

1997-98
FACULTY SENATE
California State University, Sacramento

AGENDA ADDENDUM
Thursday, February 26, 1998
Forest Suite, University Union
3:00-5:00 p.m.

FS 98-01 (2/26 agenda, page 2) ^{FS 98-11}
FS 97-22/22A (2/26 agenda, pages 2-5) ^{FS 98-05}
FS 98-06 (2/26 agenda, page 5) ^{FS 98-12}

Subsequent to the February 19 Senate meeting, the Academic Policies Committee proposed the following amendments to FS 98-07 on the February 19 Senate agenda. The Executive Committee offers the following as a substitute for FS 98-07:

FS 98-07A/APC, Ex. UNDERGRADUATE ACADEMIC ACTIONS—REINSTATEMENT
FROM ACADEMIC DISQUALIFICATION

The Faculty Senate recommends approval of the following:

Reinstatement of Academically Disqualified Students

Students who have been academically disqualified may petition for reinstatement. Reinstated students must be placed on a special contract. An academically disqualified student may obtain a petition for immediate reinstatement from the Admissions and Records Office. Failure to meet the conditions of the reinstatement contract will result in academic dismissal.

The completed petition including the student's statement of circumstances, significant changes and necessary documentation are submitted to the student's major department chair or major advisor as determined by ~~department~~ of the major department procedures. If the department recommends continuation in the major, unit maximum, specific courses and achievement levels may be stipulated. ~~Reinstated students on academic contract are subject to Academic Dismissal in the subsequent semester if they fail to achieve a semester GPA of 2.0 or fail to meet other conditions specified in the contract.~~

The petition is then carried back to the Admissions and Records Office where an admissions counselor interviews the student and acts on the request made by the academic department, based on the following information: ~~past academic problems, test scores, outside workload, vocational interests and goals, competing time obligations and any extenuating circumstances.~~ Students not recommended by their academic department for continuation in the first choice of major may be considered for University reinstatement into a different major when sponsored by the department offering that major or as an undeclared student.

Undeclared students and students not recommended for reinstatement into a particular major by the major department must meet with an advisor/admissions counselor at the Academic Advising Center or Academic Achievement Center who may recommend reinstatement to the University as an undeclared student on academic contract. The decision to reinstate the student as an undeclared student shall be based on consideration of past academic problems, test scores, outside workload, vocational interests and goals, competing time obligations and any extenuating circumstances. Students not recommended by their academic department for continuation in the first choice of major may be considered for University reinstatement into a different major when sponsored by the department offering that major. Students reinstated as undeclared students shall be placed on academic contract and shall not be allowed to enroll in upper division major courses during the period of the contract without permission of the department chair or designee for that major. In order to enroll in upper division major courses in a subsequent semester, admission to the major must be approved by the major department.

All reinstated students on academic contract are subject to Academic Dismissal in the subsequent semester if they fail to achieve a semester GPA of 2.0 or fail to meet other conditions specified in the contract.

Students whose petitions are approved are subject to review each semester until they improve their overall and CSUS GPA's to minimum standards.

Deadlines to petition for immediate reinstatement are as follows: (except for the School of Engineering and Computer Science and the School of Business Administration):

Spring semester

Third week of January

Fall semester

End of the first week in July for CASPER registration

Third week of August for late registration

Students with majors in the School of Engineering and Computer Science and the School of Business Administration should refer to the section on special reinstatement procedures pertaining to their schools.

NOTE: Catalog statement must be revised from academically dismissed to academically disqualified students in the Special Reinstatement Procedures for the School of Engineering and Computer Science and the School of Business Administration in order to become consistent with the overall policy. Language needs to reflect that schools can only deal with academic disqualification and reinstatement, not academic dismissal and readmission.

ASA

FS 98-08 (2/26 agenda, page 7)

Per Senate's request of February 19, 1998, the Executive Committee proposes the following amendments (strikeover=deletion; underscore=addition) to FS 98-05 as presented on the February 19 agenda:

Carried.
 FS 98-05/Ex. CSU SUPPORT BUDGET, ENDORSE CSU, SACRAMENTO SENATE RESOLUTION (AS 2401-98) RE SUPPORT FOR AN AUGMENTATION OF PROPOSED 1998-99

The Faculty Senate of California State University, Sacramento, endorses CSU Academic Senate resolution AS 2401-98 approved unanimously January 22-23, 1998 the following resolution in support for an augmentation to the proposed 1998-99 CSU Support Budget:

Support for an Augmentation to
 the Proposed 1998-99 CSU Support Budget

RESOLVED: That the Academic Faculty Senate of the California State University, Sacramento, urge the Chancellor, working in conjunction with the California Faculty Association (CFA), to develop and the Board of Trustees to approve a proposal to augment the CSU 1998-99 Support Budget by an amount appropriate to reducing the CSU faculty salary gap by at least one-third in FY 1998-99; and be it further

RESOLVED: That any reductions in the CSU salary gap in FY 1998-99 be achieved through a General Salary increase for all faculty and not through the allocation of additional funds to the current PSSI/merit pay system; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge the Chancellor, working in conjunction with the California Faculty Association (CFA), to develop and the Board of Trustees to approve and publish a plan for eliminating the entire CSU faculty salary gap through General Salary increase for all faculty by Fiscal Year 2000-2001.

RATIONALE: Over the past 10 months, Chancellor Barry Munitz and Board of Trustees Chair Martha Fallgatter have expressed the need for and intention to develop a plan for reducing the CSU faculty salary gap. At this time, no such plan exists and the gap has increased to 11.2 percent¹.

The original CSU 1998-99 Support Budget Proposal was submitted to the Department of Finance in October 1997, in accordance with the terms of the existing budget compact and estimates of state revenues. Since that time, state revenues have risen dramatically. It is appropriate for the CSU to formulate a proposal to augment the original budget to address

¹ Letter from Thierry Koenig, CSU Human Resources Analyst to William Storey, California Post-Secondary Education Commission, dated December 8, 1997.

this and other needs that both the faculty and the administration have agreed are vital to the future of the CSU.

The CSU is entering a period in which large numbers of faculty hired during the vast expansion of the system during the 1960s will be retiring. Without a competitive salary structure CSU campuses will be severely disadvantaged in hiring replacements for retiring faculty to the detriment of educational quality. In addition, current CSU faculty, most of whom have endured the lean years of the 1990s budget reductions, deserve compensation at least equivalent to the average of their national peers.

As well, the CSU has other pressing needs, such as physical plant maintenance, instructional equipment replacement, and library acquisitions and support, that should be addressed in a budget augmentation proposal. The faculty would support an augmentation proposal that includes a comprehensive package of items critical to the future of the CSU so long as closing the faculty salary gap is the top priority.

FS 98-11/Ex.^{file} RESOLUTION OPPOSING THE REMOVAL OF DEPARTMENT/PROGRAM CHAIRS FROM UNIT 3

Carried over

The Faculty Senate of California State University, Sacramento endorses the following resolution in opposition to the proposal to remove department and program chairs from Unit 3 (faculty) and place them under MPP (Management Personnel Plan) employment status:

RESOLVED: That the Faculty Senate of the California State University, Sacramento maintain that department and program chairs are part of the faculty in that they:

1. are traditionally chosen from among the faculty;
2. serve, as part of their responsibilities, as faculty representatives and advocates to the university administration;
3. frequently teach in addition to their chair responsibilities; and
4. play an important role in curriculum development and delivery, areas that have traditionally been primarily the responsibility of the faculty; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Faculty Senate of the California State University, Sacramento maintains that by changing the status chairs from Unit 3 to that of MPP (Management Personnel Plan) the university would, in effect, make chairs additional members of its administration and impair the ability of chairs to effectively carry out the responsibilities described above; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Faculty Senate of the California State University, Sacramento strongly opposes the proposal contained in the current collective bargaining position taken by the CSU to change the status of department/program chairs from Unit 3 to MPP; and be it further

RESOLVED: The Faculty Senate of the California State University, Sacramento strongly urges the CFA acting on behalf on the faculty, the Chancellor, and the Board of Trustees to assure that such a change in department chair status is not part of any future contract (MOU) negotiated between the faculty and the CSU.

***Rationale:** In the California State University system, department and program chairs have traditionally been seen as representatives and advocates of their program's faculty; it is routinely assumed that the chair speaks with voice and authority of his/her department. This stems in large part from the fact that chairs are ordinarily chosen by the faculty from among the faculty, and thus share and understand faculty interests and concerns.*

If the status of chairs is changed from that of faculty member to administrator, as a switch from Unit 3 to MPP would entail, the chairs would be viewed by faculty as simply representatives of another -- and considerably more intrusive -- layer of university administration. Faculty confidence in the ability of chairs to adequately represent faculty and departmental interests would be lost, and in all likelihood the need for an additional level of faculty-based leadership within departments (i.e., a "faculty" chair as opposed to the "department" chair) would arise.

In addition, a whole range of practical problems would arise and need to be resolved. How would chairs (now administrators) be selected? How would chairs be able to carry out those responsibilities that are currently considered within the purview of the faculty (e.g., curriculum development)? How would the issue of compensation for chairs under MPP status be resolved?

While one can see the desirability from an administration point of view for such a change in chair status, it completely goes against the traditional role of the department/program chair as a representative of the faculty. It would undoubtedly undermine the atmosphere of collegiality that is essential to the effective operation of university academic units.

FS 98-12/Ex. ^{FIR} FACULTY GOVERNANCE

RESOLVED: That the California State University, Sacramento Faculty Senate create an ad hoc committee of no fewer than 5 and no more than 7 at large members appointed by the Executive Committee to review the Senate membership sections of *The Constitution of the Faculty* and *By-Laws of the Academic Senate*, survey other faculty senates, and review previous studies of this senate and develop proposals for Senate consideration on the following:

(4) use of units committees by the admin that results in the suspension of the governance

- (1) a statement of duties and responsibilities of senators; and
- (2) changing the Senate membership from Department based representation to School and University at-large membership; and be it further
- (3) ~~look at procedures & efficiency of senate~~ ^{Senate} recom. on procedural matters of the Senate incl. mtg schedules, mtg times & conduct of mtgs

RESOLVED: That Faculty Senate direct the Chair to issue a memorandum to the faculty informing the faculty of the creation of the ad hoc committee on review of Senate Membership and inviting interested faculty to submit their names to the Executive Committee for consideration for appointment to the Committee; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ad hoc committee be requested to present its recommendations to the Senate in a timely manner so that a constitutional referendum can be held by the end of the Fall 1998 semester.

FS 98-10

If the status of chairs is changed from that of faculty member to administrator, as it is from Unit 3 to MPP would entail, the chairs would be viewed by faculty as simply representatives of another -- and considerably more intrusive -- layer of university administration. Faculty confidence in the ability of chairs to adequately represent faculty and departmental interests would be lost, and in all likelihood the need for an additional level of faculty-based leadership within departments (i.e., a "faculty" chair as opposed to the "department" chair) would arise.

In addition a whole range of practical problems would arise and need to be resolved. How would chairs (now administrators) be selected? How would chairs be able to carry out those responsibilities that are currently considered within the purview of the faculty (e.g., curriculum development)? How would the issue of compensation for chairs under MPP status be resolved?

While one can see the desirability from an administration point of view for such a change in chair status, it completely goes against the traditional role of the department/program chair as a representative of the faculty. It would undoubtedly undermine the atmosphere of collegiality that is essential to the effective operation of university academic units.

FS 98-12EX, FACULTY GOVERNANCE

RESOLVED: That the California State University, Sacramento Faculty Senate create an ad hoc committee of no fewer than 5 and no more than 7 at large members appointed by the Executive Committee to review the Senate membership sections of The Constitution of the Faculty and B-1-Laws of the Academic Senate, survey other faculty senates, and review previous studies of this nature and develop proposals for Senate consideration on the following:

- (1) a statement of duties and responsibilities of senators; and
- (2) changing the Senate membership from Department based representation to School and University at-large membership; and be it further

(3) ~~but at the same time~~
 ~~to be in practical matters of the~~
 ~~Senate and into membership, not to be~~
 ~~conduct of the~~

(Handwritten notes and signatures)