

1998-99
FACULTY SENATE
California State University, Sacramento

AGENDA

Thursday, October 29, 1998
Foothill Suite, University Union (3rd floor, new wing)
3:00-5:00 p.m.

INFORMATION

1. Tentative Fall 1998 Faculty Senate Meeting Schedule:

November 3--

- 1) 12:00-1:15 p.m., Senate meeting with Chancellor Reed, Orchard Suite (second floor, University Union)
- 2) 1:30 p.m. Convocation, "Preparing for the 21st Century at the CSU"--Chancellor Reed, University Ballroom, University Union

November 5--3:00-4:00 p.m. Cornerstones Implementation Plan Forum #1 ALL FACULTY WILL BE INVITED TO ATTEND either this Senate meeting OR a Cornerstones Implementation Plan Forum #2, time and location TBA

(Note: You can view the draft "Cornerstones Implementation Plan" on the WEB at <http://www.csus.edu/acse/corner/spense.htm>)

November 12--

November 19--No meeting

November 26--No meeting—Happy Thanksgiving!

December 3--

December 10--

December 17--

2. 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
3. Report of the CSUS Faculty Senate's ad hoc Faculty Governance Committee (to be distributed separately) - Ted Lascher

CONSENT CALENDAR

FS 98-68/Ex. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS--University

Persons with Disabilities, University Committee for:

BRUCE OSTERTAG, EDUC, 2000

CAROL WILLIAMS, Student Service Professional, 2000

REGULAR AGENDA

Approved

FS 98-67/Flr. MINUTES

Approval of the Minutes of the meeting of October 22 (#5), 1998.

Old Business

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

deleted by maker

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

New Business

Approved

FS 98-69/APC, Ex. UNDERGRADUATE ACADEMIC ACTION CATEGORIES (Amends FS 98-06, 98-07 and 98-08)

The Faculty Senate recommends approval of amendments (shown in Attachment A-1) to the Undergraduate Academic Action Categories.

Approved

FS 98-70/APC, Ex. READMISSION COMMITTEE (SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE ACADEMIC POLICIES COMMITTEE), ESTABLISH

The Faculty Senate recommends that the University Academic Action Committee (initially created in of FS 98-08 without charge or membership) be renamed the Readmission Committee and that it be established as a subcommittee of the Faculty Senate Academic Policies Committee with the following charge and membership:

Charge: To evaluate appeals for readmission from dismissed students after a mandatory interruption in enrollment.

Membership: Nine voting members, as follows:

- one faculty member from each of the seven colleges
- an admission counselor
- an evaluator

Members shall serve three-year, staggered terms. A minimum of three faculty representatives shall be present during all committee deliberations.

FS 98-71/Ex. COMMENDATION--AD HOC COMMITTEE ON FACULTY GOVERNANCE

*Approved
11/1/98*
The Faculty Senate commends Professors Juanita Barrena, Ken DeBow, Robert Buckley, Arthur Jensen (Chair), Ted Lascher, Roger Leezer and Bonnie Raingruber for their service on the ad hoc Committee on Faculty Governance and specifically for their work in preparing the "Report of the CSUS Faculty Senate's ad hoc Committee on Faculty Governance".

First Reading

FS 98-72/Ex. CONSTITUTION OF THE FACULTY--Amendments

The Faculty Senate approves the attached amendments to the Constitution of the Faculty (Attachment B-1) for submission to the voting membership of the faculty in a referendum.

FS 98-66/Flr. DISTANCE LEARNING, PROPOSED POLICY STATEMENT ON

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.



California State University, Sacramento

SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95819-6019

Academic Policies Committee
<http://gaia.ecs.csus.edu/~bayardj/apc/index.html>

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

VOICE: 916-278-5847
FAX : 916-278-5949
email: bayardj@ecs.csus.edu
<http://gaia.ecs.csus.edu/~bayardj/index.html>

OCT 13 1998

Faculty 413 Senate Received

DATE : October 13, 1998
TO : Thomas Krabacher, Chair Faculty Senate
FROM : Jean-Pierre R. Bayard, Academic Policies Committee Chair
SUBJECT: Undergraduate Academic Action Categories

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "JP Bayard", written over the "FROM" line of the memo.

By way of this memo, the Academic Policies Committee requests that the Faculty Senate adopt the following recommendations:

1. Undergraduate Academic Action Categories Proposal

In the spring 1998 semester, the Faculty Senate adopted a new proposal defining the Undergraduate Academic Categories. The present proposal is identical to that approved in the spring except for the following:

- a. The present proposal uses grade point deficiency and defined class levels as another criterion for continued academic probation. The sole purpose for this change is to be in compliance with Executive Order 393 and Title V.
- b. The "University Academic Action Committee" proposed in the spring has been renamed the "Readmission Committee", a title more fitting to its charge (see below).

2. Establishment of a Readmission Committee

This recommendation is in response to President Gerth's letter of May 28, 1998 (to Senate Chair Krabacher), requesting that the scope and membership of the Readmission Committee (formerly the University Academic Action Committee) be defined. The Academic Policies Committee recommends that a Readmission Committee be established as a subcommittee of the Academic Policies Committee. Its charge is to evaluate appeals for readmission from dismissed students after a mandatory interruption in enrollment.

Membership:

- a. One faculty member from each of the seven Colleges
- b. An admission Counselor
- c. An evaluator

All members are voting members. During the first three years of operation, APC suggests that the membership be staggered to insure continuity. The Committee also recommends that a minimum of 3 faculty representatives be present during all committee deliberations.

The new proposal defining the Undergraduate Academic Action Categories is enclosed with the changes clearly marked.

Undergraduate Academic Action Categories

Good Standing

Continuing CSUS students with no overall or CSUS grade point deficiency and new CSUS students with no transfer grade point deficiency are in good academic standing. Students who are in good standing at the end of the semester will be eligible to enroll in the subsequent semester.

Academic Probation

Students whose semester GPA, or CSUS GPA or overall GPA falls below 2.0 will be placed on probation.

Continued Academic Probation

Probationary students whose CSUS GPA and overall GPA are **above** 2.0 but who again fail to earn a semester GPA of 2.0.

Probationary students who have earned a 2.0 in the current semester but whose CSUS and overall GPA remain below a 2.0.

Probationary students who have earned a semester grade point average that maintains the grade point deficiency within class level limits. Class level limits are defined as follows:

<u>CLASS LEVEL</u>	<u>LIMIT</u>
<u>Freshmen/Sophomores</u> students with fewer than 56 semester units completed	<u>Maximum of 15 grade points below 2.0</u>
<u>Juniors</u> Students with 57-89 units completed	<u>Maximum of 9 grade points below 2.0</u>
<u>Seniors</u> Students with 90 or more units completed	<u>Maximum of 6 grade points below 2.0</u>

Academic Disqualification

Probationary students whose CSUS GPA or overall GPA are **below** 2.0, and who fail to earn a 2.0 semester GPA in the subsequent semester are academically disqualified.

Probationary students with grade point deficiency in excess of defined class level limits who fail to earn a 2.0 semester GPA are academically disqualified.

Reinstatement of Academically Disqualified Students

Undergraduate Academic Action Categories

Page 2

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

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

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

University reinstatement into a different major when recommended by another department or as an undeclared student.

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

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

Spring semester

Third week of January

Fall semester

End of the first week in July for CASPER registration

Third week of August for late registration

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

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

Academic Dismissal

Disqualified students who fail to earn a semester GPA of 2.0 or meet other requirements specified in the reinstatement contract will be academically dismissed. "Academic Dismissal" means that enrollment privilege has been withdrawn, and that based on the student's achievement it does not appear that he or she is able to profit from further educational opportunity at this time. Academically dismissed students are not eligible for readmission without at least one semester out of enrollment. Dismissed students are not eligible to use the immediate reinstatement process.

Administrative Probation and Administrative Dismissal

Undergraduate students are subject to Administrative Probation for the following reasons:

1. Withdrawal from all or a substantial portion of their courses in two successive terms or in any three terms.
2. Repeated failure to progress toward a degree or other program objective, when such failure is due to circumstances within the control of the student.
3. Failure to comply, after due notice, with an academic requirement or regulation.

Students who do not meet the conditions for removal of administrative probation may be subject to further administrative actions including administrative dismissal.

Readmission of Academically or Administratively Dismissed Students

Students who are dismissed shall not be considered for readmission to the University for at least one semester following dismissal. Academically dismissed students should meet with an academic advisor for advice on developing a plan for remedying the conditions which led to dismissal so that return to the University is possible. Former CSUS students dismissed but seeking readmission after an interruption in enrollment must submit an Appeal for Readmission following dismissal including a recommendation from the student's major department to the University ~~Academic Action~~ Readmission Committee. Students whose appeals for readmission are approved are subject to review each semester until they improve their overall and CSUS GPA's to minimum standards. Readmitted students who fail to meet conditions specified for readmission will be academically dismissed.

Notification

Students will be notified of their academic status (Academic Probation, Continued Academic Probation, Academic Disqualification and Subject to Academic Dismissal) on C@sper.NET and by letter at the end of each semester.

~~11/21/97~~10/2/98—Approval recommended by the Academic Policies Committee.

**UNDERGRADUATE ACADEMIC ACTION CATEGORIES
 CURRENT POLICY/PROPOSED REVISION**

CURRENT POLICY	PROPOSED POLICY	RATIONALE
<p>Good Standing</p> <p>Probation: if cumulative grade point average in all college work attempted or cumulative grade point average at CSUS falls below 2.0</p>	<p>no change</p> <p>Probation: if cumulative CSUS, overall, <u>or semester</u> GPA falls below 2.0</p>	<p>Catches students earlier who are in academic difficulty; students currently remain on probation for several semesters, even when semester GPA is less than a 2.0 (note: University policy requires that students on probation meet with an academic advisor)</p>
<p>Continued Academic Probation: <u>only applies to probationary students with continuing grade point deficiency within class level limits</u> uses a sliding scale based on class level</p>	<p>Continued Academic Probation: <u>also uses the class level limits</u>; eliminates sliding scale; Prob. students with overall and CSUS GPA above 2.0 who again fail to earn a semester GPA of 2.0; or probationary students with CSUS or overall GPA below 2.0 who are successful in earning a semester GPA of 2.0</p>	<p>simplifies and clarifies policy.</p>

Undergraduate Academic Action Categories
Page 5

<p>Academic Disqualification: no clear current definition. No distinction is currently made between disqualification (which requires reinstatement) and dismissal (which requires readmission). Currently the term subject to Dismissal may be in use to indicate academic disqualification.</p>	<p>Academic Disqualification: Probationary students with CSUS or overall GPA below 2.0 who fail to earn a semester GPA of 2.0 in a subsequent semester. This replaces current use of Subject to Dismissal, which is redefined in the proposed policy.</p>	<p>Current policy is unclear. Creates well defined categories of academic action increasing in severity.</p>
<p>Reinstatement: reinstated students are allowed to continue one semester at a time (forever) with achievement reviewed at each semester end to determine if continued enrollment is appropriate.</p>	<p>Reinstatement: specifies that a contract is required and that failure to meet the conditions of the reinstatement contract, or failure to achieve a semester GPA of 2.0 in the contracted semester will result in academic dismissal (this is different from and more serious than academic disqualification, and cannot be followed by immediate reinstatement).</p>	<p>Current policy is unclear, internally inconsistent, and contradictory. The proposed policy creates well defined categories of academic action increasing in severity and consequence. Under current policy, the same process (immediate reinstatement) is used no matter what the circumstance or number of semesters the student has failed to make progress), even though the policy states AOnly in rare circumstances will students thus disqualified be allowed to continue without two or more semesters out of enrollment</p>

<p>Academic Dismissal: defined in terms of grade points below 2.0 below class level limits. Enrollment privileges are supposed to be withdrawn and only in rare circumstances are students supposed to be readmitted without two or more semesters out of enrollment. However, current policy also states the University allows a dismissed student to appeal by petition for immediate reinstatement. The terms Academic Disqualification and Academic Dismissal are used interchangeably.</p>	<p>Academic Dismissal: reinstated students who fail to earn a semester GPA of 2.0 or meet other requirements specified in the reinstatement contract. Academic Dismissal means that enrollment privileges shall be withdrawn and students thus dismissed shall not be eligible for readmission without at least one semester out of enrollment. Dismissed students are not eligible to use the immediate reinstatement process. However, after one semester out of enrollment, dismissed students may submit an appeal for readmission following disqualification to the University Academic Action<u>Readmission</u> Committee. Appeals require a departmental recommendation on whether the student should be readmitted.</p>	<p>Necessary to clarify the distinction between Disqualification and Dismissal. Current policies relating to rare circumstances and two semesters out of enrollment are not enforced. The number of semesters out of enrollment is reduced to one semester (to avoid loss of catalog rights should the students be readmitted). The establishment of a University Committee ensures a uniform standard in determining whether or not circumstances leading to dismissal were extenuating, and whether the student should be readmitted.</p>
<p>Administrative-Academic Probation and Disqualification</p>	<p>Administrative Probation and Administrative Dismissal.</p>	<p>The name is changed to avoid confusion with other categories of Academic Action.</p>
<p>Readmission: Former CSUS students who were dismissed (even though there is no category called dismissal), but seeking (re) admission after an interruption in</p>	<p>Readmission: Students who are dismissed shall not be considered for readmission to the University for at least one semester following dismissal. Former CSUS students</p>	<p>Current policy is either undiscoverable or incomprehensible. Proposed Policy creates a University Academic</p>

Undergraduate Academic Action Categories

Page 7

<p>enrollment (which was supposed to be required, but has never been enforced) will also be referred to their major department for a recommendation for reinstatement.</p>	<p>dismissed, but seeking readmission after an interruption in enrollment must submit an Appeal for Readmission following Dismissal including a recommendation for the students major Department to the University Academic ActionReadmission Committee.</p>	<p>ActionReadmission Committee to ensure application of uniform standards for readmission.</p>
<p>Notification:</p>	<p>Notification:</p>	<p>Editorial changes to reflect new categories.</p>
<p>Special Reinstatement Procedures. Covers reinstatements for the Schools of Business and ECS</p>	<p>Special Reinstatement Procedures: May still be included, but language must be changed to reflect revisions to the policy. Schools may only deal with Disqualifications and reinstatements (not Dismissals and Readmissions)</p>	<p>Current languages also mixes up the terms. In the proposed policy clear distinctions are made among categories. Different processes are used for reinstatement and readmission. Readmissions are to be handled by a University Committee.</p>

11/21/97-10/2/98—Approval recommended by the Academic Policies Committee



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO

SCHOOL OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION
DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT

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

October 16, 1998

OCT 19 1998

To: Thomas Krabacher, Chair, Faculty Senate
From: ad hoc Faculty Governance Committee

Faculty
413

Senate Received

RE: Changes to the Constitution of the Faculty at California State University, Sacramento

Pursuant to the charge placed on the ad hoc Faculty Governance Committee in FS 98-12, the committee is, here in, forwarding a recommendation for changes to the Constitution of the Faculty at California State University, Sacramento. These recommendations are the result of deliberations based on examination of the current governing documents, consideration of similar documents at other campuses, a survey of the faculty at California State University, Sacramento, a survey of present and immediate past Faculty Senators, as well as numerous hours of discussion.

The recommended changes can be grouped in five categories:

1. in response to changes requested by the Counseling Faculty (SSP-ARs), who were recently moved into Unit 3; changes are recommended to Article I, Section 2 (Membership) and Article II, Section 5 (Membership) B, 1. This change was requested by the Counseling Faculty in a memo dated October 8, 1998 (copy attached).
2. To improve the communications and reporting procedures of the Faculty Senate, the ad hoc Faculty Governance Committee is proposing that the chairs of certain specified standing committees be elected by and from the Faculty Senate. This change would appear in Article II, Section 3 (Duties) B. and in Article II, Section 5 (Membership) A. This proposed change would be addressed in detail in the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate.
3. To clarify the responsibility of the Faculty Senate, as addressed in the Constitution, several statements that specify "policy" are expanded to "policy and procedures." These changes appear in Article II, Section 4 (Responsibilities) preamble; Article II, Section 4 (Responsibilities) A; B; and C.
4. Redefine representation of the Emeritus Association to allow either the Association President or a designee to be an ex officio, non-voting member of the Faculty Senate. This change is proposed as a courtesy to the Emeritus Association to encourage that group's active participation in Faculty Senate activities.
5. Include the President of the University and the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs as ex officio, non-voting members of the Faculty Senate. This change reflects the results of the faculty survey that was conducted by the ad hoc Faculty Governance Committee in May, 1998.

The ad hoc Faculty Governance Committee is forwarding these recommendations for changes to the Constitution of the Faculty at California State University, Sacramento at this time because any changes to the Constitution must be ratified by the faculty. The committee's charge called for such referendum to be held before the end of the Fall semester, 1998. It is the committee's intention to provide ample time for the recommendations to be reviewed by the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate and debated in the Faculty Senate preliminary to being sent to referendum in fulfillment of the charge.

The ad hoc Faculty Governance Committee is still working on changes to the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate and the "Standing Rules" of the Faculty Senate. The recommendations for changes to these two documents as well as other proposals that have been developed by the committee will be forthcoming.

6000 J Street, Sacramento, California 95819-6088 • (916) 278-5437 FAX

OCT 08 1998

MEMORANDUM

Faculty
413

Senate Received

October 8, 1998

TO: Art Jensen
Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Governance

FROM: Jeff Clark *JRC*
Counseling Faculty Member

SUBJECT: Proposed Constitutional Changes

I met yesterday with Senate Chair Tom Krabacher to discuss changes in the CSUS Faculty Constitution made necessary by the move of Counseling Faculty (SSP-ARs) into Unit 3. Specifically, it is appropriate for the Counseling Faculty as a unit to have full inclusion and representation in the Senate. A similar change to the University ARTP Policy was also necessary and has been accomplished (please see attached memorandum).

Given the recent change from Academic Senate to Faculty Senate with the resulting constitutional changes required, now seems a propitious time to undertake these changes as well. Following are recommendations for specific modification. As a point of reference, I have also attached portions of the current Constitution of the Faculty.

ARTICLE I

Section 2. MEMBERSHIP.

The Faculty of California State University, Sacramento is composed of . . . temporary, probationary, and tenured Library faculty, faculty on the Faculty Early Retirement Program, *temporary, probationary, and tenured Counseling faculty (SSP-AR)*; Student Service Professionals (~~SSP-AR~~, SSPI, SSPII, SSPIII, SSPIV, and Evaluators); . . .

ARTICLE I

Section 6. QUALIFICATIONS TO VOTE.

To be qualified to vote in the elections of this organization . . . **[NO CHANGE NECESSARY]**

CONSTITUTION OF THE FACULTY OF CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO

PREAMBLE

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; to facilitate coordination and cooperation among the several parts of the University; and to provide to members of the faculty a means to express themselves about matters of academic concern.

ARTICLE I

ORGANIZATION

Section 1. **NAME.**

The name of this organization shall be the Faculty of the California State University, Sacramento.

Section 2. **MEMBERSHIP.**

The Faculty of California State University, Sacramento is composed of the temporary, probationary and tenured ~~Instructional faculty; temporary faculty; temporary, probationary, and tenured~~ Library faculty; Counseling faculty; faculty on the Faculty Early Retirement Program; Student Service Professionals (~~SSP-AR~~, SSPI, SSPII, SSPIII, SSPIV, and Evaluators); administrators holding appointments in academic departments or the Library; and the President.

Section 3. **POWERS.**

A. **The Original Power**

The membership of this organization remains at all times in possession of the original authority and power of this organization. By constitutional provision, the faculty may establish its agents, to be known as sub-units, and may delegate power to them. The membership reserves to itself the entire power to alter or abolish at will, in any or all respects, the design of its agents or the terms of the delegation of power to them. The membership may delegate duties to committees or individuals; and further it may describe the composition of such committees and delegate the power to appoint the members of them.

B. Limitations on the Original Power

1. By self-limiting ordinance, the faculty binds itself not to abridge the academic freedom of any member or group of members by its own action or that of its sub-units.
2. By self-limiting ordinance, the faculty binds itself to take for its own the action of any of its duly authorized sub-units unless the action is referred to it to be ratified or revised in the exercise of its original power as provided in Section 4.

Section 4. INITIATIVE AND REFERENDUM.

A. Initiative.

Ten (10) percent of the membership of this organization qualified to vote in the campuswide elections of this organization may initiate policy and propose resolutions in the following way:

- 1) Proponents shall file with the Chair of the Faculty Senate an exact copy of the statement of policy or resolution to be submitted to the voting membership of this organization together with notice of intent to seek the signatures to cause an election.
- 2) The proponents shall have fifteen (15) instructional days from the filing of an exact text and the required notice in which to collect the signatures of ten (10) percent of the eligible faculty to cause the proposal to be put to a vote. Petitions prepared for signature under this section shall contain the exact text of the proposed policy or resolution.
- 3) Within ten (10) days of receiving the required number of signatures, the Chair of the Faculty Senate shall notify in writing each of the eligible voting members of this organization, at his/her campus mailing address, that an election shall be held to determine whether the proposed policy or resolution shall be adopted. The notice of election shall contain the exact text of the proposed policy or resolution and the period of election as defined by the date on which voting may begin and the last date on which voting may take place.
- 4) Ten (10) instructional days after mailing the notice of election, the Chair of the Faculty Senate shall cause the election to be held. At least ten (10) instructional days shall elapse between the beginning and end of the period of election.
- 5) Adoption of a proposed policy or resolution under this section shall be by a majority of the votes cast.

B. Referendum.

Any action or proposed action of any sub-unit of the faculty shall be referred to the faculty electorate for final disposition whenever thirty (30) percent or more of the members of that sub-unit agree to the motion to refer. Once agreed to, the motion to refer shall be executed by a submission to the faculty of the act referred within fifteen (15) instructional days following publication or adoption of the act referred. Until the results of the referendum have been certified, the action or proposed action giving rise to the referendum shall have no force or effect.

A majority of the votes cast shall be necessary to ratify the act referred and thereby to give to it whatever force and effect it would have had by being adopted by the referring sub-unit.

Section 5. **MEETINGS.**

General meetings of the faculty shall be called by the Chair of the Faculty Senate at the request of the President of the University, at the request of forty (40) percent of the members of the Faculty Senate, or upon submission to the Chair of the Faculty Senate of a written petition signed by ten (10) percent of the faculty eligible to vote in the elections of this organization. A general meeting of the faculty shall be convened by the Chair of the Faculty Senate within ten (10) instructional days of receiving such a request or petition. Such meetings shall be for the sole purpose of giving information and conducting a discussion. No action shall be taken or policy adopted by vote or otherwise at such meetings.

Section 6. **QUALIFICATIONS TO VOTE.**

To be qualified to vote in the elections of this organization, a person must be a member of this organization as defined in Article I, Section 2 of this Constitution. In addition to this qualification, a person must (1) be employed by the University full-time or full-time on reduced load, or be participating in the Pre-reduction in Time Base Program or Faculty Early Retirement Program, and (2) be a member of an electing unit as defined in Article II, Section 5 of this Constitution or otherwise qualified to vote in an election called to select the representatives of the faculty. All Student Service Professionals included in the membership of the faculty (Article I, Section 2) shall be eligible to vote in elections held to choose representatives of their electing unit. Only Student Service Professionals classified as Academic Related (AR) shall be eligible to vote in elections of this organization other than those held to choose representatives of electing units. Members of the faculty holding an administrative appointment shall be ineligible to vote in elections of or to hold office ex officio or otherwise in this organization, its sub-units or its committees.

ARTICLE II FACULTY SENATE

Section 1. **GENERAL.**

The Faculty Senate shall be the principal sub-unit of the faculty, the body of representatives through which the membership of this organization shall normally exercise its powers. It shall consist of representatives of the membership, students, and staff, as provided.

Section 2. **POWERS.**

A. The Faculty Senate shall have power to formulate, review, revise, adopt and recommend policy and procedures to the President of the California State University, Sacramento. Its power

shall extend to any academic matter delegated to the President by law and by the Trustees and Chancellor of The California State University. The extent of this power shall include but not be limited to academic, personnel, and fiscal policies. All policies adopted by the President that have not been initiated by the Faculty Senate or have not been the subject of formal consultation with the Faculty Senate shall be reported to the Faculty Senate for its information.

B. The power described in Section 2.A of this Article shall be exercised in a manner and to an extent consistent with the provisions of state and federal law, the regulations of the Trustees of The California State University, and the directives of the Chancellor.

C. Senate action taken to establish, modify, or repeal the policies and procedures of the University to which the power of the Senate extends shall take the form of recommendations to the President for consideration and action. Within fifteen (15) instructional days of receiving these recommendations, the President shall respond to them by announcing the decision he/she has made in light of them. If the President's decision is not entirely in keeping with the Senate's recommendation in any instance, the President shall notify the Chair of the Faculty Senate of the reasons for each departure from the Senate's recommendation. If the President has made no decision at the end of the initial period of fifteen (15) instructional days, the President shall inform the Senate of that fact and of the progress being made toward the decision. At the end of every subsequent period of fifteen (15) instructional days until the decision is made, the President shall again inform the Senate of the progress being made toward the decision. No recommendation to the President shall have the force or effect of University policy or procedure without the concurrence of the President.

D. The Faculty Senate may present to the Trustees, the Chancellor, or the Academic Senate of The California State University any recommendation which it judges to be for the benefit of The California State University or any part of it.

Section 3. **DUTIES.**

A. 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.

B. The Faculty Senate shall create such committees as it deems necessary to the performance of its duties, shall establish rules and procedures for its committees, and shall establish methods of selecting the membership of all required or requested committees. These committees shall not be construed to be sub-units of the faculty, and may not assume duties constitutionally assigned to other sub-units of the faculty. Each of these committees shall include among its members no fewer than two (2) voting members of the Faculty Senate. In addition the Faculty Senate shall elect from its membership the chairs of certain standing committees (as specified in the committee's charge).

C. The Faculty Senate shall establish reasonable methods of selecting nominees for all elective offices created by or under this Constitution, and shall conduct all such elections.

D. The incumbent Faculty Senate and its newly elected officers shall attend to matters within the scope of the Senate's power which arise during the summer and on which action cannot be delayed.

Section 4. RESPONSIBILITIES.

The following statement sets forth the academic matters explicitly reserved to the faculty or its Faculty Senate. (~~Adapted from the statement on Responsibilities of Academic Senates in a Collective Bargaining Context, adopted by the CSU Academic Senate, AS 1217-81).~~

It is the responsibility of the Faculty Senate to formulate, review, revise, adopt, and make ~~policy~~ recommendations about policy and procedures concerning 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.

A. Responsibility shall be vested in the ~~faculty or its~~ Faculty Senate for:

1. approval of degree candidates
2. development of policies governing the awarding of grades.

B. ~~Through the Faculty Senate,~~ Responsibility shall be vested in the ~~faculty or its elected~~ Faculty Senate ~~representatives~~ for developing and recommending policies and procedures making recommendations to the President on the following matters:

1. criteria and standards for the appointment, retention, awarding of tenure, promotion and evaluation of academic employees including preservation of the principle of peer evaluation and provision for the direct involvement of appropriate faculty in these decisions;
2. determination of membership in the faculty;
3. curricular policies, such as admission and degree requirements, approval of new courses and programs, discontinuance of academic programs and academic standards;
4. faculty appointments to institutional task forces, advisory committees, and auxiliary organizations;
5. academic standards and academic policies governing athletics.

C. The Faculty Senate shall be the primary source of ~~policy~~ recommendations on policy and procedures to the President on decisions related to the following matters:

1. establishment of campus-wide committees on academic or professional matters;
2. the academic role of the Library;
3. academic awards, prizes, and scholarships;
4. the academic conduct of students and means for handling infractions;
5. development of institutional missions and goals.

D. The Faculty Senate shall be consulted by the President concerning:

1. the academic calendar and policies governing the schedule of classes;
2. policies governing the appointment and review of academic administrators.

Section 5. MEMBERSHIP.

A. The membership of the Faculty Senate shall be composed of (1) the representatives of the electing units; (2) four representatives to be elected at-large by the temporary faculty from those temporary faculty who are teaching six or more units during the semester in which the election is conducted; ~~(3) chairs of certain standing committees of the Faculty Senate (when specified in the committee's charge), as ex officio, non-voting members;~~ (34) the statewide academic senators, as ex officio, non-voting members; ~~(45) the President or designee of the Emeritus Association of CSU, Sacramento, as an ex officio, non-voting member;~~ ~~(56) three student representatives, as non-voting members, chosen by, and in a manner determined by, the Associated Students of CSUS;~~ (6) the President of the University and the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, as ex officio, non-voting members.

B. Representatives of electing units shall be elected by and from those units. There shall be two (2) types of electing unit, single and combined.

1. Single electing units shall normally be academic departments or divisions having ten (10) or more probationary, tenured, and full-time temporary faculty appointments (including faculty participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program, and faculty on paid leave or reduced load, but excluding faculty holding administrative appointments). ~~In addition,~~ The Library shall be a single electing unit, ~~and a~~ A single electing unit, named the Student Services electing unit, ~~composed comprised~~ of all Student Service Professionals and Academically Related Counseling Faculty included in the membership of the faculty (Article I, Section 2) shall be established for the purpose of electing their representatives(s). Academic departments or divisions having fewer than ten (10) probationary, tenured, and full-time temporary faculty appointments (including faculty participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program, and faculty on leave or reduced load, but excluding faculty holding administrative appointments), may choose to become single electing units or may choose to form combined electing units as described below.
2. A combined electing unit shall be formed when an academic department or division with fewer than ten (10) probationary, tenured, and full-time temporary faculty appointments (including faculty participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program, and faculty on leave or reduced load, but excluding faculty holding administrative appointments) combines by mutual consent with another academic department or division to elect a representative.

C. The number of representatives to which an electing unit is entitled shall be determined annually prior to holding the annual election of representatives to the Faculty Senate. Each electing unit shall be entitled to one representative. Electing units having twenty-four (24) or more probationary, tenured, and full-time temporary faculty appointments (including faculty participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program, and faculty on leave or reduced load, but

excluding faculty holding administrative appointments) shall be entitled to one additional representative.

D. To assist in determining the number of faculty appointments in the departments, faculty members holding joint appointments shall designate one of the departments in which they serve as the electing unit in which they intend to vote. The Chair of the Faculty Senate shall ascertain the faculty member's designation prior to apportioning representatives among the electing units during the first year of the joint appointment. The faculty member may designate another of the departments in which he or she serves by informing the Chair of the Faculty Senate of his/her change of designation prior to the apportionment of representatives during subsequent years. Having designated an electing unit, a faculty member holding a joint appointment shall vote in that unit and no other.

Section 6. **TERM OF OFFICE.**

A. The term of office of a representative, whether of an electing unit or the temporary faculty, shall be two (2) years, with terms so arranged that approximately one-half (1/2) of the Senate shall be elected each year. The term of office shall begin at noon on the last day of the spring semester and end at noon on the last day of the spring semester two years hence.

B. Representatives who have served for six (6) consecutive years shall not be eligible for re-election until at least one (1) academic year has elapsed between the conclusion of the sixth consecutive year of service and the beginning of a new term.

C. When a vacancy occurs in the representation of any electing unit not caused by the expiration of a term of office, a successor shall be elected by the electing unit in a manner to be determined by the electing unit.

Section 7. **RECALL.**

The representative of an electing unit or the temporary faculty may be removed from office by a two-thirds (2/3) majority of those voting in a recall election confined to the faculty members eligible to elect the representative. A recall election shall be conducted within ten (10) instructional days following presentation to the Chair of the Faculty Senate of a recall petition signed by twenty-five (25) percent of the faculty members eligible to elect the representative. No representative shall be subject to recall more than once in any academic year.

ARTICLE III JUDICIARY

Section 1. **GENERAL.**

The Judicial Review Board shall be a sub-unit of the faculty, constituted to decide disputes relating to the interpretation of the Constitution of this organization and By-Laws of the Faculty Senate. The departments, electing units, sub-units of the faculty, or combinations thereof, acting by a majority of the members of each, may seek its decision. Faculty members may also seek its decision by a petition containing the signatures of fifteen (15) members eligible to vote in the elections of this organization.

Section 2. **POWERS.**

Rulings made by the Judicial Review Board shall be final and binding, unless (under the rules provided in Article I, Section 4.B) appealed to and reversed by the faculty.

Section 3. **MEMBERSHIP.**

- A. Membership on the board shall be open to probationary and tenured instructional faculty and library faculty.
- B. Membership on the Board shall not be open to members of other sub-units of the faculty.
- C. The Board shall be composed of nine (9) members elected at-large. The Board shall determine its own method of paneling for hearings, but no hearings shall be conducted with fewer than three (3) Board members.
- D. No more than four (4) members of the Board may be from the Library or the same school.

Section 4. **TERM OF OFFICE.**

- A. Board members shall serve for a term of three (3) years, with terms so arranged that one-third of the membership of the Board shall be elected each year.
- B. A member who has served for six (6) consecutive years shall not be eligible for re-election to the Board until at least one (1) academic year has elapsed between the conclusion of his or her sixth consecutive year of service and the beginning of his or her next term.
- C. The membership of the Board shall be chosen by annual election only. If in any instance the office of a member becomes vacant between annual elections, it shall remain vacant until the next annual election.

Section 5. **RECALL.**

A member of the Board may be removed from office by a two-thirds (2/3) majority of those voting in a recall election. A recall election shall be conducted within ten (10) instructional days following presentation to the Chair of the Faculty Senate of a recall petition signed by twenty-five (25) percent of the members of the faculty eligible to elect members of the Board. No member of the Board shall be subject to recall more than once in any academic year.

ARTICLE IV

Section 1. **ADOPTION OF THIS CONSTITUTION.**

This Constitution shall be adopted after approval by a majority of the faculty voting in a election called for this purpose, and upon approval by the President of the University.

Section 2. **AMENDMENTS TO THIS CONSTITUTION.**

Amendments to this Constitution may be proposed by two-thirds (2/3) of the voting members of the Faculty Senate present and voting to do so, or by an initiative petition signed by twenty (20) percent of the faculty eligible to vote in the elections of this organization and presented to the Chair of the Faculty Senate. Amendments shall go into effect when they have been approved by a majority of the members of this organization voting upon the amendment, and by the President of the University.

Section 3. **ADOPTION OF BYLAWS.**

Initially, the Bylaws of each sub-unit shall be adopted by an absolute majority of the Faculty Senate and submitted to the members of this organization for approval. Subsequent revisions of the Bylaws of a sub-unit shall be made by the vote of an absolute majority of the sub-unit. A minimum of three (3) instructional days shall elapse between the meeting at which Bylaws or revisions to the Bylaws are proposed and the meeting at which they are voted upon.

Adopted by the Faculty Senate on February 23, 1989.

3/17/89 - Ratified by the Faculty.

4/11/89 - Approved by the President.

5/15/97 - Amended.

7/18/97 - Approved by the President.

**Report of the CSUS Faculty Senate's
ad hoc Faculty Governance Committee**

October, 1998

The ad hoc Committee:

Art Jensen, Business Administration, Chair

Juanita Barrera, Biological Sciences

Bob Buckley, Computer Science

Ken DeBow, Government

Tom Krabacher, Geography (ex officio)

Ted Lascher, Public Policy and Administration

Roger Leezer, Mathematics

Bonnie Walker, Nursing

Table of Contents

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
I. Introduction	1
II. Diagnosing the Problem(s)	2
A. Surveys	2
B. Other Means of Problem Diagnosis	6
III. Drawing from Other Governance Models	8
IV. Key Findings	8
V. Recommendations	10
A. Duties and Responsibilities of Senators	10
B. Changes in the System of Representation	11
C. Changes to Senate Procedures	12
D. Recommendations Related to the Scope of the Senate's Governance Role	13
Appendices	
Appendix A: Faculty Senate Resolution FS 98-12	14
Appendix B: Faculty Senate Attendance	15

I. Introduction

Last spring, the CSUS Faculty Senate passed a resolution to create an ad hoc Faculty Governance Committee (FS 98-12, included in this document as Appendix A). Establishment of the Committee was prompted by a number of concerns expressed by members of the Senate. Some expressed beliefs that the Senate had been excluded from major decision making on campus, that Senate membership inadequately represented the needs of the faculty as a whole, that senators were not thoroughly committed to their duties (or did not completely understand such duties), and that structural changes to the Senate were needed. Some of these claims were controversial, as were many of the specific reform recommendations offered by senators. Accordingly, it was proposed that a smaller body be created to systematically review the way faculty governance was working at our campus and to recommend possible improvements.

Specifically, the ad hoc Faculty Governance Committee was charged with developing "proposals for Senate consideration on the following:

- (1) a statement of duties and responsibilities of senators;
- (2) whether changes should be made to the system of representation used to determine Senate membership in order to enable the Senate to function more efficiently and effectively as the representative voice of the faculty;
- (3) recommendations on procedural matters of the Senate, including meeting schedules, meeting times, conduct of meetings, and whether attendance requirements for senators should be established; and
- (4) use of university committees by the administration that results in the usurpation of the Senate role in governance[...]" (source: FS 98-12)

The ad hoc Committee was formed in April of 1998; members were selected by the Executive Committee from those senators who volunteered for the assignment. The ad hoc Committee began meeting in the spring semester and continued to meet throughout the summer and into the early fall. During this time the Committee engaged in a number of efforts to gather relevant data as described below. The Committee also examined in detail the current rules and structures that affect faculty governance on campus.

This report summarizes our recommendations and explains the rationale for them. Such recommendations include:

- o Changes to the *Faculty Constitution* that would need to be submitted to referendum and approved by the CSUS faculty as a whole (these proposals are the most time sensitive, since the resolution establishing the ad hoc Committee anticipated a fall 1998 constitutional referendum);
- o Changes to the *By-Laws of the Faculty Senate* requiring approval by 2/3 of senators; and
- o Changes to the *Senate Standing Rules* requiring approval by a simple majority of senators.

Agenda items containing language to implement these proposed changes will be forthcoming to the Senate as a whole. Our aim in this document is to provide context for such proposals.

The organization of this report is as follows. After this introduction we explain our efforts at problem diagnosis, focusing especially on the results of two surveys we conducted earlier in the year. Then we summarize what we learned from reviewing governance models used by other faculty senates. Next we present key findings that underlie our recommendations. Finally we present the recommendations themselves, organized around the four specific charges to the ad hoc Committee.

We recognize that while some of the changes we support may be readily embraced, others are likely to prompt disagreement (and some people may be disappointed by what's not in our set of proposals). Indeed, some of the recommendations were controversial within the ad hoc Committee itself, and were adopted by majority vote rather than by unanimous agreement. This document simply reflects our "best shot" at what's needed to improve faculty governance at CSUS. *We acknowledge from the outset that extensive faculty discussion of these proposals is necessary and desirable.*

II. Diagnosing the Problem(s)

A. Surveys

From the beginning of our deliberations, we recognized that there was considerable uncertainty about precisely what CSUS faculty members found problematic about current governance practices. The opinions of faculty who had not been vocal in the

governance debate were especially unclear. Were people mainly frustrated by perceived inability to influence Administration policy? To what extent were faculty upset with the way Senate meetings were run, the contributions of their colleagues, the compensation they received for campus service, or other matters?

Was the faculty divided about such questions? Did different groups of faculty members (e.g. more senior faculty versus more junior faculty; senators versus non-senators) vary significantly in their opinions? Was it possible that the faculty as a whole was more satisfied with current governance practices than it might have appeared from listening to the Senate's floor debate on governance in the spring of 1998? Answers to such questions seemed necessary in determining what changes to recommend; we wanted to make sure that "the solution fit the problem." Yet such questions could not adequately be addressed with assertions or anecdotes. More systematic evidence was needed.

Accordingly, we decided to undertake two confidential surveys. The first survey was conducted at the end of the spring 1998 semester. The universe was the entire CSUS faculty, including people holding part-time as well as full-time positions. Respondents were asked a set of closed-ended questions regarding how well informed they were of Senate actions, how they viewed current Senate practices, what responsibilities they thought the Senate should have, and what changes (if any) to the Senate rules they wanted. Respondents also were asked a set of background questions. The second survey was conducted in the summer of 1998, and addressed to people who had been elected to the Senate for academic years 1997-98 or 1998-99. Respondents to the second survey were asked a more specific set of closed-ended questions about Senate practices, as well as more detailed questions about possible reforms. As well, people were asked an open-ended question about recommendations for improving "the effectiveness and efficiency of the Senate."

A total of 371 usable responses were received from the first survey and 48 usable responses were received from the second survey (a few people responded after the data analysis had been completed). Information from the closed-ended questions was entered into a computer using a data entry program, and analyzed using a statistical software package. Responses to the second survey's open-ended question were typed verbatim into a word-processing file. Aggregate survey results were posted on the Senate's web site; results were also sent to any survey respondent who requested them. Additionally, survey results were summarized at the Senate's retreat in late August.

Because the entire set of survey results are available at the Senate's web site (<http://www.csus.edu/acse/tffg>), we will

not detail them here. Instead, below we simply present some of the most notable findings.

Findings from the First Survey (of the entire CSUS faculty)

- o Most (62%) thought the Senate "addresses important issues."
- o A plurality thought the Administration doesn't consult with Senate on important matters (37% to 16%, with the balance unsure).
- o Most thought the Senate is "too slow to act" (41% to 11%, with the balance unsure).
- o While a vast majority of respondents indicated their own senator represented their interests, those answering the questionnaire were divided about whether the Senate as a whole does so (30% agree, 26% disagree, with the balance unsure).
- o Nearly 2/3 indicated it's equally important to represent the Department and to represent University as a whole.
- o There was overwhelming support for departmental election of senators (88% support).
- o There was overwhelming support for allowing for alternate senators (85%).
- o Most (72%) thought administrators should serve on the Senate, at least as non-voting members.

Findings from the Second Survey (of recent senators)

- o Regarding the current status of the Senate:
 - There was the most agreement with the following statements: "Being a senator is personally worthwhile;" "I am familiar enough with parliamentary procedures to participate effectively;" "The Senate attracts capable people;" and "Senate service is appreciated by my department/unit."
 - There was least agreement with the following statements: "The Senate agenda reflects priority issues;" "Senators have sufficient information related to issues that come before the Senate;" and "Senate service is appreciated by the Administration."

o The following factor was listed as most important in determining whether a senator is involved in Senate dialogue: "Whether I see an issue as relevant to the University" (as opposed to importance to department/unit, degree of collegiality, prior discussions with other senators).

o The following phrases marked most frequently in describing Senate meetings:

- "Dominated by a few" (89% agreed); and
- "Poor use of time" (50% agreed).

o The following changes to Senate practices were supported (in order of strength of support, with most supported changes listed first):

- Provide regular electronic mail communications summarizing Senate activities (63% agree strongly, 24% agree somewhat);
- Establish a budget committee to advise the Administration about the University budget and priorities (46% agree strongly, 32% agree somewhat);
- Establish a mentoring program for new Senators (26% agree strongly, 43% agree somewhat);
- Establish a procedure for evaluating the University president, vice president, and academic deans (37% agree strongly, 34% agree somewhat); and
- Require chairs of all Senate standing committees to be Senators (32% agree strongly, 34% agree somewhat).

o A large majority of respondents (75%) indicated they wanted minutes available from at least one of a number of specified committees.

o 85% of respondents indicated that the Executive Committee should remain the current size.

Sample Verbatim Responses to Open-Ended Question Posed to Recent Faculty Senators (responses selected at random)

o 1) Senate Chair and Executive Committee need a vision, a broad focus or goal, a sense of priority issues rather than hitting whatever comes up. 2) Senators must be aware of that focus for

the year (GE revision, etc.) and aware of how individual meetings fit into it. 3) Meetings must be more focused and efficient, with less wasted time, more involvement of the parliamentarian to keep it moving, and less involvement of those who take on the parliamentarian and in general dominate. 4) Faculty should receive regular info. on goals, focus, upcoming action items, accomplishments of the Senate. [Also recommended elsewhere a one-time meeting for new senators rather than a mentoring program.]

- o I recommend the Senate reduce the number of meetings held each month. Additionally, I suggest the Senate not meet during the end of semester exam week.

- o 1) limit time a speaker has the floor; 2) limit number of times a speaker has floor on any motion; 3) improve communication from the Senate to academic departments through senators.

- o The executive committee should work with the Administration to prioritize an agenda. There should be a 15 minute Administration report at the beginning of every senate [meeting] with a question and answer period to follow. The executive committee should make efforts to introduce real issues for debate.

- o less time spent on redundant discourse; too few voices influence the Senate agenda; limits (time) for responses-positions should be enforced.

B. Other Means of Problem Diagnosis

In addition to conducting surveys, we used a number of other means to determine the extent to which there was support for various criticisms of the present governance process at CSUS. These included review of Faculty Senate archival data, review of the committee structure at the university, and sharing of the committee members' experience in governance over many years.

One of the hardest claims to evaluate was the assertion that the Administration had *in fact* (as well as in people's perception) usurped authority from the Senate. Empirically, evaluation of this question turned on the relative roles and responsibilities of "Senate committees" (e.g. the Curriculum Policies Committee), which at least in theory were directly accountable to the Senate as a whole, versus those of "University committees" (e.g. the Committee on University Planning, or CUP), which included faculty representation but did not answer directly to the Senate. The assertion was that the power of the latter had waxed while the power of the former had waned. A major

difficulty in evaluating this claim was that information about the various University committees was widely scattered and often limited.

Members of the ad hoc Committee took a number of steps to determine the state of affairs with respect to university committees. We requested that the Administration provide us with a list of all such committees and their charges. At the same time we attempted to identify for ourselves what committees were operational. Based on available documents and the University Manual, we determined that there were a total of 72 active committees, subcommittees, and boards on campus. The Faculty Senate has 17 committees or subcommittees; the University has 33 committees, subcommittees or boards; and there are 22 affiliated/auxiliary organizations. It is not at present clear precisely how these numbers differ from past numbers, although there appears to be consensus that the number of university committees has increased.

Nor was it clear that the Administration supported the maintenance of all such committees. Thus in his September 24, 1998 letter to the Senate on governance issues President Don Gerth suggested there were too many such committees. Gerth also expressed skepticism about the political ability to limit their number.

Following in part from the efforts of the ad hoc Committee, the Administration and the Senate leadership have begun a collaborative process for identifying criteria for concluding if committees are worth maintaining (as well as for determining if various provisions of the Faculty Constitution need updating). We expect that this process ultimately will lead to a set of recommendations to the Senate beyond those summarized in this report.

We were able to answer more definitively the question of whether disenchantment with faculty governance had manifested itself in declining attendance at the Senate's regular Thursday meetings. The Senate office kept records of meeting attendance over recent years; from this information we were able to evaluate whether there had been a worsening trend.

Significantly, we found little evidence of a recent "crisis" in Senate attendance. While there was some evidence that average attendance had been a little higher dating back to the 92-93 academic year (i.e. between 70% and 80% of those eligible to attend), there was no clear attendance trend since that time. Indeed, the variance in attendance levels between individual

meetings seemed to dwarf any long run trend (a chart summarizing this information is included as Appendix B).

III. Drawing from Other Governance Models

Included in the authorizing resolution was language indicating that the ad hoc Committee should investigate governance practices in other senates. We concentrated mainly on senates of other California State University (CSU) campuses, believing their experiences were most relevant to ours.

More specifically, the ad hoc Committee reviewed the By-laws and constitutions of CSU senates, minutes of senate meetings, and agendas of senate meetings posted on the World Wide Web during the last two years. The campuses surveyed included CSU at Dominguez Hills, Fullerton, Humboldt, Long Beach, Northridge, Polytechnic University at Pomona, San Diego, San Francisco, San Jose, Sonoma, and Stanislaus. The CSUS Senate Chair also made contact with the Chair of the Senate in San Jose to clarify information regarding faculty involvement in the budget process.

Information regarding operations of the Statewide Academic Senate were also used by the Faculty Governance Committee.

In particular, we would emphasize that some other CSU faculty senates appear to take a more active role in budget formation. Notably, San Jose has a budget advisory committee which submits a draft budget plan and participates in preparing the budget. This allows the Senate to recommend overall budget priorities and advise the president on budget proposals for administrative units.

IV. Key Findings

Based on the survey results, other information we analyzed, and our extensive deliberations, we came to a number of conclusions about the types of reforms that were desirable. Major ones included the following:

- o There was broad based support among the faculty for *maintaining the department based system of representation within the Faculty Senate.*
- o Given the strong support in our surveys for including administrators as non-voting members of the Faculty Senate, and the common expressions of concern about the

state of communications between the administration and the Senate, there is a need to *consider a move to restore some degree of administrator representation on the Senate.* At the same time, there was a need to recognize the concern about excessive administrative input that had prompted strong support for a 1997 referendum changing the CSUS Academic Senate to a Faculty Senate. Accordingly we concluded that any such move toward restoring Administrative representation should be incremental (including only top administrators) rather than wholesale.

- o Given that there are legitimate reasons for senators to miss occasional meetings, there is a *need to consider a formal arrangement whereby alternates could "stand in" for senators having to miss a meeting.* At the same time, it was important not to create incentives for senators to shirk their responsibilities. Therefore *consideration needed to be given to means of informing departments of senators who repeatedly failed to attend, and perhaps sanctioning such behavior after a reasonable period.*
- o Senate floor procedure could be improved. On the one hand, there was widespread concern about a few voices dominating the Senate, and about the Senate being too slow to act. On the other hand, there was concern about inadequate debate on some important issues. This *suggested that it might be desirable to attempt to both "rein in" debate on action items and provide opportunities for more general discussion of issues before action was to be taken.* At the same there was a *need to consider changing the order and flow of Senate business to better assure that the body addresses the most pressing issues.*
- o There is a *need to provide senators (and faculty members generally) more ready access to information about governance related activities, as well as to make the information that was provided more readable and "user friendly."*
- o There is a *need to provide the Senate with a stronger voice in campus budgetary decisions.* We found that many of the concerns about lack of faculty input centered around the allocation of resources. Moreover, there was a sense among many that faculty input into the budget had at one time been stronger. We believe that structural

changes are necessary to accomplish the aim of increasing the Senate's input into budgetary matters.

- o There is a need to provide tighter links between the Senate and its standing committees. We believed that some senators' concerns about lack of involvement in key policy decisions may be related to lack of close links between the committees and the Senate as a whole, especially since currently the chairs of committees need not be senators. We also believe that concern about reenforcing links is sufficiently compelling to justify a small expansion of the Senate Executive Committee, even though a minority of senators surveyed favored that option.
- o There is a need for further work to clarify whether all of the large number of university committees are really necessary.

V. Recommendations

Following is a summary of our recommendations. Again, some of these changes (i.e. changes to the standing rules) could be accomplished by a simple majority vote of senators attending a regular Senate meeting, while others (i.e. changes to the Faculty Constitution) would need to go to a vote of the faculty as a whole. For each recommendation we indicate whether a change is needed in the Faculty Constitution, Senate By-Laws, or Senate Standing Rules.

A set of actual motions to implement our recommendations will be forthcoming to the Senate as a whole.

A. Duties and Responsibilities of Senators

We recommend that provisions be added to the By-Laws to indicate as follows:

"The role of faculty governance within the university is a major part of the collegial environment. The Faculty Senate is the recognized voice of the faculty and is charged with proposing and overseeing policy pertaining to the academic well-being of the institution. A faculty senator, duly elected by his/her department/unit, is expected to discharge the duties and

responsibilities attendant on that office. These duties and responsibilities are:

1. To be an informed member of the Faculty Senate;
2. To attend all appropriate meetings of the Faculty Senate;
3. To consult with and consider the opinions/interests of the department/unit being represented while engaging in Faculty Senate business;
4. To recognize and respect the duties and responsibilities of fellow Faculty Senators; and
5. To maintain a friendly and objective bearing during debate in Faculty Senate meetings."

B. Changes in the System of Representation

1. Maintain departmental representation to the Faculty Senate.
2. Require that chairs of Senate standing committees (currently 4 in number) be senators (Constitution).

Important note: We recognize that there are significant workload issues relating to this recommendation, and believe these need careful discussion.

3. Modify the Senate Executive Committee in the following manner (Constitution):
 - a. Increase the size from 7 to 9 members;
 - b. Include as members the chairs of the standing committees; and
 - c. Reduce the number of at-large members.
4. Provide that the President and Provost (but no other administrators) be ex-officio, non-voting members of the Faculty Senate (Constitution).
5. Allow departments to designate alternate senators, and allow such alternates to attend Senate meetings and act on motions in the event the regular senator cannot attend (By-Laws).

6. Specify that academically related counseling faculty be included in the Student Services Professionals electing unit of the Faculty Senate (Constitution).

Note: This change, which we assume to be non-controversial, was requested by the counseling faculty. It is appropriate given that counseling faculty have been moved to Unit 3, and will not result in a change in the number of Senate representatives.

C. Changes to Senate Procedures

1. Specify that if both the senator and the alternate senator are absent for more than two consecutive Senate meetings, the electing unit shall be notified to allow that unit to make changes in its Senate representation if it so desires (By-Laws).
2. Specify that if both the senator and the alternate senator are absent for more than two consecutive meetings, the lack of representation from that unit shall not be considered in determining if a Senate quorum is met; however, 40% of senators/alternates must be present for Senate business to be conducted (By-Laws).
3. Require "second readings" of agenda items, i.e. a first reading where information sharing and debate can occur but no amendments can be taken or action taken, and a second reading for action; the consequence of this change is that matters will first appear as information items on the Senate Agenda (Standing Rules).
4. Adopt the CSU system's Academic Senate practice of limiting debate on action items to 3 speakers each on the "pro" and "con" sides, with 3 speakers also allowed to ask "informational" questions or express uncertainty about their position; debate could be extended by vote of the Senate (Standing Rules).
5. During second reading of agenda items, limit remarks of "pro," "con," and "informational" speakers to 3 minutes each (Standing Rules).
6. Re-order the typical Senate agenda as follows: a) roll-call; b) consent items; c) minutes; d) second reading of

items/action on items; e) first reading of new items; f) reports/items for information only; and g) open forum.

7. Change the format of the agenda to provide a cover page, a "plain English" summary of items, and an indication of the rationale for any proposed changes (Standing Rules).

D. Recommendations Related to the Scope of the Senate's Role in Governance

1. Specify that the Faculty Senate has the responsibility for developing *procedures* as well as policy in specified areas such as academic faculty review, tenure, and promotion (Constitution).
2. Add specific provisions that define the relationship between Academic Affairs and the Senate Executive Committee regarding such matters as notification of the creation of new university committees.
3. Establish one or more Senate fiscal/budget committees (Standing Rules).
4. Establish a joint Senate-administration procedure for reviewing the nature and charge of various university committees, with an eye toward reducing their number (this is expected to be a collaborative process with Administration representatives; initial work in this area already has begun)

APPENDIX A

FS 98-12/Ex., Flr. FACULTY GOVERNANCE

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

- (1) a statement of duties and responsibilities of senators; and
- (2) whether changes should be made to the system of representation used to determine Senate membership in order to enable the Senate to function more efficiently and effectively as the representative voice of the faculty; and
- (3) recommendations on procedural matters of the Senate, including meeting schedules, meeting times, conduct of meetings, and whether attendance requirements for senators should be established; and
- (4) use of university committees by the administration that results in the usurpation of the Senate role in governance; and be it further

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

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

Carried. March 12, 1998

APPENDIX B

Senate Attendance in Recent Years

