" vote on "Outstanding/Meritorious" shall be differentiated using a rating scale of "Recommended" to "Very Highly Recommended." The recommendation to assign an application to a particular 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 (Ref: Provision 31.22 and 31.24 MOU).
- 8.7 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.
- 8.8 The recommendation of the ULRC shall be forwarded to the President or designee no later than December 1 of each year in which negotiated PSSI's are awarded. 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 PSSI'S (Ref: Provision 31.22 and 31.24, MOU).

---

<sup>2</sup>Faculty unit employees whose performance does not include assignments in all of the above areas, i.e. part-time faculty, shall nonetheless be eligible for a Performance Salary Step Increase on the basis of their performance in the individual areas of their assignment.



8.9 The ULRC shall inform all applicants of their recommendations no later than ten (10) academic work days after its recommendations have been forwarded to the President or designee. Upon receiving a written request from an applicant, the ULRC shall inform the applicant in writing of the reasons for its recommendations. Such a request must be received no later than ten working days of receipt of the recommendations.

8.10 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 31.18, 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 no later than January 1 of each year in which negotiated PSSI'S are awarded. The President or designee shall determine the appropriate number of steps to be granted, consistent with the limitations provided in section 1.3 of this policy (Ref: Provision 31.25, 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 31.26, MOU):

A. The ULRC makes a positive recommendation for enough candidates to fully expend the pool for PSSI'S 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 section 8.8 of this policy (Ref: Provisions 32.22 and 31.24, MOU).

10.2 If the ULRC submits fewer than the minimum number of positive recommendations needed to expend fully the pool for PSSI'S 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 31.27, MOU).

## 11.0 Peer Review of Salary Step Denials

- 11.1 A candidate who 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 31.40, 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 31.42, 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 31.41, MOU).
- 11.3 All requests for reconsideration by the UPRP must be submitted in writing to the Dean of Faculty and Staff Affairs no later than January 15 of each year in which negotiated PSSI'S are awarded (Ref: Provision 31.40, MOU). The written request for reconsideration shall be no more than two double-spaced single-sided pages and shall indicate whether the appellant wants to make a presentation to the Peer Panel.
- 11.4 The UPRP shall begin to review the specific PSSI denial within fourteen (14) days of its selection by lot. The panel's review shall be limited to a reconsideration of the PSSI denial of the appellant; 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 sections 4.4, 4.5, 4.9, 6.2, 6.6, 8.2, and 8.6 of this policy (Ref: Provision 31.43, MOU).
- 11.5 The proceedings of the UPRP shall not be open to the public and shall not be a hearing (Ref: Provision 31.44, 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 31.45, 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 31.46, MOU).

- 11.8 All written materials pertaining to the review of PSSI 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 PSSI 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.

## FACULTY MERIT SCHOLARSHIP AWARD PROGRAM

### Program Description:

Each year, ~~four~~ a maximum of six Faculty Merit Scholarship Awards, each equal to the cost of registration fees for one semester, ~~shall~~ may be made from funds generated from the Faculty Endowment Fund. Of the six awards, a maximum of ~~Three~~ three of the awards shall ~~may~~ be made to undergraduate students, and one ~~award shall be made~~ to a postbaccalaureate student, one to a credential student and one to a classified graduate student. The awards shall recognize academic achievement and promise of continued academic success. Award recipients shall be selected by the Faculty Endowment Fund Committee and recognition of award recipients shall be made at ~~an Academic~~ a Faculty Senate meeting.

### Eligibility Criteria:

#### Postbaccalaureate students:

1. Postbaccalaureate students must have completed at least one semester at CSUS as a postbaccalaureate student and have completed at least 12 units of course work as a postbaccalaureate student.
2. Postbaccalaureate students must be enrolled at least half-time (6 units) during the semester of application and have at least one semester remaining at CSUS.
3. Postbaccalaureate students must have an overall and CSUS postbaccalaureate GPA of at least 3.5 and be in the top 5% of GPA's in the student's major.
4. Previous recipients of the postbaccalaureate award shall not be eligible for a second award in this category (previous recipients in the undergraduate category may be eligible for a postbaccalaureate award).

#### Undergraduate students:

1. Undergraduate students must have completed at least one year at CSUS and have completed at least 60 units in their academic career including at least ~~30~~ 24 units of course work at CSUS.
2. Undergraduate students must be enrolled at least half-time (6 units) during the semester of application and have at least one semester remaining at CSUS.
3. Undergraduate students must have a minimum overall and CSUS GPA of 3.5, and be in the top 10% of GPA's in the student's major discipline.
4. Previous recipients of an undergraduate award are not eligible for a second award in this category.

May 7, 1997

To: Faculty Policies Committee

From: W.A. Dorman and Linda Martin, Co-Conveners  
Working Group on Faculty Evaluation

Subject: Final Report

Background:

In the Fall of 1995, the Faculty Policies Committee established a Working Group on Faculty Evaluation, Assessment and Accountability (since shortened to "Faculty Evaluation"). The group's assignment was to survey current RTP practices throughout the university and recommend reforms if warranted. Based on the group's initial inquiry, Faculty Policies Committee sent forward an *Interim Report* to the full Senate in March of 1996. Subsequently, in November 1996, a Position Paper on Proposed Changes in Faculty Evaluation and Assessment (Appendix A) was circulated to the campus community. Comments were solicited, and an abstract of comments was compiled and made available to Deans and Chairs early Spring semester, 1997 (See Appendix B).

Conclusions:

- Our year-and-a-half long study of RTP policies and procedures at CSUS and at other CSU campuses, in addition to our extensive review of the scholarly research concerned with teaching, learning and meaningful evaluation, have uncovered an unmistakable need for significant changes in how faculty are evaluated at CSU, Sacramento. These changes should take the form of increased emphasis in school and department evaluation procedures on (1) formative [as opposed to summative]



evaluation;\* \* (2) clear standards against which performance is measured, whether in the areas of teaching, scholarship or service; (3) focus on quality of accomplishment rather than quantity; (4) peer mentoring; (5) self-reflection about teaching, professional development, or contributions to the department; (6) multiple-sources of information for evaluation, particularly in the realm of teaching.

- At the same time, we found considerable evidence that (a) periodic review of tenured faculty is not carried out with the same rigor as review of un-tenured faculty and (b) that un-tenured faculty have a high degree of anxiety because of uncertainty about how they are being evaluated
- Originally, it was assumed that Faculty Policies Committee would present to the Senate a package of changes in university-wide RTP procedures for debate and possible adoption as policy. We have come to change our thinking. First, while there was widespread support expressed for the sorts of reform called for in the Position Paper, there was also significant principled opposition. Certainly, no clear consensus emerged. Second, as we became more familiar with the literature and examined successful change models on other campuses, we came to conclude that for meaningful change to occur it must be from the "department or school up" rather than "university down." Put another way, we became concerned that we were concentrating on political/policy solutions for cultural/academic problems, rather than exploring ways of changing faculty evaluation that are (a)

---

\* \* Summative evaluations emphasize only data or evidence from the past in judgments about performance, while formative evaluations also consider the direction a faculty member might take in the future, particularly in terms of professional development.

discipline or domain specific and (b) have faculty ownership from the beginning. The recommendations below reflect this change in direction.

- There is a particular urgency to the task of reconsidering faculty evaluation. Some 500 of the 650 full-time faculty at CSU, Sacramento are now over the age of 50 and significant numbers of new hires can be expected in the next five to ten years. Today's faculty have the opportunity to perform a major service for those who will follow by taking on the task of reforming the present system.
- The Faculty Policies Committee has met its goal of encouraging a long overdue campus-wide conversation about faculty evaluation judging from both informal and formal comments about the Position Paper. Two steps should be taken to make certain that the conversation continues (see recommendations below).

Recommendations:

That the Senate recognize the need for and urge the serious re-examination of faculty evaluation on a school-by-school, department-by-department basis using as a starting point the 1996 Position Paper on Faculty Evaluation of the Faculty Policies Committee.

That the Senate endorse the Faculty Policies Committee's current efforts to strengthen and expand the Center for Teaching and Learning, among other things, to investigate, encourage and facilitate new directions in faculty evaluation.

cc: Executive Committee, Academic Senate

**PROPOSED  
CSUS NEW-FACULTY SOCIALIZATION PROGRAM**

**PREAMBLE**

The CSUS New-Faculty Socialization Program is proposed as a mechanism to foster the integration of new faculty into campus life and contribute to their success in obtaining tenure and thriving beyond the award of tenure. The term "socialization" is adopted because it is consistent with the spirit and language of the recent WASC Report and focuses on a faculty member's long-term success, not just his or her immediate integration into the campus community. The Program also furthers the WASC Self-Study Report's goal of supporting campus efforts "which aid in the continued development of organizational health."

5/7/97: Approved by the Faculty Policies Committee

**PROPOSED  
CSUS NEW-FACULTY SOCIALIZATION PROGRAM**

- I. Pre-Hire
  - A. Description of campus, school, and department cultures (i.e., priorities).
  - B. Inclusive interview process (e.g., invite faculty from all departments within the relevant school to the candidate's research presentation, provide candidate with visit to Office of Research & Graduate Studies).
- II. New Faculty
  - A. University
    - 1. New Faculty Orientation (Conducted by Faculty & Staff Affairs. Currently a one-day session, although some other CSU campuses have multiple sessions)
    - 2. Information Packet
      - a. Current Information
      - b. University ARTP Policy
      - c. List and Description of Senate and University Committees
      - d. Description of Center for Teaching and Learning, Office of Research & Graduate Studies, and Other Similar Functions
      - e. List and Description of Campus Organizations (Including Student Organizations, such as ASI)
  - B. School
    - 1. Meeting with School Dean
    - 2. New Faculty Orientation (Conducted by Dean's Office)
    - 3. Information Packet
      - a. School ARTP Policy
      - b. List of School Departments (including chair and faculty names with primary areas, phone numbers, and e-mail addresses)
      - c. List and Description of School Committees
    - 4. Socialization Peer Group (number of members established by each School)
    - 5. Social Event (to welcome the new faculty member to the school and introduce school colleagues)
  - C. Department
    - 1. Meeting with Department Chair
    - 2. New Faculty Orientation (e.g., meeting with chairs of department committees)
    - 3. Information Packet
      - a. Department ARTP Policy
      - b. List of Department Faculty (including background information)
      - c. List and Description of Department Committees
    - 4. Social Event (to welcome new faculty member to the department)

*Carried  
unanim.*

Draft 9/11/97

RESOLUTION ON THE QUALIFICATIONS AND SEARCH PROCESS  
FOR THE NEW CSU CHANCELLOR

WHEREAS: The California State University is an academic institution and a key responsibility of the Chancellor is to serve as the academic leader of the faculty of that institution; and

WHEREAS: Recent changes in the requirements for the new Chancellor no longer emphasize academic qualifications, thus creating the impression that candidates need not be familiar with the academic culture of higher education; and

WHEREAS: The CSU faculty, who by nature of their profession are intimately familiar with the nature and needs of their academic institution, have been excluded (except for representation by the faculty Trustee) from direct participation in the search process; and

WHEREAS: Both the changes in the requirements for the new Chancellor and the exclusion of faculty from meaningful participation in the search process are likely to undermine faculty trust in and support for the new Chancellor even before that individual is appointed; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the CSU Board of Trustees <sup>to encourage the</sup> revise the qualifications for the new Chancellor to include <sup>substantial</sup> academic experience in areas of teaching and scholarship as well as experience in administration; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the CSU Board of Trustees <sup>to</sup> revise its current procedures to allow representatives of the faculty, in addition to the faculty Trustee, to participate directly in the <sup>current</sup> Chancellor search process, particularly in the final candidate interviews; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the CSU Board of Trustees formally adopt a policy <sup>which</sup> includes <sup>members</sup> of the CSU faculty on all search committees established in the future to recommend candidates for positions of Chancellor or President within the CSU.

Faculty Senate  
California State University, Sacramento

Resolved:

*to do of csus if not  
Chair BOT  
Chair CSU  
to do of csus if not  
Chair BOT  
Chair CSU*

*attainment  
1. 1  
supp  
merit  
rank  
full  
prof.  
apptd to*

*carried*

*Barreny  
Carried*