

1998-99  
FACULTY SENATE  
California State University, Sacramento

AGENDA

Thursday, September 24, 1998  
Foothill Suite, University Union (3<sup>rd</sup> floor, new wing)  
3:00-5:00 p.m.

**INFORMATION**

1. Moment of Silence:

**CHARLES V. HUME**  
Professor of Theatre Arts Emeritus  
CSUS 1949-1979

**RALPH E. TALBERT**  
Professor of Photography Emeritus  
CSUS 1969-1998

**GEORGE CREEL**  
Professor of English Emeritus  
CSUS 1948-1981

**CARL E. LUDIG**  
Professor of Biological Sciences Emeritus  
CSUS 1949-1980

**BARBARA J. MANSON**  
Office Manger, Dean's Office  
Health and Human Services  
CSUS 1987-1998

**BARBARA TORRES-YCIANO**  
Program Coordinator, Science  
Educational Equity  
CSUS 1988-1998

**DOROTHY ZIETZ**  
Professor of Social Work Emeritus  
CSUS 1955-1976

2. Tentative Fall 1998 Faculty Senate Meeting Schedule:

October 1--Meeting  
October 8--No meeting  
October 15--John C. Livingston Annual Faculty Lecture  
October 22--  
October 29--  
November 3--FACULTY CONVOCATION--Chancellor Reed (early afternoon TBA)  
November 5--  
November 12--  
November 19--No meeting  
November 26--No meeting--Happy Thanksgiving!  
December 3--  
December 10--  
December 17--

3. Senate Home Page (<http://www.csus.edu/acse/> or CSUS Home Page *then* Administration and Policy *then* Departments *then* Faculty Senate) - Vice Chair Arthur Jensen
4. Response to Faculty Governance Issues (FS 98-27A, Attachment A)  
TIME CERTAIN: 3:15 p.m., President Gerth
5. Report on September 10-11, 1998, CSU Academic Senate meeting -- CSU Academic Senator Cristy Jensen

## CONSENT CALENDAR

### FS 98-48/ConC COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS--Senate

#### Elections Committee:

DENISE CUMMINS, At-large, 1999

#### Faculty Endowment Fund Committee:

SHIRLEY THORNTON, At-large, 2001

#### Faculty Policies Committee:

LILA JACOBS, At-large, 2001

### FS 98-49/Ex. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS--Senate

#### Academic Policies Committee:

MICHAEL BALLARD-ROSA, At-large, 2000 (repl. N. Ostiguy)

#### Faculty Endowment Fund Committee:

ELLY WILLERUP, At-large, 1999 (F'98 repl. B. Raingruber)

### FS 98-50/Ex. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS--University

#### Academic Council on International Programs:

KENNETH LUK, Faculty At-large, July 1, 1998 through June 30, 2001

#### Administrative Review, Committee on:

BRUCE BEHRMAN, At-large, 2001

#### AIDS Advisory Committee:

KERRY PHILLIPS, Faculty Senate Chair/designee, 1999

GENI COWAN, Faculty At-large, 2000

#### Alcohol and Drug Steering Committee:

MELINDA SEID, Faculty At-large, 2001

ELLY WILLERUP, Faculty At-large, 2001

Alumni Board, CSUS:

ROGER LEEZER, Faculty Alumnus, 1999

ASCSUS Children's Center Parents Advisory Board:

CHRISTINE MILLER, At-large, 1999

ASI Appellate Council:

MICHAEL FITZGERALD, At-large, 1999

ASI Board, Faculty Representative to:

ROBYN NELSON, At-large, 1999

ASI Elections Complaint Committee:

TIM HODSON, At-large, 1999

Athletic Advisory Board:

JOAN NEIDE, Faculty Representative, 1999

KEN DeBOW, Faculty Representative, 1999

Campus Cooperative Education Advisory Committee:

CECIL CANTON, At-large, 1999

Campus Educational Equity Committee:

KERRY PHILLIPS, A&L, 2001

CLARE LEWIS, H&HS, 2001

BOB BUCKLEY, Senator, 1999

Council for University Planning:

LINDA BUCKLEY, Chair/designee, Academic Policies Committee, 1999

MIKI VOHRYZEK-BOLDEN, Chair/designee, Faculty Policies Committee, 1999

JERRY TOBEY, Chair/designee, Curriculum Policies Committee, 1999

MARY ANN REIHMAN, Chair/designee, General Education Policies/Graduation Requirements Committee, 1999

ARTHUR JENSEN, Executive Committee Member, 1999

Diversity Awards, Committee for:

OLIVIA CASTELLANO, At-large, 1999 (repl. M. Oshana)

MIKE LEE, At-large, 2000

CIRENIO RODRIGUEZ, Curriculum Policies Committee Member, 1999

Energy Management Committee:

ANDREW BANTA, Faculty At-large, 2000

Grade Appeal Procedural Appeals Board:

KEN DeBOW, At-large, 1999  
ANN MOTEKAITIS, At-large, 1999  
PATRICIA CLARK ELLIS, At-large, 1999

Honorary Degrees Committee:

TURAN GONEN, Faculty At-large, 2000

Institutional Scholarship Committee:

HAROLDENE WUNDER, At-large, 2000

Instruction-Related Activities Committee:

MICHAEL FITZGERALD, At-large, 1999  
ANNE-LOUISE RADIMSKY, At-large, 1999

Lottery Fund Allocation Committee:

MIKE LEE, BA, 2001  
CECIL CANTON, H&HS, 2001

Multicultural Center Advisory Board:

JOSE CINTRON, Faculty At-large, 2000

Public Safety Advisory Committee:

ROLAND DART III, At-large, 2001

Selection Advisory Committee for the Director of University Outreach:

ROBBIE CHING, Faculty At-large

Student Academic Development Committee:

RUTH WANG, At-large, 2000

Student Complaint Hearing Panel:

PATRICIA CLARK ELLIS, At-large, 2001  
ROBERT PLATZNER, At-large, 2001

Student Disciplinary Action Hearing Officer:

MICHAEL FITZGERALD, At-large, 1999  
PATRICIA CLARK ELLIS, At-large, 1999  
ROLAND DART III, At-large, 1999  
BONNIE RAINGRUBER, At-large, 1999  
PAUL FALZONE, At-large, 1999  
ROBIN REESE, At-large, 1999

University Copyright and Patent Committee:

EILEEN HEASER, Faculty At-large, 2001

University Trust Foundation Board:

GREGORY WHEELER, Faculty At-large, 2001

University Union Board of Directors:

JOSEPH KILPATRICK, Faculty At-large, 1999

FS 98-51/Ex. 1998-99 FACULTY SENATE PARLIAMENTARIAN

William Dillon, Professor of Government, shall serve as Parliamentarian for the 1998-99 Faculty Senate.

FS 98-52/CPC, Ex. CURRICULUM REVIEW--DEPARTMENT OF BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

The Faculty Senate receives the commendations and recommendations of the Curriculum Policies Committee on the program review of the Department of Biological Sciences (Attachment B) and recommends that 1) the Bachelor of Arts degree program in Biological Sciences be approved for six years or until the next scheduled program review, 2) the Bachelor of Science degree program in Biological Sciences be approved for six years or until the next scheduled program review, and 3) the Master of Science degree program in Biological Sciences be approved for six years or until the next scheduled program

FS 98-53/CPC, Ex. CURRICULUM REVIEW--GRADUATE PROGRAM IN INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

The Faculty Senate receives the commendations and recommendations of the Curriculum Policies Committee on the program review of the Graduate Program in International Affairs (Attachment C) and recommends that the Graduate Program in International Affairs be approved for a period of six years or until the next scheduled program review.

FS 98-54/APC, Ex. ANNUAL SCHEDULE OF CLASSES

The Faculty Senate recommends that the University adopt a schedule of classes for both Fall and Spring semesters for publication in print and on the worldwide WEB in May of each year. The Annual Schedule publication shall include statements that clearly inform students of the tentative nature of the schedule of course offerings, particularly the Spring semester. In addition to the Annual Schedule, the Faculty Senate recommends that an updated schedule of Spring classes be published in print and on the worldwide WEB in mid-November of each year.

**CONSENT--INFORMATION**

FS 98-45/Ex. GRADE APPEAL PROCEDURES (Amends AS 88-67)

The Executive Committee, on behalf of the Faculty Senate, recommends approval of amendments to the CSUS Grade Appeal Procedures (AS 88-67) as shown in Attachment D.

**REGULAR AGENDA**

FS 98-46/Flr. MINUTES

Approval of the Minutes of the meetings of April 2 (#14), April 16 (#15), April 23 (#16), April 30 (#17), May 7 (#18) and May 14 (#19), 1998.

FS 98-47/Flr. MINUTES

Approval of the Minutes of the meetings of April (#1) and May (#2), 1998.

~~FS 98-55/Flr. STANDING RULES GOVERNING THE CONDUCT OF SENATE MEETINGS, CHANGES TO~~

~~[The ad hoc Committee on Governance will distribute proposals at meeting.]~~

FS 98-28  
4/16/98

23

\*FS 98-27A/Flr. REQUEST FOR A RESPONSE FROM THE PRESIDENT ON MATTERS  
PERTAINING TO UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE AND THE ROLE OF  
THE FACULTY SENATE

RESOLVED: The CSUS Faculty Senate requests that the President in consultation with the Senate conduct a review of the "Constitution of the Faculty" and other University policies pertaining to consultation and governance processes to the following ends:

- 1) identification of provisions which are no longer applicable,
- 2) recommend rescission or amendment through established processes of provisions of the "Constitution of the Faculty" and other policies pertaining to consultation and governance which are no longer applicable,
- 3) recommend development through established processes and issuance of new policies pertaining to consultation and governance which are now necessary,
- 4) revision of the University Manual, as necessary, to reflect agreed upon changes to the "Constitution of the Faculty" and other policies pertaining to consultation and governance; and be it further

RESOLVED: The CSUS Faculty Senate requests that the President issue a written statement to the Faculty that describes his views on the processes wherein decisions should be made pertaining to the instructional program and faculty professional matters are to be made. Specifically, with regard to the instructional program, the Faculty Senate requests that the President address his views on how decisions should be made with regard to such matters as admissions policies, academic standards, curriculum, scheduling and manner of delivery of course offerings, graduation requirements, and resource support for the instructional program (including general fund and lottery allocations, space allocation and capital outlay plans). With regard to professional matters, the Faculty Senate requests that the President address his views on how decisions should be made at both the policy level (e.g., development of criteria and standards) and application level (e.g., evaluation of merit) in such matters as ARTP, Professional Leaves, and PSSI; and be it further

RESOLVED: The Faculty Senate requests that the President provide a written statement in which he specifies his views on the role of the Faculty Senate, University committees (including CUP and all other standing and ad hoc University committees), ASI, the University Staff Assembly, School Councils, Academic Departments, the Council of Deans, the Office of the Provost, and the President's Cabinet in the decisions making process on matters pertaining to the instructional program and faculty professional matters.

Carried. May 7, 1998.

**Summary of Recommendations to the Department:**

It is recommended that the Department of Biological Sciences:

1. place a significantly higher priority on obtaining external support for upgrade of equipment and laboratory facilities in its objectives/action plans. (p. 7)
2. encourage and support as much as possible the (faculty) development of both junior and senior faculty. (p. 7)
3. revise its RTP document to strengthen its definition of scholarly and creative activities and require clear and strong evidence in this area for retention, promotion, and tenure; and the Department submit its revisions to the Dean and the School RTP Committee no later than March 1999. (p. 10)
4. include in its RTP document a clear peer review process in the evaluation of teaching performance and submit the proposal to the Dean and the School RTP Committee no later than March 1999. (p. 11)
5. consider adding more rating or multiple choice questions to the student evaluation questionnaire. (p. 11)
6. consider evaluating all courses taught by part-time faculty as is the case for full-time faculty. (p. 11)
7. implement its Governance Model and include student input in appropriate committees. (p. 12)
8. consider the suggestions of the external consultant regarding the molecular biology program and the development of a program or certificate in biotechnology. (p. 13)
9. monitor students in the M.S. program to determine if they are making reasonable progress toward the degree. (p. 14)
10. consider making the graduate coordinator's tenure at least two years. (p. 14)
11. thoroughly analyze the costs required to support and sustain its proposed two-option M.S. program and identify funding sources before adopting the plan. (p. 14)
12. specify in the catalog that with advisor approval Marine Science courses at Moss Landing Marine Laboratories may be used to satisfy the requirements in the M.S. in Marine Science or part of the requirements in Biological Sciences. (p. 15)
13. monitor grading patterns to insure that grades reflect the varying achievements and abilities of students. (p. 15)
14. continue and expand its efforts to fund and support new faculty in their scholarly and creative activities. (p. 16)
15. continue and expand its efforts to encourage all faculty to seek external funding for equipment and support of student research. (p. 16)



16. work with the Dean to determine what is an appropriate full-time load for their faculty and to account for scholarly and creative activities in faculty workload. (p. 16)
17. hire new faculty in the area of cell and molecular biology to strengthen and expand this area in the undergraduate and graduate programs. (p. 17)
18. develop a mechanism for advising in which all majors receive academic advising. (p. 19)
19. actively seek donations of usable surplus equipment from UC Davis, state agencies, and firms in the community. (p. 20)

### **Summary of Recommendations to the Department and the School:**

It is recommended that:

1. the Department and School consider a mechanism to support the assigned time for a graduate coordinator position. (p. 14)
2. the Department and School review the level of clerical and technical support in the Department, and the School allocate additional positions to the Department as is appropriate for the size of the faculty and FTES. (p. 17)
3. the Department develop a prioritized list of equipment, facilities, and space needs required for their instructional programs and scholarly activities. Equipment repair, replacement, and upgrade should be itemized. The Department and the Dean's Office should conduct a series of meetings to discuss these needs, determine minor capital outlay priorities, and develop a plan for identifying the sources of funding to meet these needs. (p. 20)

### **Summary of Recommendations to the School:**

It is recommended that:

1. the School submit requests for minor capital outlay funds to increase the number of student stations in Chemistry labs. The Dean coordinate with the department chairs of Biological Sciences and Chemistry to insure that the progress of Biological Sciences majors (whose numbers are significantly increasing) toward their degrees is not impeded by closed sections of required Chemistry courses. (p. 13)
2. the School increase the allocation of funds to the Department for faculty travel. The Department explore alternative sources to supplement travel funds, such as, concurrent enrollment funds. (p. 16)
3. the School provide a tutoring room for Biological Science majors or for all majors in the School. (p. 19)
4. the Dean assist the Department in obtaining from the University a clear explanation for the changes to Goethe account allocations to the Department. (p. 21)

5. the Dean review the allocation process for faculty positions, instructional budget, equipment budget, operating expense budget, and clerical and technical support to Biological Sciences in order to 1) determine if there is parity with comparable high priority science programs at CSUS and within the CSU system and 2) modify the allocation process to ensure adequate support for Biological Sciences. (p. 21)
6. the School and University provide more adequate start-up funds to support new faculty research efforts. (p. 22)

#### **Summary of Recommendations to the University:**

It is recommended that the University support the conversion of the Department's allocation of faculty positions from part-time to full-time so that the percentage of WTUs taught by part-time faculty is 20% or less. (p. 17)

#### **Recommendations to the Academic Senate:**

It is recommended that the

1. Bachelor of Arts degree program in Biological Sciences be approved for six years or until the next scheduled program review.
2. Bachelor of Science degree program in Biological Sciences be approved for six years or until the next scheduled program review.
3. Master of Science degree program in Biological Sciences be approved for six years or until the next scheduled program review.

## I. OVERVIEW

The Department of Biological Sciences is one of seven departments in the School of Natural Sciences and Mathematics. Biological Sciences is among the three largest departments in the School in terms of FTES, and relative to other undergraduate programs in the School, has the second highest number of undergraduate majors.

The Department offers B.A., B.S., and M.S. degrees in Biological Sciences. According to the Department's Self-Study report (SS, Section II, p.15), the B.A. is a general degree which is designed for pre-health professional students and those desiring to teach biology in middle and high schools. The B.S. degree provides students with more training in biology or in a one of four concentration areas. These areas are Biological Conservation (for students interested in fisheries or wildlife management, conservation biology or ecology), Clinical Laboratory Technology (for students interested in becoming licensed medical technologists), Microbiology (for students seeking advanced degrees in microbiology or interested in becoming public health microbiologists), and Molecular Biology (for students seeking advanced degrees in molecular biology or interested in working in the biotechnology industry). In the past six years, the three concentrations of Aquatic Biology, Environmental Health Sciences, and Anatomy and Physiology, were deleted due to faculty retirements and low enrollments.

As of Fall 1995, there were 22 full-time and 18 part-time faculty, 6 full-time technical staff members, and 2 secretarial/clerical staff members. Two new tenure-track faculty were hired in Fall 1996.

### **Commendations:**

1. Comprehensive set of objectives, organized by category, and detailed in terms of action plans which will be an effective and useful guide in assisting the Department in reaching its goals
2. Dedication and commitment of the faculty to the academic programs in the Department
3. Student-oriented faculty who take special interest and care in advising students
4. Well-defined administrative structure which insures faculty voice and participation in Departmental governance
5. Contributions to the University's General Education Program
6. Formulation and development of a well-thought out and comprehensive assessment plan for its academic programs
7. Active participation in educational equity practices and goals
8. Sound graduate teaching associate program to guide and assist graduate students interested in becoming teaching associates

After reviewing thoroughly the attached Academic Program Review Report for the Graduate Program in International Affairs, prepared by the Review Team, the Faculty Senate Program Review Subcommittee endorses the commendations and recommendations contained in the report and directs them to the indicated units and administrative heads. (Page references refer to the documentation for the response in the Report.)

### COMMENDATIONS

The Review Team commends

- the faculty of International Affairs on its progress in designing an assessment plan and its commitment to the success of its program.
- Emeritus Professor Robert Curry for his dedication to International Affairs and for his extraordinary efforts on its behalf.
- the faculty of International Affairs for the excellence of its teaching and scholarship.
- the program for its record of attracting underrepresented students and for its diverse faculty.
- Emeritus Professor Robert Curry for the extraordinary role that he has played in the advising of students in International Affairs.

### RECOMMENDATIONS

The Review Team recommends that

1. the Coordinator and faculty revise the goals and objectives in its assessment plan to reduce their vagueness and to address more specifically the curriculum goals of the program so that students will know the skills and knowledge that the curriculum provides. (p. 3)
2. in terms of the over-all program assessment that the Coordinator in consultation with the Faculty Advisory Committee determine what skills and knowledge a student should have acquired upon completion of the degree congruent with the goals and objectives of each course syllabus. These outcomes should then be integrated into the instructional program. To assist them in this process the Coordinator and the faculty should consult the "DAP" goals in the Master of Arts in International Affairs at San Francisco State and the undergraduate outcomes assessment document in the International Affairs program at the University of Colorado, Boulder. (p. 4)
3. the Coordinator and faculty continue to refine and clarify its assessment plan, including a systematic examination of the course syllabi so that each one addresses the goals and objectives of the course. When this process is completed, the Coordinator should report the results of the assessment to the Dean and continue to do so on an annual basis. (p. 4)

4. in fall, 1999, the Coordinator in consultation with the faculty, prepare a report for the Dean assessing the effectiveness and success of the movement International Affairs to the School of Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies and of his serving as coordinator of both International Affairs and Public Policy and Administration. (p. 5)
5. the Coordinator appoint a core of committed faculty members to serve both as the Faculty Advisory Committee and as the Admissions Committee and that it address the problems caused by lack of faculty participation in program governance and that this committee report its findings and recommendations to the Coordinator in spring, 1999. (p. 6)
6. faculty who teach at least two courses a year in the program be given a secondary appointment in International Affairs. (p. 6)
7. the Coordinator form a small Student Advisory Committee to serve as a source of information and suggestions for curriculum reform and evaluation. (p. 7)
8. the Faculty Advisory Committee in consultation with the Student Advisory Committee design a student evaluation form that reflects the interdisciplinary nature of the program and that this form be available for use in spring, 1999. (p. 7)
9. the Coordinator encourage all faculty teaching in the core program have at least one of their International Affairs classes evaluated each academic year. (p. 7)
10. the Coordinator have direct access to these evaluation pursuant to the conditions of the MOU. (p. 8)
11. IA 210: International Relations: Theory Scope and Methods, be changed to Theories of International Relations and cross-listed with Government 230: Theories of International Relations in order to emphasize the interdisciplinary nature of the course. (p. 8)
12. the Faculty Advisory Committee and the Coordinator revise the core curriculum to make it more current in the discipline and to reduce the number of International Affairs courses by increasing the number of core courses cross-listed with other department's courses. The Coordinator shall report to the Dean on the progress of this revision in spring, 1999. (p. 8)
13. the Coordinator in consultation with the Faculty Advisory Committee revise the present system of electives so as to provide a limited number of 15 unit curriculum tracks. (p. 9)
14. the Coordinator in consultation with the Faculty Advisory Committee reconsider the present thesis requirement and examine the possibilities of limiting it to the Pd.D. track, or creating a comprehensive examination, and/or a capstone course. The Coordinator shall report to the Dean on the outcome of this reconsideration in Spring, 1999. (p. 9)

15. the Coordinator in consultation with the Faculty Advisory Committee give serious consideration to using cross-listed courses in the core curriculum with course offerings in other departments. (p. 10)
16. the Coordinator in consultation with the Faculty Advisory Committee examine the feasibility of reducing the number of required academic units in the program. (p. 10)
17. the Coordinator in consultation with the Faculty Advisory Committee consider increasing the number of students admitted into the program each year to 30. (p. 10)
18. the Coordinator in consultation with the Faculty Advisory Committee examine the feasibility and possible additional costs of admitting a new cohort of students in both the fall and spring semesters. (p. 10)
19. the Coordinator develop a comprehensive program of publicity for the program, such as a web page, brochure, newsletter, and announcements in the appropriate professional journals and meetings. (p. 11)
20. the Coordinator create a Community Advisory Committee to give outside recognition to the program and assist in obtaining internships. (p. 11)
21. the Coordinator and the Faculty Advisory Committee emphasize the interdisciplinary approach of International Affairs to the Chairs of departments whose faculty might interested in the program and strongly encourage interested faculty to contact the program. (p. 12)
22. the Coordinator of the program contact the Center of Teaching and Learning to determine if the Center might be interested in publicizing the program to the faculty of the University. (p. 12)
23. the Coordinator and the Faculty Advisory Committee organize a workshop through the Center for Teaching a Learning on how to develop and organize interdisciplinary courses and strategies for teaching such courses. Such workshops should stress the faculty development aspects of such courses. (p. 12)
24. the program make use of its web page and other sources of publicity to publicize the multicultural emphasis of International Affairs. (p. 13)
25. the Coordinator of the program consult with the Director of the Career Center on ways the Center may better serve the needs of the students in the International Affairs program. (p. 14)
26. the Coordinator appoint a faculty member to serve as Internship Coordinator. (p. 15)

27. the Coordinator and Faculty Advisory Committee develop a final version of a questionnaire to be sent to all alumni of the program. (p. 15)

#### RECOMMENDATION TO THE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE AND INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDIES

The Review Team recommends that the School of Social Science and Interdisciplinary Studies provide a full-time secretarial position to the programs of International Affairs and Public Policy and Administration. (p. 15)

#### RECOMMENDATION TO THE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE AND INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDIES, THE ASSOCIATE VICE PRESIDENT FOR RESEARCH AND GRADUATE STUDIES, AND THE PROVOST AND VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

The Review Team recommends that the Dean of the School of Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies, the Associate Vice President for Graduate and Sponsored Programs, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs make available to the International Affairs program the following:

1. an operating expense budget of \$1,000.00;
2. .75 of a full-time faculty position to pay for two classes to be taught by a part-time faculty and for reimbursement to the Department of Government for Professor Bahman Fozouni to teach one course;
3. the hiring of a new full-time, tenure track appointment in Public Policy and Administration. (p. 12-13)

#### RECOMMENDATION TO THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

The Review Team recommends that the University library install a second terminal for Lexis and Nexis access. (p. 13)

#### RECOMMENDATION TO THE FACULTY SENATE

The Review Team recommends that the Graduate Program in International Affairs be approved for a period of six years or until the next scheduled program review.

4-14-98

**CSUS GRADE APPEAL PROCESS  
SUGGESTED REVISIONS--amends AS 88-67  
(strikeover = deletion; underscore = addition)**

WHAT GRADES MAY BE APPEALED?

...  
GROUNDS FOR APPEAL: A GENERAL STATEMENT OF POLICY

...  
GRADE APPEAL PROCEDURES: SUMMARY OF BASIC STEPS

1. INFORMAL ~~PROCEDURES~~ PROCESS
  - a. Student-Instructor Meeting
  - b. Student-Department Chair Meeting
  - c. ~~Student-Department Chair-Instructor Meeting~~
2. FORMAL PROCEDURES
  - a. Student Grade Appeal Form
  - b. Grade Appeal Review Panel Hearing

GRADE APPEAL PROCEDURES - INFORMAL PROCESS

1. Student-Instructor Meeting.  
Students who believe that they have not received an appropriate grade ~~must~~ shall seek to resolve, in good faith, the matter informally with the Instructor who assigned the grade. This ~~should~~ shall be done as soon as possible, but no later than the end of the ~~fourth~~ third week of classes of the semester following the semester in which the grade was ~~earned~~ assigned.
2. Student-Department Chair Meeting.  
If the informal student-instructor meeting does not result in a solution satisfactory to the student, the student ~~must~~ shall present his/her appeal to the chair (program coordinator or director) of the academic unit (division, department or program) in which the course was listed. This ~~should~~ shall be done as soon as possible, but no later than the end of the ~~sixth~~ fifth week of classes following the semester in which the grade was ~~received~~ assigned.

The chair ~~will~~ shall attempt to seek a solution which may include a student-instructor-department chair meeting to attempt a resolution of the appeal. Within ~~ten (10)~~ five (5) working days after meeting with the student, the chair ~~will~~ shall notify the student of the result of the chair's effort to resolve the matter. ~~If unsatisfied, the student may then continue with the informal process or initiate a formal grade appeal.~~

3. ~~Student-Department Chair-Instructor Meeting. If the informal student-department chair meeting does not result in a solution satisfactory to the student, it is~~



~~recommended but not required that the student, chair and Instructor have a joint meeting to attempt a resolution of the appeal. The student and/or chair may propose such a meeting within five (5) working days of the receipt by the student of the chair's report of his/her effort to resolve the matter. If the student, chair, and instructor agree to the meeting, it will be convened by the chair within ten (10) working days after being proposed. If still unsatisfied, the student may initiate a formal appeal. This appeal must be initiated by submitting to the department chair, the Student Grade Appeal Form within ten (10) five (5) working days, following the failure of the informal procedures process.~~

Note: All formal appeals shall be submitted no later than the seventh week of the semester.

### GRADE APPEAL PROCEDURES - FORMAL PROCEDURE

1. Student Grade Appeal Form.

Students wishing to initiate a formal grade appeal ~~must~~ shall fill out the Student Grade Appeal Form (see attached) and submit it in triplicate to the chair (program coordinator or director) of the academic unit in which the course was listed within ~~ten (10) five (5) working days as specified in GRADE APPEAL PROCEDURES - INFORMAL #3 the informal process.~~ One copy ~~will~~ shall be retained by the student, one forwarded to the instructor and one held for the Grade Appeal ~~Review~~ Panel. Upon receipt of the appeal form, the chair ~~will~~ shall establish a Grade Appeal ~~Review~~ Panel as outlined below.

~~An initial meeting of the panel will be held within fifteen (15) working days after the selection of the panel. The chair will designate a faculty member of the panel as convener for the initial meeting.~~

2. Grade Appeal ~~Review~~ Panel. The Grade Appeal ~~Review~~ Panel ~~will~~ shall consist of two tenured or tenure-track faculty from the academic unit in which the course was listed, and one student who ~~is a major in that same academic unit (or, if there are no majors, a student who has taken courses in the academic unit in question and maintains an on-going involvement in it)~~ shall be an upper-division or graduate student in good standing currently registered in an undergraduate major or graduate program in the School in which the academic department is located. An upper division student in good standing shall serve on the panel to hear the appeal of an undergraduate. A graduate student in good standing, to hear the appeal of a graduate student. One faculty member ~~will~~ shall serve as chair.

a. Selection of Faculty.

- (1) The department chair ~~will~~ shall randomly select ~~six~~ eight prospective panel members, (who ~~will~~ shall be numbered in order of selection), from the list of full-time faculty members within the department (excluding those on ~~leave~~ sabbaticals or other leaves and those involved in the

appeal), or related disciplines as determined by the department chair in those cases where there is an insufficient number of eligible faculty members. ~~The first two selected will be designated as panel members and the third through sixth will be alternates.~~ If any faculty member selected is unwilling or unable to serve, due to extenuating circumstances, random selection ~~will~~ shall continue until the names of ~~six~~ eight consenting faculty members willing and able to serve have been drawn.

(2) The department chair ~~will~~ shall inform the student and the faculty member of the ~~six~~ eight names ~~that have been drawn on the list~~. During the 48 hours following, Each of the principals will shall then have ~~48 hours~~ the right to challenge up to two names ~~from the panel~~ on the list for any reason or no reason at all (for whatever reason) ~~who will then be replaced by the alternates following the order in which these alternates were drawn.~~ If the two principals do elect to challenge panel members, they will do so in alternate order beginning with the student. The first two unchallenged faculty on the list shall be the faculty panel members and the other unchallenged faculty shall be alternates.

b. Selection of student.

(1) The Department shall request from Admissions and Records a mailing list and labels of 100 randomly identified upper division and graduate students in good standing registered in undergraduate majors or graduate programs in the Department's School. The Department shall forward the list and labels to Associated Students, Inc. with a copy of the grade appeal form. The list shall be generated after the census date; i.e., the end of the fourth week of instruction.

(2) ~~The Student Senate Chair~~ Associated Students, Inc. Government Office ~~will~~ shall randomly select from the forwarded list five prospective panel members (who ~~will~~ shall be numbered in order of selection.) ~~from among the majors in the academic School unit who are willing to serve (or, if there are no majors, from among all of those who have taken courses in the academic unit and maintain an on-going involvement in it).~~ The first one will be designated as the panel member and the second through fifth will be alternates. If the student appealing is an undergraduate, each of the selected students shall be an upper division student. If a graduate student, each shall be a graduate student. Associated Students, Inc. shall ascertain the willingness of each student selected to serve. If any student member selected is unable to serve, Random selection will shall continue until a list of five consenting members have qualified students willing and able to serve has been drawn.

(3) ~~The Student Senate Chair~~ Associated Students, Inc. ~~will~~ shall inform the student and the faculty member of the ~~five~~ names of the five students

~~selected that have been drawn.~~ Each of the principals ~~will~~ shall then have 48 hours to challenge simultaneously ~~up to two~~ one names ~~from on~~ the panel list (for ~~whatever any~~ any reason ~~or no reason at all~~) ~~who will then be replaced by the alternates following the order in which these alternates were drawn.~~ ~~If the two principals do elect to challenge the student panel member, they will do so in alternate order beginning with the student.~~ The first unchallenged student on the list shall be the student panel member and the other unchallenged students shall be alternates.

- c. An initial meeting of the panel shall be held within ten (10) working days after the selection of the panel. The Department chair shall designate a faculty member of the panel to convene the initial meeting.
- ed. The panel ~~will~~ shall select its own chair from between the two faculty members at the initial meeting of the panel. The chair ~~will~~ shall be responsible for seeing to it that the appeal ~~review~~ is ~~carried out~~ heard in an orderly fashion and a decision ~~arrived at~~ reached as promptly as possible.

- 3. Guidelines for Panel Hearings
  - a. - f. ...
- 4. The Hearing Process
  - a. - g. ...
- 5. The Recommendation of the Panel
  - a. - d. ...
- 6. Appeal of Procedural Violations
  - a. - f. ....

6/2/98



## CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

September 24, 1998

### MEMORANDUM

TO: Faculty Senate Members

FROM: Donald R. Gerth

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Don Gerth", written over the printed name.

I am responding to FS 98-27A, Request for a Response from the President on Matters Pertaining to University Governance and the Role of the Faculty Senate.

Before I respond directly to each of the resolve clauses, I think it important to provide a framework for my response. First, this response was prepared after I thoroughly reviewed a number of key historical documents concerning governance and administration within the CSU including the Constitution of the Faculty Senate at CSU, Sacramento, and others noted at the end of the document. A copy of all documents and memoranda referenced in my response is available in the President's Office and Senate Office and I ask that these be placed on the Senate Web page, together with a copy of this response.

Second, the scope, focus and forum of this response is shaped by the extensive conversations that Faculty Senate Chair Krabacher (and sometimes Vice Chair Jensen) and Provost Koester had over the summer and early fall concerning the intention of the Senate in its resolution. (Koester memos to Krabacher, August 25, 1998 and September 8, 1998.)

Third, given the interlocking nature of the three resolve clauses in the Senate resolution, I intend my response as a whole, rather than as disparate parts. It seems that the Senate's resolution is driven by underlying concern about the role of the Faculty Senate in the governance of CSU, Sacramento. Since active and collegial participation and support for faculty senates has been a hallmark of my work in the California State University, I am hopeful that the careful articulation of the appropriate rights and responsibilities of the faculty in governance that follows will allow us to work together with renewed energy to allow CSU, Sacramento to meet the challenges of an increasingly complex world for higher education. We may occasionally disagree on how to address some issues. I do not view such disagreement as a sign that the governance process is broken or flawed.

Let me make clear my own views on the principles that guide decisions—and in which I firmly believe. The principles are outlined in the CSUS Statement on Collegiality (my Presidential Memorandum, PM 96-02). The most important of these are as follows:

6000 J Street, Sacramento, California 95819-6022

- that “collegial governance assigns primary responsibility to the faculty for deliberation about the educational functions of the institution in accordance with basic policy as determined by the CSU Board of Trustees, though not to the exclusion of other constituencies”;
- that “recommendations are normally accepted [by the President] in a healthy university, except in rare instances and for compelling reasons”;
- that governance is a decision-making process to be shared among the members of the various University constituencies, including “students, faculty, staff, alumni and representatives of the greater community”; and
- that “after consultation, recommendations come to the administrators who are responsible and accountable ultimately to the CSU Board of Trustees for policy on the campus and for the well-being of the institution.” The president is finally responsible and accountable.

This statement has been the policy on the campus since 1985, when I adopted it from the Board of Trustees’ document (itself adapted from a 1984 statement by the CSU Academic Senate). It was altered only once (in 1996), when, at the request of the Associated Students and with the agreement of the Senate Executive Committee, I expanded the constituencies to be consulted to include explicitly students, staff, alumni, and members of the greater community.

#### FIRST RESOLVE CLAUSE: REVIEW OF CONSTITUTION AND POLICIES

In the first resolve clause the Faculty Senate asks that the President, in consultation with the Senate, conduct a review of the Senate’s constitution and other university policies pertaining to consultation and governance in order “to identify provisions which are no longer applicable,” and, based on that review, recommend changes to the current constitution and/or policies or the development of new provisions or policies.

In discussions between Chair Krabacher and Provost Koester during the summer, they agreed that through Chair Krabacher’s work with the Senate Ad Hoc Committee on the Governance of the Senate, he would provide information on constitutional changes that would be recommended. Provost Koester was informed that the Ad Hoc Committee had not found a lot within the constitution that we [the committee] needed to talk about with us [university-wide administration] concerning changes to the constitution. (Koester memo to Krabacher, August 25, 1998.) Chair Krabacher did note that the faculty survey on governance indicated a faculty perception that the Senate should be more involved in fiscal decision making.

In my own review of the Senate’s constitution, I discovered several instances of language in the Senate constitution, drawn from the material that guided the establishment of Senates within the CSU, which are ambiguous, inconsistent, or contradictory. Since several of these examples are relevant to my response to other aspects of the Senate’s resolution, I will refer to them later. I would offer that if the Senate wishes to work toward modification of its constitution, I believe that these variations in language would be a good starting point for further Senate discussions.

The first resolve clause also asked for the identification of other University policies that required review. I would like to suggest the following approach to identifying these policies for review. I propose that a small number of the current members of the Senate, including Chair Krabacher,

meet on a regular basis with Provost Koester and Vice President Moulds to discuss and jointly agree upon a process to identify a list of criteria to develop a priority list of policies to be reviewed. My April 16, 1998 memo to you identified four generic categories of policies that would be my highest priority for review. Once the criteria are mutually agreed to, I would propose that the same group identify the specific policies for review and make recommendations for the process and priority by which to review them. Because of the importance of this policy review, I have recently asked my administrative staff to suggest policies in need of revision. However, I do believe that the criteria and process for review need to be jointly agreed upon with the Senate.

SECOND RESOLVE CLAUSE:      DECISIONS PERTAINING TO THE INSTRUCTIONAL  
PROGRAM AND FACULTY PROFESSIONAL  
MATTERS

In its second resolve clause the Faculty Senate has asked that I provide a statement describing my own views on how decisions pertaining to the instructional program and faculty professional matters are to be made.

Specific areas that the Senate would like to have me address include admissions policies, academic standards, curriculum, scheduling and manner of delivery of course offerings, graduation requirements, resource support for the instructional program (general fund, lottery, capital outlay, space), ARTP, Professional Leaves, PSSI.

As per discussions with Provost Koester, I will not detail here how decisions are to be made in each of these areas since to do so would involve a great deal of unproductive repetition of the principles of the Collegiality Statement; therefore, I will limit my comments to a few examples, prefaced by my general views on the essential issues.

To begin, it should be noted that the Collegiality Statement (PM 96-02), which I authored in 1985 and amended in 1996, lists the areas in which faculty are to be involved in governance and explicitly names almost every item on the Senate's list (with the exception of the items under "resource support"—more about that later):

- conditions of admission, degree, and graduation requirements
- curriculum and methods of teaching
- academic and professional standards
- conduct of creative and scholarly activities
- participation in budgetary matters

Second, the primary way in which decisions are made in these areas is very much the same no matter what the topic: generally, recommendations come from subcommittees to committees, from committees to the Senate, and from the Senate to the President. Thus, recommendations on admissions policies and academic standards may come from the Academic Policies Committee, recommendations on the curriculum from the Curriculum Policies Committee, on graduation requirements from the General Education Policies and Graduation Requirements Committee, on faculty matters from the Faculty Policies Committee, and so forth.

If this were all there was to it, however, there would be no point to this discussion that we have embarked on. Clearly, there are factors that make the process of governance more complex and more ambiguous than is evident in this model, and it is on those that I will focus my attention. I begin by laying some conceptual groundwork.

### Recommending Policy on Academic and Professional Matters

One of the key documents relevant to faculty participation in governance is the 1981 “Responsibilities of Academic Senates Within a Collective Bargaining Context” of the CSU Academic Senate (AS-1217-81/Ex). The statement recapitulates the history of senates within the CSU, reminding us that they were created in the early 60’s in response to resolutions in the Legislature and encouragement by the Board of Trustees and the Chancellor, and their purpose was to allow faculty members to elect colleagues “for the purpose of representing them in the *formulation of policy on academic and professional matters*” (Senate Resolution No. 98 and Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 78, 1961—emphasis mine). With few variations, that is the formula that is invoked in every subsequent document describing the faculty’s role in governance and the phrase is sprinkled liberally throughout AS-1217-81. While nobody, to my knowledge, has challenged this definition of faculty responsibility, some have raised questions about the extent of faculty “ownership” of this area, as well as about the faculty’s role in budget matters. Evidence of variant interpretations of this document’s definitions—or at least evidence of an ambiguity not present in AS-1217-81—can be found, particularly, in the Constitution of the Faculty of CSUS.

Article II, Section 4 of the Constitution (“Responsibilities”) quotes almost verbatim the four separate areas of faculty responsibility listed in AS-1217-81 (categories “A” through “D,” with many items enumerated under each). It is in the Constitution’s preamble to these lists, however, that causes tension between the two documents. First, the preamble opens with the sentence:

The following statement sets forth the academic matters explicitly reserved to the faculty or its Faculty Senate. (Constitution of the Faculty of CSUS, Article II, Section 4)

Not only have “professional” matters disappeared in this version, but also the word “reserved” suggests an exclusivity of ownership that is nowhere implied in AS-1217-81. AS-1217-81’s own preamble to the lists in question reads:

... the academic senates/councils of the campuses shall be the primary consultative bodies regarding educational and professional matters delegated to the individual campuses by the Chancellor or by the Board of Trustees of the California State University and Colleges and shall be consulted on fiscal matters which affect the instructional program. (AS-1217-81)

That the lists that follow then introduce some items under the heading “responsibility shall be vested in the faculty ... for [the following]” should not alter this conclusion: the preamble to the lists—the overarching characterization—describes the faculty as the “primary [not ‘exclusive’]

consultative body”; nor does the word “exclusive” appear in the heading (e.g., “exclusive responsibility,” or “vested exclusively”). That the faculty has always been the primary, but not exclusive, consultative body on academic and professional matters is evident also in the Collegiality Statement, which states this concept explicitly. The reason is that faculty members are the keepers of the disciplines: they, more than any other constituency, can insure the integrity of what is taught to our students, and how, and by whom. This makes primary consultation with the faculty critical. It does not, however, negate the need to hear other voices in the University community as these decisions are made.

### Budget

The second difficulty with the CSUS Senate Constitution’s preamble to Section 4 concerns the faculty’s role in budget matters. The preamble states:

It is the responsibility of the Faculty Senate to formulate, review, revise, adopt, and make policy recommendations about any academic matters delegated to the President by law, and by the Trustees and Chancellor of the CSU, including but not limited to academic, personnel, and fiscal policies, and to forward them to the President of the University. (Constitution, Article II, Section 4)

This preamble appears to limit the Senate’s comments on fiscal policies to academic matters. The document on which the Constitution was at least partially modeled, supports the view of the faculty’s limited role in budget matters. In describing the faculty’s role in governance, AS-1217-81 five times cites the “academic and professional matters” formula by itself, and three times cites it in conjunction with fiscal matters. This fact alone suggests that the faculty’s role here is more consultative than the responsibility that it has for formal recommendations in academic and professional areas, and secondly, that its role extends only to budget matters with academic implications.

It might be noted also that in the long lists specifying the faculty’s governance province that follow the two preambles cited, budget matters are not mentioned. Finally, note the wording of the Collegiality Statement: after describing the faculty’s primary responsibility for “deliberation about the educational functions of the institution” (elaborated at some length), it reads: “The collegial process also recognizes the value of participation [by all constituencies] in budgetary matters” (the qualifier “particularly those directly affecting the areas for which the faculty has primary responsibility” that appears in both the Trustees’ and my 1985 statements is dropped in my 1996 revision).

What conclusions can be drawn from these comparisons? Simply that tradition (beginning with a legislative mandate) and consensus see the faculty as the primary recommender of policy on academic and professional matters, and invite its “consultative” participation in related fiscal matters.<sup>1</sup> Obviously, no fixed value can be assigned to a term like “primary,” nor final

---

<sup>1</sup> It was for just these reasons that I declined to approve AS 92-60, the Senate’s recommendation that the Executive Committee make its own formal recommendations on all budget recommendations made over the summer of 1992 by CUP. For a more detailed account of my reasons, see my June 4, 1992 response.



definitions reached concerning what constitutes “participation,” or “related matters,” or even “consultation.” It is this inherent vagueness of key terms that is likely at the root of some of our debates and disagreements about the conduct of governance concerning budget.

### Policy versus Procedure

The final issue concerning the faculty’s role in governance is that of policy versus procedure: our documents are ambiguous, and sometimes contradictory, concerning who has responsibility for each. In my review so far of the faculty’s role in governance, it has been clear that the faculty role has always been as “policy recommender.” Article II, section 4, of the Senate’s Constitution itemizing faculty responsibilities is taken almost verbatim from AS-1217-81 and refers only to policy recommendations. A check of the By-Laws of the Faculty Senate also reveals no mention of procedures: Senate committees, by their description, “shall recommend policy and the interpretation of policy to the Faculty Senate by way of the Executive Committee” (By-Laws of the Faculty Senate, IV.C). Each policy committee will determine and recommend policies in its functional area(s). ... Committees *are to distinguish between policy and procedures*. ... Each policy committee ... will insure the integrity of procedures that are developed and implemented by the Administration. (Standing Rules, 3.06.00 B1, emphasis mine). The Senate’s own Standing Rules document is similarly clear about the purview of the Senate Committees.

Policies appear to be the purview of the faculty, procedures the purview of the administration—until, that is, one reads further in this document, or consults other documents. The General Education Policies Committee, for instance, is to make recommendations on administrative procedures in certain areas, and on the procedures of other committees whose work affects GEPC (Standing Rules, 3.07.01 A2,7). The first of the Academic Policies Committee’s responsibilities is “policies and procedures for academic standards and student appeals” (Standing Rules, 3.07.04 A1). The third responsibility of the Faculty Policies Committee is “personnel policies and procedures” (Standing Rules, 3.07.05 A3), and its two subcommittees are to recommend to it policies and procedures relating to the award programs that they manage. The Curriculum Policies Committee’s responsibilities include “policies and procedures for ... review ... of courses and academic programs” (Standing Rules, 3.07.06 A1). Similarly, several University Committees’ charges include work on procedures (e.g., Occupational Health and Safety Committee, Student Fee Advisory Committee, Committee for Persons with Disabilities). Similarly, when we turn to the Constitution, the distinction between the two blurs. Its preamble states:

The Faculty of the California State University, Sacramento, acting in its corporate capacity, has adopted this constitution to establish and define the means of its formal participation in the formulation, evaluation, and recommendation of University *policy and procedures*... (Constitution, Preamble, emphasis mine)

Article II, Section 3 lists as the first of the Senate’s duties:

The Faculty Senate shall perform all of the duties consistent with the exercise of its power to formulate, review, revise, and adopt recommendations of University *policy and procedure*. (Constitution, Article II, Section 3, emphasis mine)

It would seem, based on my review, that there are conflicting interpretations of what the faculty's governance purview is. Obviously there is no unequivocal point at which policy ends and procedure begins, but clearer and less contradictory language can be agreed upon well before we try to resolve that irreducible ambiguity, and here, too, tradition would suggest that the faculty's original responsibility lay with "policy."

### THIRD RESOLVE CLAUSE: THE ROLE OF SENATE AND UNIVERSITY COMMITTEES

The question of what constitutes consultation brings us to concerns about the respective roles of Senate and University committees. Senate committees are created, charged, and staffed by the Senate and make recommendations to the Senate, which acts in some cases by forwarding recommendations to me. At present, in addition to the Executive Committee and the Committee on Committees, there are the four standing committees (Faculty Policies, Academic Policies, Curriculum Policies, General Education Policies and Graduation Requirements) and their several subcommittees, as well as the hybrid UARTP Committee (with elected rather than appointed membership) and four smaller, specialized committees (Diversity and Equity, Election, Faculty Endowment Fund, Livingston).

University committees—of which there are some twenty-four—are created by the President and report to the President or an administrative designee. Consistent with the Constitution,<sup>2</sup> the President either confers with or reports to the Senate on their creation and functioning. They have faculty representation as appropriate, with members recommended to the President by the Senate. My sense of the essential difference between the two types of committees is that whereas the Senate committees are generally charged with responsibilities for policy recommendation on broad areas that are at the heart of the University's academic operations (e.g., academic policies, curriculum policies, etc.), the University committees generally have quite narrow and frequently less directly academic charges such as environmental health and safety, disability, IRA fees, the Multicultural Center, diversity awards, honorary degrees, outdoor art, public safety, student fees, student health, telecommunication, lottery funds, etc. The major exception to this, to be discussed below, is the Council for University Planning.

That there are these two types of committees is simply a product of the long evolution of governance on this campus and, as well, a recognition of the boundaries of the Senate's role and responsibilities. I do not, however, view the two structures as cumbersome, or redundant, or in competition with one another, and therefore in need of revision. However, a review of the charges of specific committees is appropriate and should be done as we jointly review all University policies. The business of this University is immensely diverse and must be spread out among a large number of working groups—staffed by those whom it most directly affects—if governance is to be collegial and consultative. Our committee structures accomplish this.

---

<sup>2</sup> I should note here that I am working with two differing versions of the Standing Rules document (one labeled "Draft 4/05/95," and one labeled "1994 Version").

As we discuss the role of Senate and University committees, we need to remember that faculty through their departments and colleges have opportunities to provide recommendations to the Senate or directly to administrators. Each college has its own governance structure to provide recommendations and feedback to each college dean. Some structures are very elaborate with multiple committees; others are simpler with one large faculty council to provide recommendations to the dean. Departments also have varying degrees of complexity in their committee structures, all of which feed recommendations at various times to the dean, college faculty, the Senate, or to campus administrators.

The Council for University Planning (CUP) is another matter. It is the planning committee for all of the University's business, and its aim is to integrate planning with budgeting, guided by assessment mechanisms whose development is an ongoing process. Specifically, CUP is charged with recommending and maintaining the University's Strategic Plan, recommending resource priorities to guide the development of the annual budget, reviewing assessment information, reviewing and commenting on enrollment targets, recommending updates to the five-year Capital Improvement Program and minor Capital Outlay Program, and reviewing and making comments to the President on the proposed annual budget.

Because its purview is so broad, and its tasks so important, its membership comprises all constituencies of the University (including seven members of the faculty representing various groups), and its consultation with other governance groups is extensive. But also because of the very broadness of its purview—i.e., because it is not limited to “academic and professional matters,” or the “academic and professional implications” of budgetary matters—CUP is more appropriately a University than a Senate committee. CUP was developed (initially as URPC, the University Resources Planning Committee) as part of the administrative reorganization that I undertook upon my arrival here as President in 1984, but it was tailored also to meet the requirements of a “Campus Budget Advisory Committee” stipulated by the Board of Trustees.<sup>3</sup>

Some have expressed concern about inadequate Senate involvement in CUP's activities. Senate involvement has typically occurred through its membership links in CUP. Ordinarily, each summer the Senate Chair sits down with the Provost to make necessary changes in the charge and membership of CUP. Specifically over the last several years the membership of CUP has been changed to strengthen ties to the Senate. While there have always been seven faculty members on CUP, during the last two years, that membership has been linked specifically to the standing Senate committees of Academic Policies, Curriculum, and Faculty Policies. During this last summer the Senate Chair and Provost agreed to further strengthen that relationship by having the chairs of the four Senate Standing Committees (also including the General Education/Graduation Requirements committee) sit as members of CUP. This is in addition to an at-large member of the faculty, recommended to the President by the Senate and a faculty member from the Executive Committee. One other faculty member, either from the library or academically-related faculty, is recommended to the President to serve on CUP.

---

<sup>3</sup> One of the principles of Board policy reads as follows: “Committees, which include students, faculty and any other appropriate constituency, shall exist at each of the campuses and at the system level to offer advice on budget policy, planning and resource allocation.” (Quoted from a memo from Chancellor Ann Reynolds to campus Presidents, dated June 26, 1987, Code #BA 87-14)

CUP regularly shares its recommendations with other governance bodies, including the Senate and its committees, for “additional consideration prior to action by the President” (quoted from the charge to CUP; “The Structure and Functioning of the Council for University Planning,” June 1997).

I believe that one of the weaknesses in the relationship between CUP and the Senate has been a lack of communication regarding CUP activities to the full Senate. One way to address the weakness is for the Senate to articulate expectations regarding interactions between faculty members on CUP and the Senate. Another complementary way would be for the Provost to make monthly reports at Senate meetings on significant aspects of CUP’s activities. I believe the Provost has offered several times to make reports such as this a standard part of Senate meetings. It is my understanding that, thus far, she has not been successful in receiving a commitment of time to provide those reports. At the suggestion of the Senate leadership, Provost Koester has also recently asked staff to provide a CUP Web page on which agenda, minutes and materials from CUP meetings will be regularly posted.

Finally, let me make some additional comments on the Senate’s third resolve clause, the question of the role of each governance body. Consistent with the agreements reached by Chair Krabacher and Provost Koester, I will not address each specific group. As I have already emphasized, each has an important role to play in the governance process, and each brings different kinds of expertise to bear on problems. I have already discussed at some length my views on the responsibilities of the Senate, and of the committees of the Senate and the University (especially CUP). I have also offered examples of the type of initiatives that might come from other governance bodies and officers, and early on I mentioned a successful initiative of ASI, requesting the inclusion of students in the Collegiality Statement. In general, any of the University constituencies may initiate discussion of issues that are of concern to it, and, more specifically, relevant constituencies are regularly named and included in the membership specifications of all of the institution’s committees—thus faculty, staff, students and administrators appear regularly in membership lists. Each of the University’s program centers has its own forms of internal self-governance (colleges, departments, the Staff Assembly, etc.), and each operates with reasonable autonomy in regulating its own affairs (bound naturally by the need to conform to policies of the campus, the system, etc.), and makes recommendations and reports through appropriate channels, on issues that affect other bodies.

The only bodies on the Senate’s list that I have not explicitly addressed so far are the Administrative Council<sup>4</sup> and my “Cabinet,” or staff. These are not governing bodies. Like any chief executive, I find it necessary and useful to confer regularly with my top administrators to discuss issues and problems within each of their spheres of activity and those concerning the University as a whole. Votes are not taken, resolutions are not made: we simply come together to share information and generate ideas on how to manage the work that needs to be done. If specific suggestions seem promising, I can then pursue them through regular governance

---

<sup>4</sup> Not, as the resolution calls it, the Council of Deans: that body, created in PM 84-02 and amended in PM 85-11 is no longer operative, and is a good example of policies which have been superseded and need to be formally updated or replaced.

channels, consulting with and reporting to those who will be affected by any action that might result. It would be a poor chief executive whose office pursued no vision and generated no initiatives in that pursuit. I firmly believe in a collaborative leadership.

## FINAL THOUGHTS

Having given my positions on some of the larger issues and controversies of collegial governance, let me provide some final thoughts concerning the workings of collegial governance in practice. Returning to the list of academic and professional topics that the Senate wanted me to address, in most instances discussions have been initiated by the Senate and have resulted in recommendations to me.

I believe that we will increasingly see a number of demands placed on us by those external to the campus. Action requests contained in statutes, in Board of Trustees mandates, in labor contracts, or in government regulations will usually require prompt, swift feedback to meet established deadlines. For example, most of the teacher education initiatives which I outlined in this year's Fall Address have target deadlines attached to them by the Board of Trustees. Similarly, last year, periodic recommendations on modifying Cornerstones had deadlines associated with responses. I believe we need to collectively discuss how, when faced with imminent deadlines, we can mutually move important recommendations forward in a timely yet thoughtful manner. I am open to suggestions on how we can cooperate to accomplish this. I renew the pledge in my April 16, 1998 memorandum to Chair Krabacher, "I will consult to the extent possible and feasible;" however, timely action on the part of the Senate must be a characteristic of these consultations.

As I said in the Collegiality Statement, "Recommendations are normally accepted in a healthy university, except in rare instances and for compelling reasons." My record of the past seven years confirms that from my perspective (earlier decisions are not reflected here merely because they are now in the Archives, and less readily available), we have a healthy university:

I approved 96% of all Senate recommendations and disapproved 2%. Significant changes were made to an additional 1.8% of the recommendations.  
(Memorandum, Gerth to Krabacher, 4/16/98)

In each of the few instances where I failed to accept a recommendation, I offered my reasons in detail.

Let me state in different words my most important point. This is a time of great change in California higher education. We—all of us in this University—need to emphasize collaboration as we work together to make decisions for the present and future of CSUS—this peoples' university within the most remarkable system of public higher education in the world. I am committed to doing just that.

## ATTACHMENTS LIST

1. FS 98-27A: Faculty Senate Resolution: "Request for a Response from the President on Matters Pertaining to University Governance and the Role of the Faculty Senate"
2. Memo from Koester to Krabacher dated August 25, 1998 and Memo from Koester to Krabacher dated September 8, 1998
3. PM 96-02: California State University, Sacramento Statement on Collegiality and  
PM 85-14: California State University, Sacramento Statement on Collegiality
4. RBOT 09-85-06, Report of the Board of Trustees Ad Hoc Committee on Governance, Collegiality, and Responsibility in the California State University: Attachment A
5. Memo from Gerth to Krabacher dated April 16, 1998
6. AS-1217-81/Ex: Academic Senate of the California State University": Responsibilities of Academic Senates Within a Collective Bargaining Context" also quoting AB 1091, The California Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations Act, 1978; California Senate Resolution 98, 1961; and Assembly Concurrent Resolution 78, 1961.
7. Constitution of the Faculty of California State University, Sacramento
8. AS 92-60 and  
Memo from Gerth to Charlotte Cook dated June 4, 1992
9. Standing Rules of the Academic Senate, California State University, Sacramento, 1994 and  
Draft changes to the Standing Rules, 1995
10. Charges to Occupational Health and Safety Committee, Student Fee Advisory Committee, and Committee for Persons with Disabilities.
11. By-Laws of the Faculty Senate, California State University, Sacramento
12. California State University, Office of the Chancellor, Code Memo BA 87-14: Campus Budget Advisory Committee
13. June 1997 Charge to the Council for University Planning: "The Structure and Functioning of the Council for University Planning."
14. PM 84-02 and PM 85-11: The Council of Deans