

1998-99 FACULTY SENATE
OF
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO

Minutes
May 6, 1999

Issue #18

ROLL CALL

Present: Amata, Barakatt, Bauerly, Behrman, Bossert, Buckley, Cajucom, Chambers, Ching, DeBow, de Haas, Dillon (Parliamentarian), Dokimos, Dworkin, Elfenbaum, Hall, Hill, Huff, Huffman, A. Jensen, Jew, Kando, Klyse, Kostyrko, Krabacher, Lan, Leezer, LeFebvre, McCrystle, Palmer, Raingruber, Reardon, Scott, Seid, Smith, Stabinsky Tejada, Tobey (Emeritus), Turrill, Verdone, G. Wheeler

Absent: Alexander, Anderson, Banks, Barrena, Cameron Wedding, Cleek, Dundon, Kim, Lascher, Lee, Lee-Sammons, Lewis, Llamas-Green, Lund, Newsome, Phillips, Pickett, Reveles, Rodriguez, Scanlan, Serrano, V. Wheeler, Zucker

ACTION ITEMS

FS 99-36/Flr. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of April 22 (#17), 1999, are approved as published.

Carried.

*FS 99-37/Ex. C COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS--University

CSUS Foundation Board of Directors--nominees:

At-large, June 1, 1999-July 30, 2003 President Gerth will interview and select one from the following nominees:

JOAN DWORKIN
GEORGE PARROTT
GREGORY WHEELER

Carried unanimously.

*FS 99-38/Ex. FACULTY GRIEVANCE HEARING PANEL (PER EXECUTIVE ORDER 702) [*See May 6, 1999, Faculty Senate Agenda Attachment A*]

The Executive Committee, on behalf of the Faculty Senate, recommends that the Faculty Grievance Hearing Panel called for in Executive Order 702, be elected as follows:

The panel shall be composed of faculty elected by each department or program and shall, where possible, constitute 25% of the full-time faculty of that department. Departments with fewer than four full-time faculty are invited to elect a faculty member to the panel but are not required to do so.

Carried unanimously.

*FS 99-40/UARTP, FPC, Ex. UNIVERSITY ARTP DOCUMENT, AMEND SECTION 9.03B

The Faculty Senate recommends amendment of the University ARTP Document as follows [strikeover = deletion; underscore = addition] (*See May 6, 1999, Faculty Senate Agenda Attachment B for UARTP Committee and Faculty Policies Committee comments*):

9.03 Periodic Evaluation

A. ...

- B. "Periodic evaluation procedures shall be approved by the President after consideration of recommendations from the appropriate faculty committee(s). Such procedures shall, for tenure-track faculty unit employees who teach, include, but not be limited to, student evaluations of teaching performance, peer review(s), and administrative review. Department chairs may make recommendations as a part of the periodic evaluation process. If such a separate recommendation is to be made the chair shall not participate as a member of the department peer committee." (M.O.U. 15.18) (On this campus, 1) procedures shall be developed by primary and secondary committees and shall be reviewed by the University ARTP Committee in the case of the periodic evaluation of probationary faculty; 2) procedures shall be developed by primary committees and shall be reviewed by the University ARTP Committee in the case of the periodic evaluation of temporary faculty; and 3) procedures shall be developed by primary committees and shall be reviewed by the Faculty ~~Affairs~~ Policies Committee in the case of periodic evaluation of tenured faculty.) Unless ordered otherwise by University policy, periodic evaluation of tenured faculty shall be ordered by the provisions of this document, and in no case shall it be ordered in a manner inconsistent with the M.O.U.

...

Carried.

*FS 99-25A/CPC, Ex., Flr. WRITING AND READING IN THE UNDERGRADUATE
MAJORS--ADVISORY STANDARDS (per FS 99-09)

The Faculty Senate endorses the "Advisory Standards for Writing in the Undergraduate Major" (see Attachment) as advisory standards for distribution by the Office of Academic Affairs as set forth in the policy on Writing and Reading in the Undergraduate Major (FS 99-09, II.C).

Carried.

The following items received a first reading and will be presented for action at the next regular meeting:


FS 99-39/APC, Ex. LAST WEEK OF INSTRUCTION/FINAL EXAM WEEK [amends
PM 88-05]

FS 99-41/FPC, Ex. COMMENCEMENT, FACULTY ATTENDANCE AT

INFORMATION

1. Academic Impact of Summer 2000 Olympic Trials: Ed Del Biaggio, Vice President for Administration, and Alice Tom, Director and Dean, Regional and Continuing Education, reported on campus plans for minimizing disruption to academic programs during the Summer 2000 Olympic Trials, asked for suggestions and responded to questions.
2. Report on Academic Affairs: Jolene Koester, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, reported briefly on 1) a request to the Senate to consider next year recommending revisions to the Academic Programs Theme of the CSUS Strategic Plan to incorporate changes which have taken place since its adoption in 1993, and 2) the process currently underway in colleges to provide resources to full-time faculty for the support of faculty professional development.
3. Tentative Spring 1999 Faculty Senate Meeting Schedule:
May 13 (3:00-4:00 p.m.; 4:00-5:30 p.m., Outstanding Teacher Award Reception), 20, 27 (Finals Week)
4. Senate Home Page (<http://www.csus.edu/acse/> or CSUS Home Page *then* Administration and Policy *then* Faculty Senate) - Vice Chair Arthur Jensen

The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 p.m.


Janice McPherson, Secretary

*Presidential approval requested.

ADVISORY STANDARDS FOR WRITING IN THE UNDERGRADUATE MAJOR

A EXCELLENT—A paper in this category

- Addresses the assignment thoughtfully and analytically, setting a challenging task.
- Displays awareness of and a sense of purpose in communicating to an audience.
- Establishes a clearly focused controlling idea.
- Demonstrates coherent and rhetorically sophisticated organization; makes effective connections between ideas.
- Provides clear generalizations with specific detail, compelling support and cogent analysis.
- Cites relevant sources and evaluates their validity, effectively integrating them into text when appropriate.
- Displays superior, consistent control of syntax, sentence variety, word choice, and conventions of Standard English.

ESL/Dialect Guideline: Grammatical errors are rare and do not interfere with overall effectiveness of paper; occasional imprecision in word choice or usage may occur.

B STRONG—A paper in this category

- Addresses the assignment clearly and analytically, setting a meaningful task.
- Addresses audience needs and expectations.
- Establishes a clearly focused controlling idea.
- Demonstrates clear and coherent organization.
- Provides clear generalizations and effective support and analysis.
- Cites relevant sources, effectively integrating them into text when appropriate.
- Displays consistent control of syntax, sentence variety, word choice, and conventions of Standard English.

ESL/Dialect Guideline: Some grammatical errors may occur throughout the paper but do not interfere with overall effectiveness; occasional inappropriate word choice or incorrect usage may occur.

C ADEQUATE—A paper in this category

- Addresses the assignment with some analysis.
- Addresses most audience needs and expectations.
- Establishes a controlling idea.
- Demonstrates adequate organization.
- Provides support for and some analysis of generalizations.
- Cites appropriate sources, adequately integrating them into text.
- Displays adequate control of syntax, sentence variety, word choice, and conventions of Standard English; errors do not slow the reader, impede understanding, or seriously undermine the authority of the writer.

ESL/Dialect Guideline: Grammatical errors, inappropriate word choice, or incorrect usage may occur throughout the paper but rarely interfere with effective communication.

D SERIOUSLY FLAWED—A paper in this category

- Addresses the assignment inadequately.
- Shows insufficient audience awareness.
- Strays from the controlling idea, or the idea is unclear.
- Displays formulaic, random, or confusing organization.
- Lacks generalizations, or provides generalizations with inadequate support or analysis.
- Fails to cite sources or cites and/or integrates them inappropriately.
- Shows deficient control of syntax, word choice, and conventions of Standard English; errors impede understanding.

ESL/Dialect Guideline: Serious and frequent errors in grammar, word choice, or usage hinder communication.

F FUNDAMENTALLY DEFICIENT—A paper in this category

- Fails to address assignment.
- Demonstrates a lack of audience awareness.
- Lacks a controlling idea.
- Lacks organization or organizes illogically.
- Displays inability to generalize, analyze, or support ideas.
- Fails to use outside sources or misuses the texts of others.
- Shows inadequate control of syntax, word choice, and conventions of Standard English.

ESL/Dialect Guideline: An accumulation of serious and frequent errors in grammar, word choice, or usage prevent communication.

Guidelines for Evaluating the Writing of ESL/Dialect Students: *The writing of ESL/Dialect Students should be held to native speaker standards for content and addressing the assignment. However, because certain types of errors persist in ESL/Dialect writing even at an advance level, some accommodation for ESL/Dialect features is appropriate.*

