

4 Report on Academic Affairs Vice President for Academic Affairs, discussed 1) projected enrollment for the spring semester and for the academic year, 2) issues of class size at CSUS (handout), 3) letter sent to all full- and part-time faculty regarding aspects of final exam week.

## CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO

Minutes  
February 4, 1999

Issue #11

ES 99-016R Minutes

### ROLL CALL

- Present:** Alexander, Amata, Barakatt, Barrena, Bauerly, Behrman, Bossert, Buckley, Ching, DeBow, Dillon (Parliamentarian), Dokimos, Dworkin, Elfenbaum, Hall, Hill, Huff, A. Jensen, Jew, Kawamoto, Kim, Krabacher, Lan, Lascher, Lee, Leezer, LeFebvre, Lund, McCrystle, Neuman (Faculty Emeritus Association), Newsome, Palmer, Raingruber, Rodriguez, Scott, Seid, Stabinsky, Tejada, Timmer, Verdone, G. Wheeler, V. Wheeler, Zucker
- Absent:** Anderson, Banks, Cajucom, Cameron Wedding, Chambers, Cleek, de Haas, Dundon, Huffman, Jacobs, Kando, Klyse, Lee-Sammons, Lewis, Llamas-Green, Kostyrko, Phillips, Pickett, Reardon, Scanlan, Serrano, Smith, Turrill

### INFORMATION

1. A Moment of Silence was observed in memory of:

#### **JO-ANN BULF**

Administrative Operations Analyst  
College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics  
CSUS 1974-1999

2. Tentative Spring 1999 Faculty Senate Meeting Schedule:
  - February 18 (4:15 p.m., Faculty Merit Scholars Reception), 25
  - March 4, 11, 18, 25
  - April 1 (Spring Recess), 8, 15, 22 (3:00-3:30 p.m., 1999-2000 Senate Nominations; 3:30-5:00 p.m., 1998-99 Senate), 29
  - May 6 (3:00-3:30 p.m., 1999-2000 Senate Elections; 3:30-5:00 p.m., 1998-99 Senate), 13 (3:00-4:00 p.m.; 4:00-5:30 p.m., Outstanding Teacher Award Reception), 20, 27 (Finals Week)
3. Senate Home Page (<http://www.csus.edu/acse/> or CSUS Home Page *then* Administration and Policy *then* Faculty Senate) - Vice Chair Arthur Jensen

4. Report on Academic Affairs: Jolene Koester, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, discussed 1) projected enrollment for the spring semester and for the academic year, 2) issues of class size at CSUS (handout distributed), 3) letter sent to all full- and part-time faculty regarding aspects of final exam week.

## ACTION ITEMS

### FS 99-01/Flr. Minutes

The Minutes of December 10 (#10), 1998, are approved as published.

Carried.

### \*FS 99-02/Ex. WANG FAMILY EXCELLENCE AWARD--NOMINEES

[see February 4, 1999, Faculty Senate Agenda Attachment A, for background]

The Executive Committee, on behalf of the Faculty Senate, recommends that nominees for the Wang Family Excellence Award be selected in the following manner:

1. *For the current year:* Given the short time line involved, the President should select faculty nominees for the four identified award categories from among CSUS faculty who have served as or been a recipient of any of the following:
  - Livingston Annual Faculty Lecturer;
  - Outstanding Teaching Award;
  - Scholarly Achievement Award;
  - President's Award for Research and Creative Activity;
  - Performance Salary Step Increase (PSSI).
2. *For subsequent years:* The Executive Committee has requested that the Faculty Policies Committee develop a formal process by which recommendations for campus nominees will be made. We expect this process to be in place in time for next year's call for nominees.

Carried.

### \*FS 99-03/Ex. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS--University

#### Director of International Programs, Selection Advisory Committee

PAM MILCHRIST, Faculty At-large  
 MING TUNG "MIKE" LEE, Faculty At-large  
 RICHARD SHEK, Faculty At-large

Carried unanimously.

FS 99-04/Ex. COMMENDATION

The Faculty Senate commends Professor John Oldenburg and Professor Warren Smith for their unstinting efforts, as faculty members in the CSUS Biomedical Engineering Program, to maintain the quality and viability of the program in recent years, especially given the serious challenges the program faced during that period.

Carried unanimously.

FS 99-05/Ex., Flr. SENATE FLOOR PROCEDURES, CHANGES TO

The Faculty Senate adopts as amended, on a trial basis for the Spring 1999 semester, the changes to Senate floor procedures recommended by the ad hoc Committee on Faculty Governance (Attachment).

Carried.

FS 99-06/Flr. 1999-2000 COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

The Faculty Senate elects college representatives to the 1999-2000 Committee on Committees, as follows:

JOAN BAUERLY, College of Arts and Letters

ROGER LEEZER, College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics

TOM KANDO, College of Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies

MIKE LEE, College of Business Administration

VICTORIA JEW, College of Education

KWAI-TING LAN, College of Engineering and Computer Science

ELIZABETH DOKIMOS, College of Health and Human Services

The Committee will meet:

#1: Tuesday, March 2, 3:00-5:00 p.m., SAC 275

#2: Tuesday, March 16, 3:00-5:00 p.m., SAC 275

Additional Committee members are:

Thomas Krabacher, Chair, Faculty Senate

Arthur Jensen, Vice Chair, Faculty Senate

Bob Buckley, Member, Executive Committee

Joan Dworkin, Member, Executive Committee

Ted Lascher, Member, Executive Committee

Melinda Seid, Member, Executive Committee

Gregory Wheeler, Member, Executive Committee

Ben Amata, Senior Library Senator

Booker Banks, Senior Student Services Senator

Carried.

FS 99-07A/Flr. DROP POLICY PROPOSAL

The Faculty Senate postpones consideration of FS 99-07/APC, Ex., Drop Policy Proposal, to the next Senate meeting when it will be taken up as a second reading item.  
Carried.

The hour of adjournment being near, the following items were postponed and will be presented as first reading items at the February 18 Senate meeting:

- FS 99-08/APC, Ex. ACADEMIC ADVISING POLICY
- FS 99-09/CPC, Ex. WRITING AND READING IN THE UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM
- FS 99-10/CPC, Ex. WRITING AND READING SUBCOMMITTEE, ESTABLISH
- FS 99-11/CPC, Ex. GRADUATE CONCENTRATIONS

The meeting was adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

*Janice McPherson*  
Janice McPherson, Secretary

\*Presidential approval requested.

The Committee will meet:

#1: Tuesday, March 2, 3:00-5:00 p.m., SAC 275

#2: Tuesday, March 16, 3:00-5:00 p.m., SAC 275

Additional Committee members are:

Booker Banks, Senior Student Services Senator

Ben Amara, Senior Library Senator

Gregory Wheeler, Member, Executive Committee

Melinda Seid, Member, Executive Committee

Ted Lacher, Member, Executive Committee

Joan Dworkin, Member, Executive Committee

Bob Buckley, Member, Executive Committee

Arthur Jensen, Vice Chair, Faculty Senate

Thomas Kriebacher, Chair, Faculty Senate

Carried

January 27, 1999

Memo To: Faculty Senators  
From: ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Governance  
Re: Senate Floor Procedures for the Spring 1999 Semester

#### OVERVIEW

This memo sets forth and explains recommended changes to Senate floor procedures. All modifications are aimed at improving the efficiency and effectiveness of the Senate. We recommend that the Senate adopt these changes on an experimental basis for the spring 1999 semester.

#### BACKGROUND

Last spring, the CSUS Faculty Senate passed a resolution to create an ad Hoc Faculty Governance Committee (FS 98-12). The Committee was charged with examining the way faculty governance was working at our campus and recommending possible improvements. The Committee met over the summer and issued its report last October.

The ad Hoc Committee offered recommendations requiring a) amendments to the **Senate Constitution**, b) changes to the **Senate By-Laws**, and c) changes to the **Senate Standing Rules**. All such recommendations were discussed in the Committee's report. However, because the constitutional changes were subject to the strictest time deadlines, the fall 1998 governance debate in the Senate focused on those items. Most of the constitutional amendments originally proposed by the Committee were included in a referendum that went to the faculty in the late fall. The package of changes was overwhelmingly approved.

Nevertheless, we wish to emphasize that *the recommendations most directly affecting the conduct of regular senate meetings are contained in the proposed standing rule changes summarized in this memo*. These changes address widely expressed concerns

The extent of such concerns is underscored in the table below, which presents data from the summer 1998 survey of faculty senator. As shown in the table, survey respondents expressed particular concern about the Senate being dominated by a few individuals, and about poor use of Senate time.

**PHRASES USED TO DESCRIBE SENATE MEETINGS**  
(From Summer 1998 Survey of Faculty Senators)

Phrase	% Marking Phrase
"Dominated by a few"	89
"Poor use of time"	50
"Too little follow-up"	34
"Disliked by participants"	32
"Loosely organized"	21
"Valued by participants"	18
"Tightly organized"	9
"Disorganized"	7
"Good use of time"	5
"Little discussion"	2

We have attempted to craft the rule changes carefully. Yet it is an *empirical* question whether these modifications would lead to greater satisfaction on the part of senators. Accordingly, we recommend that the changes be in effect for a single semester and then reevaluated at the end of that period.

**SUMMARY AND RATIONALE FOR CHANGES**

The following chart summarizes the differences between the way business is currently conducted in the Senate and the way we are proposing it be conducted in the spring of 1999. The right hand side of the chart also contains the rationale for the changes.

*Important Note Regarding "First and Second Readings."*  
We propose to draw a distinction between agenda items that are on "first reading" and those that are on "second

reading." First reading items would come to the Senate floor for discussion rather than action such as amendments or up-down votes (however, first reading items could be referred to a committee for further consideration). Items that have completed first reading would appear on the "second reading" file of the *subsequent* Senate meeting, at which time any action would be appropriate.

### SUMMARY OF SPECIFIC CHANGES TO SENATE RULES

#### CURRENT RULES

##### Whether Action Can Be Taken on Agenda Items

- o Items are ready for action when they appear on the agenda

##### Order of the Meeting

- o Normal Order:
  1. Open forum
  2. Information items
  3. Approval of the agenda (followed by approval of minutes)

#### PROPOSED RULES

##### Whether Action Can Be Taken on Agenda Items

- o Normally items initially will be placed on "first reading;" items completing first reading would go on the "second reading" at the *subsequent* meeting

- The Executive Committee may request a waiver of the first reading requirement to place the item on the agenda for immediate action; such requests will appear on the printed agenda. the waiver would require a 2/3 vote of the entire Senate

*Rationale:* This best ensures that senators are prepared to address action items

##### Order of the Meeting

- o Normal Order:
  1. Open forum
  2. Approval of the agenda (followed by approval of minutes)
  3. Second reading agenda

4. Action on agenda items

- items
4. First reading agenda items (at a time certain or at the end of completion of the second reading file)
  5. Information items

*Rationale:* Information items are lower priority; it's desirable to get to action items earlier

**Re-Ordering the Agenda**

- o Re-ordering the agenda requires a motion and a majority vote

**Re-Ordering the Agenda**

- o Re-ordering the agenda requires a motion and a 2/3 vote

*Rationale:* Re-ordering the agenda can be time consuming and possibly result in high priority items not being addressed

**Adding a New Agenda Item from the Floor**

- o Adding a new agenda item requires a motion and a majority vote

**Adding a New Agenda Item from the Floor**

- o Adding a new first reading item to the agenda requires a motion and a majority vote; any new item added would go at the end of the first reading file

*Rationale:* Many senators are not prepared to address items added from the floor; it's desirable to stick to the published agenda

**Time Limits on Considering Agenda Items**

- o There are no time limits on

**Time Limits on Considering an Agenda Items**

- o 1) the executive committee



the length of time that can be devoted to any agenda item

would set time limits on first reading items; and 2) the default time limit for each first reading item and each item added from the floor would be 10 minutes (by 2/3 vote, the Senate could allocate more than 10 minutes) *Rationale:* This will improve the efficiency of the Senate's work

#### **Order of Items on the First Reading Calendar**

- o Not applicable

#### **Order of Items on the First Reading Calendar**

- o The Executive Committee would set the order of items on the first reading calendar; normally, second reading items would appear on the agenda in the order in which they were moved from first to second reading, although the Executive Committee may adjust the order of items when appropriate; the Senate could re-order the items by 2/3 vote

*Rationale:* The Executive Committee ought to be able to determine which first reading items are lesser or higher priority

#### **Limits on Time Allocated Individual Speakers**

- o There are no limits on how long an individual speaker can have the floor

#### **Limits on Time Allocated Individual Speakers**

- o Speakers normally would be limited to three minutes at a time; longer remarks would be allowed when a senator is making an opening presentation on an item (on either first or second

reading) or a summary argument against an item

- A motion could be made to allocate a speaker additional time; the motion could be approved by unanimous consent or, failing that, by majority vote

*Rationale:* This limitation addresses the commonly heard complaint about long-winded remarks

#### FLOW OF ITEMS TO THE SENATE FLOOR

If our proposals are approved, agenda items could come to a vote before the full Senate in the following ways:

1. (*Most common route*) Senate standing committee (e.g., Academic Policies Committee) ==> Senate Executive Committee ==> full Senate for first reading ==> full Senate for second reading
2. Recommendation of individual senator (e.g., in the "open forum") ==> Senate Executive Committee ==> full Senate for first reading ==> full Senate for second reading
3. At a meeting of the full Senate, item added to the first reading file by floor motion (majority vote required) ==> full Senate for second reading at subsequent meeting
4. At a meeting of the full Senate, item of pressing importance added to the agenda (2/3 vote required); second reading requirement waived so action can be taken on the item on the same day (2/3 vote required for this motion as well)

#### SENATE ACTION

We request that the package of changes be approved for the spring 1999 semester only (i.e., that there be a "sunset clause"

on the new rules). We further recommend that the Senate evaluate the effectiveness of the changes by the end of the semester. After the evaluation a motion could be made to implement any or all of the proposed changes on a full-time basis, as appropriate.

