

Note: You'll need your October 1 Agenda Attachment.

1998-99
FACULTY SENATE
California State University, Sacramento

AGENDA
Thursday, October 22, 1998
Foothill Suite, University Union (3rd floor, new wing)
3:00-5:00 p.m.

INFORMATION

1. Moment of Silence:

CLAUDE BRASHEARS
Business Services
CSUS 1960 - 1978

PETER A. GRIFFIN
Professor of Mathematics and Statistics
CSUS 1965-1998

CAROLINE ESMAILPOUR
Junior, CSUS

2. Tentative Fall 1998 Faculty Senate Meeting Schedule:

October 29--

November 3--CONVOCATION--Chancellor Reed (1:30 p.m., Grand Ballroom,
University Union)

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

CONSENT CALENDAR

FS 98-64/Ex. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS--Senate

Faculty Policies Committee:

LINDA GOFF, Library/Student Services, 2001 (repl. R. Rios Kravitz)

FS 98-65/Ex. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS--University

Financial Aid Satisfactory Progress Appeals Board:

ANN MOTEKAITIS, At-large, 1999 (repl. J. Barrena)

Grade Appeal Procedural Appeals Panel:

KEN DeBOW, At-large, 1999

WILLIAM DILLON, At-large, 1999

ANN MOTEKAITIS, At-large, 1999

Institutional Scholarship Committee:

JACK BRACKMANN, At-large Emeritus, 2000

Lottery Fund Allocation Committee:

ROLLIN POTTER, A&L, 2001

Persons with Disabilities, Committee for:

LEILANI HALL, Library Faculty, 2001

Student Economic Support, University Committee for:

JIM HILL, NS&M, 2000

RICHARD CIONCO, A&L, 2001

CANDELARIA PEREZ-DAVIDSON, H&HS, 2001

Student Health Advisory Committee:

SUSANNE LINDGREN, At-large, 1999

CONSENT--INFORMATION

FS 98-60/Ex. CONVOCATION

The Executive Committee, on behalf of the Faculty Senate, recommends that a convocation be called to allow Chancellor Reed to address the campus community during his CSUS visit on November 3, 1998.

REGULAR AGENDA

FS 98-63/Flr. MINUTES

Approval of the Minutes of the meeting of October 1 (#4), 1998.

Old Business

FS 98-58/CC, Ex. COMMUNITY SERVICE-LEARNING [*FS 98-33 postponed from 1997-98 session.*]

The Faculty Senate recommends approval of the Community Service-Learning definition and guidelines presented in *October 1, 1998, Faculty Senate Agenda Attachment.*

TIME CERTAIN: 3:45 p.m., Charlotte Cook

FS 98-60A FS 98-60 CHANCELLOR REED VISIT-CONVOCATION

FS 98-61/Flr. POSSIBLE SENATE ACTIVITIES IN CONNECTION WITH
CHANCELLOR'S VISIT

[*Note: See attached background material.*]

FS 98-62/Flr. FACULTY SENATE CONSIDERATION OF POSSIBLE ACTIONS ON LACK
OF FACULTY CONTRACT

New Business

FS 98-66/Flr. DISTANCE LEARNING, PROPOSED POLICY STATEMENT ON (*First Reading*)

The Faculty Senate recommends approval of the following statement: California State University, Sacramento recognizes the value of different teaching strategies and pedagogies in higher education, including those used in distance (or distributive) education. It is ultimately the responsibility of the faculty to determine the appropriate format in which a course should be offered.



THE CALIFORNIA STATE UN

Attachment
Faculty Senate Agenda
October 22, 1998

BAKERSFIELD • CHANNEL ISLANDS • CHICO • DOMINGUEZ HILLS • FRESNO • FULLERTON • HAYWARD • SACRAMENTO
LONG BEACH • LOS ANGELES • MARITIME ACADEMY • MONTEREY BAY • NORTHRIDGE • POMONA • SACRAMENTO
SAN BERNARDINO • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO • SAN JOSE • SAN LUIS OBISPO • SAN MARCOS • SONOMA • STANISLAUS

CHARLES B. REED
CHANCELLOR

August 5, 1998

California State University, Sacramento
6000 J Street
Sacramento, California 95819-6036

AUG 10 1998

Professor Thomas Krabacher
Chair, Faculty Senate
CSU Sacramento
6000 J Street
Sacramento, CA 95819-6036

Faculty Senate Received
413

Dear Professor Krabacher:

Thank you for your recent letter regarding several issues that surfaced during my session with your Faculty Senate Executive Committee. I agree that these issues are important as we shape the future of the California State University.

I also concur that these topics can be addressed most productively through dialogue and discussion. Therefore, I will come to my visit to CSU Sacramento scheduled for November 3, 1998, prepared to provide more detail and insight into my views on these subjects.

I look forward to seeing you again and exploring how we can work together to strengthen the CSU.

With kind regards,

Sincerely,

Charles B. Reed
Chancellor

CBR/ssg

cc: Dr. Donald R. Gerth
Dr. Jolene Koester



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO

FACULTY SENATE

July 28, 1998

Dr. Charles Reed, Chancellor
The California State University
400 Golden Shore, Suite 324
Long Beach, CA 90802-4275

Dear Chancellor Reed:

Now that summer is well underway, I would like to thank you for making time available to meet with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee during your visit to the Sacramento campus this spring. I have heard from others that you found the session confrontational at times; if this indeed were the case, I would like to apologize. Despite this, however, the members of the Executive Committee found the meeting useful in that it allowed us to explore your ideas for the future of the California State University.

When the Executive Committee reported the results of the meeting to the full Senate body, a number of salient areas of faculty concern emerged. These either involved cases in which uncertainty existed about your position on an issue, or topics on which further information was desired. They are:

Your view on the future of the tenure system in the CSU;

Your view on the future role of both part-time and full-time faculty in the CSU; for example, does your call for an expanded role for part-time faculty mean you feel the CSU should decrease its use of full-time faculty?

The nature of your concern over faculty release time for "service" as it relates to faculty productivity. What precisely do you mean by the term "service" in this context? Does it include, for example, faculty involvement in campus governance?

What you see to be the future role of faculty in the learning process, given the way educational technology seems to be moving the university away from the traditional classroom format.

These topics are important because they address the future role of the faculty in the CSU. We realize, however, that they do not lend themselves easily to quick responses, but are probably best addressed through dialogue and discussion. We would nonetheless greatly appreciate it if

Dr. Charles Reed, Chancellor
July 28, 1998
Page 2

you could take the opportunity to respond to them in a format that is convenient for you. An appropriate time might be as part of an address to the faculty during your visit to our campus in the fall. Your comments on these matters would most likely be of interest to CSU faculty systemwide, not just to those of us in Sacramento.

Again, on behalf on the CSUS Faculty Senate, I would like to thank you for taking time to visit the Sacramento campus this past spring. We look forward to your upcoming visit in the fall.

Sincerely,

Thomas Krabacher
Chair, Faculty Senate

TK:jl

cc: Members, CSUS Faculty Senate Executive Committee

Donald R. Gerth, President, CSUS

Jolene Koester, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, CSUS

Distributed
4/30/98 FSMtg

To: Faculty and Student Colleagues
From: Linda Palmer, English Department Faculty
Date: April 30, 1998



This week, as a member of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, I met with our new CSU Chancellor, Charles Reed. President Gerth and Provost Koester also attended. One department chair who called to see when he could meet with Chancellor Reed was told that the Chancellor did not have time to talk to faculty, so this meeting was, I assume, unique in its meeting of faculty and Chancellor. I found the meeting *chilling* and want to share with you the gist of the meeting, both so you will know what, according to Chancellor Reed, is the future of the university and so that you will, if you see fit, respond to it in any committees or other forums you might attend on campus. [This is of course my own reading of the meeting. I have used quotation marks only in those places where I am close to certain the wording is his; otherwise I've left the wording out of quotes to let you know I am paraphrasing. I did write down what he said, and of course tried for accuracy, but the meeting was not taped.]

Members of the Executive Committee asked Chancellor Reed several direct and pointed questions, many of which were based on interviews you have probably seen in various publications including the *Hornet*. His response was a consistent confirmation of all of the comments attributed to him in the interviews regarding the future of the university; as he said, "I am not bashful about this." Following are some of the questions raised by Senate Executive Committee members and his responses to those questions.

- The first question was about the role of distance learning & Internet courses. The senator posed some of her concerns about Internet classes and asked him to comment. His response was that yes, of course, poorly planned distance education could be problematic and that distance learning was not for everyone or every situation but that he thought well planned distance classes and Internet courses would be "a more efficient way of teaching." He noted that he thought Internet courses could draw students and faculty closer rather than put a distance between them, as the senator had suggested. In response to her direct question about increased workload/class size with Internet courses, Chancellor Reed did not give a direct answer but instead repeated his "more efficient" comment, and in response to her question about whether or not he saw a scenario in which faculty would teach on the TV or Internet and much of the work (chat rooms, paper comments) would be done by Teaching Associates, he said "yes," he did see that as possible.
- The next question was about the model he created in Florida to eliminate tenure. Yes, he said, he was in favor of such a model, and he indicated he planned to move ahead with it in the CSU. In this model faculty are offered 5 year contracts rather than tenure, a move he thought would lead to more accountability and top quality faculty. He did connect the 5 year contract to higher pay, noting that he is pledged to close the pay gap for CSU faculty and that faculty on 5-year-contract could get as much as 10% more pay than tenured faculty.
- Chancellor Reed was asked about his comments in interviews that he wanted faculty to "work more." In response, he reiterated that "Yes, I do believe that everyone can do more." He said that in fact he believed CSU now has "a very attractive class size." (The implication was that the class size was attractive to faculty. He noted that what he sees are overall figures of class sizes, whereas we might be thinking specifically of particular classes we have had; again he repeated that looking at overall class size figures suggested that ours were "very attractive.") Putting four or five more students in each of those classrooms, he said, seems like it might be "a good idea." He also said that when he arrived in California and heard that many faculty received "release time for service" his response was "Hey, what's this about?" When one senator challenged him on workload (noting her own 60-75 hour week as a junior faculty member) he did not waver in his belief that we can work more nor did he seem to waver when a senator pointed out to him both the importance of service and the considerable time devoted to it.

QUOTES FROM RECENT INTERVIEWS OF CHANCELLOR CHARLES REED

[Note: these interviews appeared in *The San Jose Mercury News*, 3/3/98 and *The State Hornet*, 3/17/98]

• **On dealing with expectations for an increase in numbers of students:** “We’ll do it by expanding the current capacity of the 23 institutions, to have more productivity and larger class sizes. We’ll have a different way of faculty and staff providing service. The day is going to have to get longer. Everyone is going to have to do more on Friday, Saturday, and Sunday. Technology can play a role. (SJM)

• **On moving students through the system more quickly and efficiently:** “We’re looking at outcome measures. You can study on your own, go out, come back and say, ‘I’m ready to take an exam in calculus,’ or ‘I’ve done service I’m ready to be a nurse, I’ve worked in a hospital.’ Students will be getting credit for service.” (SJM) “[We must provide students] the ability to say ‘I’m ready to take the test. I don’t need the course.’ (SH)

• **On Workload:** “Everybody can do more.” (SJM) “Everyone is going to have to do more on Friday, Saturday, and Sunday.” (SJM) “Students are our customers. When do our customers want to come to school? It’s up to us to meet our customers’ needs.” (SH)

• **On technology:** “Teaching is going to shift, and professors are going to become more like coaches, directors of learning. They’re going to be pointing students in directions to get access to digital information, digital libraries.” (SH)

• **On a Tenure-Free Policy:** There are different reward structures than tenure right now: three and five-year contracts. Those who want to do that, we paid them [in Florida] a little more....If there’s less tenure, and it works, and people get paid more and students learn more faster, that’s what we’re supposed to do....Yes [I would favor trying a similar pilot in California]. (SJM) “Three to five year contracts seem pretty long to me....The reality is that there are no long term jobs unless you’re a federal judge.” (SH)

• **On increased use of part time faculty:** “Sometimes you don’t need to offer courses except every year or two and part-time help to fill that rather than full-time.” (SH)

• **On Merit Pay:** “Those people who are faculty members who are working the hardest and being the most productive need to be rewarded and paid more. And I think if you have a meritorious reward system, you’ll see people working harder.” (SJM)

(Compiled by Linda Palmer, English)

10/22/98

Re: FS98-61

To: Chancellor Reed

From: CSU Sacramento Faculty Senate

On the occasion of your Nov. 3, 1998 visit to our campus

As elected representatives of the faculty, we wish to express in this public forum, our anger and disappointment about the lack of dialogue between you and the faculty; most specifically, we are deeply disappointed in your failure today to establish a format for the kind of dialogue you referred to in your letter of August 5, 1998. In that letter you were responding to a July 28 letter to you from Senate Chair, Tom Krabacher -- a letter written by him on behalf of the CSUS Faculty Senate. The Senate requested that the Chair write to you, after hearing a report of your meeting with the Senate Executive Committee in the Spring Semester of 1998. We quote your reply to Chair Krabacher:

Thank you for your recent letter regarding several issues that surfaced during my session with your Faculty Senate Executive Committee. I agree that these issues are important as we shape the future of the California State University.

I also concur that these topics can be addressed most productively through dialogue and discussion. Therefore, I will come to my visit to CSU Sacramento scheduled for Nov. 3, 1998, prepared to provide more detail and insight into my views on these subjects.

I look forward to seeing you again and exploring how we can work together to strengthen the CSU.

After this assurance from you, the Senate strongly objects to the Convocation format of today that has taken the whole of your time on our campus with our faculty. Such a format in no way provides for the kind of "dialogue and discussion" referenced in your August 5 letter. When the Senate asked to meet with you during your visit here, Provost Jolene Koester responded that you "had no time to meet with the Faculty Senate nor with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee."

The Faculty at CSU Sacramento, and from what we have heard, throughout the CSU system, have grave concerns over the direction you appear to have set forth in several public forums for *our* system. We have many questions to ask of you and many issues to raise. Specifically, as you know from the Executive Committee's meeting with you last Spring, we are concerned about the pedagogical implications of Distance Learning, about faculty workload, and about year-round scheduling. We are concerned about the future of tenure-track hires, about the declining ratio of full-time to part-time faculty, about the rumors of three-year and five-year contracts for future hires, and about year-round scheduling. We have serious *pedagogical*, not *self-serving* concerns, about all of these issues and as professionals in the field we have been

ignored and discounted as these ideas for the future of the system are bandied about, as funding priorities are set, and as programs begin full force; hundreds of new administrative posts are created to support programs we have had no voice in planning, programs that have serious implications for the future of this system.

We are also concerned about our own academic careers; there are serious problems with merit-pay-- with the concept itself, with fair implementation, and with the implications of this implementation for the logical and orderly, established ARTP procedures in the institution. We are concerned about the 10 to 12% lag behind comparable institutions in faculty salaries. We now add to these concerns expressed last Spring, the more recent public statements you have made about faculty as "workhorses" and your refusal to support a fair faculty contract, even as legislators argue over State surplus funds and how to spend them. We are appalled and insulted as we watch you create more and more highly-paid administrative positions and award 30% raises to system presidents, at the same time that you offer a mean-spirited and insulting 2.5% pay raise to your faculty, the backbone of this institution that you claim you want to lead into the future.

But more important than any of this, we are concerned that you seem to display an attitude of contempt and dismissal toward the faculty you were hired to lead; we are concerned that you operate with the kind of top-down administrative fiat that even most corporations have abandoned, in the last few years, as unworkable and unprofitable.

Now this visit to the campus, with its dismissal of requests that the faculty be allowed an open forum for discussion and dialogue is particularly disappointing in light of your promise of such dialogue in your letter of August 25. We ask you, in the name of a sound and healthy educational institution, to consider long and hard whether the adversarial relations that are hardening between you and the faculty you must guide and lead are in anyone's best interests.



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

October 20, 1998

Faculty Senate,

At an October 16th department meeting, the English Department discussed the upcoming visit of Chancellor Reed to CSUS. Faculty voiced deep concern about the direction in which Chancellor Reed is taking the CSU and the disrespect with which he has treated faculty, or "workhorses," in his own words. Equally disturbing is Chancellor Reed's refusal to engage in open discussion about issues raised by his comments in interviews, at his April meeting with the CSUS Senate Executive Committee, and in recent talks on CSU campuses. In April, the Senate requested amplification of several comments Chancellor Reed had made in his April visit. In an August letter to Senate Chair Krabacher, Chancellor Reed agreed that these issues were best explained through "dialogue and discussion." Yet his November 3rd visit to the campus will involve no dialogue or discussion but rather a formal Convocation address with little time for questions and answers. Requests for meetings with faculty, with the Senate, with students, have been rejected. He will, we understand, have lunch with President Gerth and other top administrators, deliver his speech, and depart immediately. This schedule once again ignores the requests of the faculty for open discussion and once again shows a lack of respect for faculty.

English Department faculty are deeply concerned by reports of Chancellor's Reed's tone and message in recent visits to other CSU campuses, including San Luis Obispo and Los Angeles. We understand that faculty there responded with picketing and vocal objection to Reed's message. We prefer dialogue to hissing and booing from the audience. The absence of such open dialogue can only further the perception that Chancellor Reed is unconcerned about faculty concerns, can only increase cynicism.

We therefore urge the Senate to request of Chancellor Reed full response to the questions his interviews and talks have raised:

- CFA bargaining issues
- Merit Pay
- Tenure and 3-5 year contracts
- Faculty workload
- Class size
- The role of technology in educating more students
- Increased use of part time rather than tenured faculty
- Attempts to move students through the system more quickly and "efficiently"
- Reduction of seat-time for students

We further request the Senate to ask that Chancellor Reed meet with the full Senate for an open discussion to supplement what appears to be a formal talk with little time for discussion or questions.

We look to the Senate for leadership.

SIGNATURE SHEET

for letter from English Department
to the Faculty Senate
October 20, 1998

Linda Palmer
Mary Lou Chandler
Judith
Charles Greys
David Thacker
Bill Moriarty
Alvin Schmitz
Gloria Plalynn
Robert O. O'Rourke
Elliot M. O'Rourke, Jr.
Sara Hicks
V. A. Houlberg
Suzanne Becker
Kathy Kelly

Lynne Klyse
Mel J. Szegrow
Doris W. S. S.
Judy Brodeur
Maureen Edgmont
Sheryl Meyer
Lucian L. Agosta
David Beese
Robert Miles
Marie E. Steet
Maureen
Fred Marshall
Julie W. Jan
Stephanie Catalano
Joan L. Bauerly

Dear Chancellor Reed,

As a faculty member at the CSU for over thirty years, I have watched with alternating dismay and amusement as you assumed your post as our new Chancellor and began negotiations for a new contract and avoided coming to an agreement with the faculty union, of which I am a member. We are now several months into impasse, three months since the nominal beginning of the fiscal year, and many years since the recession of the early 1990s which has so damaged faculty morale and income. I am sorry to say that, despite the two letters I received from you in the last few months, you don't seem much interested in improving faculty morale and very little interested in raising their income.

As I'm sure you are aware our income lags behind that of faculty at comparable institutions by about 10%, and has for a number of years despite the generally empty promises of our former Chancellor, Barry Munitz. You seem to think that if you give all of us a 2.5% raise and some of us an additional 2.5% you will have made grade strides toward bridging this gap, even though undoubtedly many of those comparison institutions will also be raising the salaries of their faculties by comparable and even greater amounts, so that in the end our faculty will be no further ahead (no closer to a reasonable salary on a national level, despite the fact that the CSU is one of the major institutions of higher education in the country, and employs doctorates educated at many of the more prominent graduate schools, such as the UC and others). It is hard, I would think, both ethically and intellectually to plead that you can not close that gap because of penury—especially in a year when both the nation and the state are profiting from a boom economy, and when there is so much money around that legislators battle over how to spend it and how much to give back. I would think it is hard to offer the faculty a 2.5% across-the-board raise in a period when their presidents have received a 10% raise one year and a similar one the year before. That doesn't sound to me like good leadership or good economics. I suspect the money is there in the CSU budget and in the hearts of Californians to give faculty a decent increase. Over the past 8 years the faculty have been asked to suffer through several years with no raises or increases, several years of 1% raises, several years of demands to teach more students for the same pay, and years of bland and evasive promises about workload and salary from leaders at all levels.

So economically, the faculty seem to me depressed—especially given that many of my colleagues, unlike me, only received their current relatively secure positions in their 40s, after years of work and expense in graduate school. The morale in our department is so poor that about ¼ of our department, many several years before their time, retired last spring—the greatest wholesale departure I can remember in my 30 years: my reading is that they now view the university as an unwelcome place, where they will encounter more harassment and far less respect or support than in the past.

* Faculty morale is also depressed, as, given the remarks you made to many newspapers throughout the state, you seem to have little regard for faculty as mentors or educators, but instead appear to envision them as little more than gate-keepers in the Drive-through U—some version of Phoenix University transplanted to a state institution—of the future. You want them to work harder, even though with a 4-course load they are among the hardest worked faculty of higher education in the nation. You want them to work for less pay (as compared with their colleagues). And you want them to teach courses over the Internet or via long-distance even though there is no reputable evidence that this is pedagogically sound and even though many of them—with direct experience of years educating students—are deeply suspicious of this.

In addition you want to take 2.5% of a very minimal raise and devote it to “merit pay,” which you have not defined or explained—and despite the fact that the recent PSSI program of supposed merit pay was highly unpopular with many faculty. Most faculty used to assume that their promotion system was one that rewarded meritorious faculty, and that a variety of other strategies in place also recognized and awarded merit. Still, despite the opposition of both the union and much of the faculty, you want to have a new merit system. From what I’ve read, I presume that you base your faith on such a system on the so-called “industrial model” used by corporations such as Microsoft or Coca-Cola, to mention only two corporations that seem very well run and for which I have some respect, though neither is a paragon of intellectual excellence, as I presume a university aspires to be. One of the dubious aspects of such an implied comparison is that students or “educated students” are not at all products like computer programs or soft drinks—their self-evaluations and their evaluations by others are far more fluid. But suppose we assumed this model for the moment: we reward the few faculty (with a pittance) that we deem meritorious for educating the few students (at most, 150/semester) they have meritoriously educated. Meanwhile, the remainder of the faculty—whether it be 40% or 60%—go on trying to educate the rest of the students, while they themselves have been deemed non meritorious and their esteem suffers and so on. This doesn’t seem to me to produce better “products” or a majority of better-educated students. It seems to produce a system for administrators to run and control, to compare to other systems, to evaluate.

The faculty, after all, are not just employees but represent the backbone of the university: the buildings educate no one, the students are gone after 4 or 5 or 6 years, but a good faculty define what the education is and establish the character of the institution. Your moves so far seem designed to devalue and demoralize the faculty. Some of my colleagues suspect it is fruitless to communicate with you or appeal to you, that you have been assigned a job to do or you have a fixed mind on these issues, that you are the point man in the corporization of the university. I suppose if I agreed totally with that position, I would not be writing this email.

You need to seriously and quickly reconsider your stance vis-a-vis the faculty and to make some moves that suggest respect and encouragement. I suspect that the first most appropriate move would be to come to terms with their union and sign a contract, rather than see whether you can destabilize them or manipulate them long enough so that they will capitulate to terms which are neither good for the faculty nor good for the university in the long run.

Professor Jonathan L. Price

Department of English

CSU Sacramento