

1997-98 FACULTY SENATE
OF

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO

Minutes Issue #10
February 26, 1998

ROLL CALL

- Present: Alexander, Alvayay, Amata, Barakatt, Barrena, Bossert, Cameron Wedding, Canton, Chambers, Cooley, DeBow, de Haas, Dillon (Parliamentarian), Dokimos, Dundon, Dworkin, Gelus, Huff, Jacobs, A. Jensen, Jew, Kando, Kapoor, Kostyrko, Krabacher, Lan, Lee-Sammons, Lund, Martin, Newsome, Palmer, Parrott, Phillips, Raingruber, Reardon, Rodriguez, Scott, Seid, Stabinsky, Timmer, Verdone, G. Wheeler, V. Wheeler
- Absent: Ahmadi, Allen, Banks, Cajucom, Corley, Gardner, Hornback, Lascher, Leezer, Mackey, McKee, Nystrom, Partovi, Pickett, Pittman, Ritchey, Scanlan, Serrano, Strahan, Turrill, Valtierra, Wilcox

INFORMATION

1. Spring Senate meeting dates (tentative):
 March 5, 12, 19, 26
 April 2, 16, 23, 30
 May 7, 14, 21
2. Senate Home Page (<http://www.csus.edu/acse/> or CSUS Home Page then Departments then Faculty Senate)

ACTION ITEMS

***FS 97-22/APC, Ex. COURSE REPEAT/GRADE REPLACEMENT POLICY**

The Faculty Senate recommends amendment of the policy on Repeating Courses (pages 79-80 of the 1996-98 CSUS Catalog), to read as follows:

Any course taken at CSUS may be repeated one time at CSUS without departmental approval. The number of additional times a student is allowed to repeat the same course may be limited by some academic departments. [Academic Departments with limits on course repeats will clearly publicize their specific repeat policy.] If a student exceeds the repeat limit established by a department, the department may administratively drop the student from the course, and/or disallow the course if it is presented in fulfillment of graduation requirements.

Students intending to repeat a course more than one time should discuss this with their academic advisor and the Chair of the department offering the course to determine whether specific departmental repeat limits exist and if there are provisions for exceptions.

In the case of a first repeat, only the grade earned in the second attempt (even if it is lower) will be used in the CSUS calculation for grade point average. However, it should be noted that the grade earned in the first attempt remains on the student's transcript and may be used in grade point calculations by other institutions (e.g., medical schools and law schools).

Grades earned in repeats after the second attempt (first repeat) will be averaged with the second and subsequent attempts in grade point calculations, even if the student was granted departmental permission to enroll in the course a third or subsequent time.

If the original course attempt and first repeat were both courses taken at CSUS, students should file a "Repeat Grade Replacement Petition" with the Office of Admissions and Records in order to initiate a unit and grade point adjustment. In this case, departmental approval is not required. If a "Repeat Grade Replacement Petition" is not submitted by the students the unit and grade point adjustment will not be made until the student's graduation evaluation is completed.

However, under the following conditions, students must file a "Repeat Grade Replacement Petition," approved by the Chair of the department offering the course, with the Office of Admissions and Records to initiate unit and grade replacement if:

- 1) the repeated or original course is taken at another accredited institution, or
- 2) the repeated course differs in number or title from the original course.

Under these conditions, students must obtain petition approval prior to enrollment in the repeated course since it is possible that the courses may not be considered equivalent.

The repeat grade replacement policy of a transfer institution, if it can be determined, will be applied to a student's record at the time of transfer to CSUS. If it cannot be determined, CSUS policy will apply.

Note to Graduate Students: Grades earned in courses repeated as a postbaccalaureate student may not be used to replace grades earned in a course as an undergraduate student. In addition, grades earned at another institution will not be counted in the postbaccalaureate GPA.

Carried.

FS 98-01/Flr. MINUTES

The Minutes of December 4 (#6), December 11 (#7) and December 18 (#8), 1997, are approved as published.

Carried.

FS 98-05/Ex. CSU SUPPORT BUDGET, CSU, SACRAMENTO SENATE RESOLUTION RE
SUPPORT FOR AN AUGMENTATION OF PROPOSED 1998-99

The Faculty Senate of California State University, Sacramento, endorses 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 Faculty Senate of 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 PSSSI/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 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

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

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.

Carried.

***FS 98-09/CPC, Ex. PROGRAM CHANGE PROPOSALS**

The Faculty Senate recommends approval of the following program change proposals:

1. **Professional Administration Services Credential:** Addition of an Induction Seminar and an Assessment Seminar. This provides students with an option which includes the involvement of non-university activities in the preparation of school administrators. The program could be reduced from 24 units to 16-24 units, depending on the students' background. This credential is being modified in order to comply with the new requirements from the state's Commission on Teaching Credentialing.
2. **Single Subject Credential Program:** Creates a new course, EDTE 480D-Single Subject Internship, to designate internship student teaching in Phase III in the Single Subject Credential Program.
3. **Single Subject Credential Program:** Creates a new course, EDTE 480E-Internship in Single Subject-Phase III-CLAD, to provide more intensive supervision to interns who will be assuming full responsibility for multilingual classrooms at the single subject level.
4. **Multiple Subject Credential Program:** Creates a new course, EDTE 421D-Multiple Subject Internship, to designate internship student teaching in Phase III in the Multiple Subject Credential program which will provide more intensive supervision to interns who will be assuming full responsibility for classrooms at the multiple subject level.
5. **Multiple Subject Credential Program:** Creates a new course, EDTE 421E-Multiple Subjects Internship-Phase III-CLAD, to designate CLAD intern student teaching in Phase III in the Multiple Subject Credential Program which will provide more intensive supervision to interns who will be assuming full responsibility for multilingual classrooms at the multiple subject level.

Carried unanimously.

***FS 98-10/CPC, Ex. JOINT PH.D. PROGRAM IN PUBLIC HISTORY (Request to Negotiate, AS 95-82)**

The Faculty Senate recommends approval of a joint Ph.D. in Public History (February 26, 1998, Faculty Senate Agenda Attachment) in cooperation with the University of California at Santa Barbara. This program will train students in advanced historical research skills and systematic thinking about professional issues.

Carried.

FS 98-11/Ex., Flr. RESOLUTION OPPOSING THE REMOVAL OF DEPARTMENT/PROGRAM CHAIRS FROM UNIT 3

The Faculty Senate of California State University, Sacramento endorses the following resolution in opposition to any 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 of 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: That 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.

Carried unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned before discussion was concluded on FS 98-12, Ex., Flr., Faculty Governance. That action, along with the following will be considered at the March 5 meeting:

FS 98-06/APC, Ex. UNDERGRADUATE ACADEMIC ACTION CATEGORIES--
DEFINITIONS

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

FS 98-08/APC, Ex. UNDERGRADUATE ACADEMIC ACTIONS--ACADEMIC DISMISSAL
AND ADMINISTRATIVE DISMISSAL AND PROBATION

The meeting was adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Janice McPherson
Janice McPherson, Secretary

*Presidential approval requested.