1998-99 FACULTY SENATE

OF

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO

Minutes	Issue #10
December 10, 1998	

ROLL CALL

Present: Amata, Anderson, Barakatt, Barrena, Bauerly, Behrman, Bossert, Buckley, Cameron Wedding, Chambers, Cleek, DeBow, de Haas, Dworkin, Elfenbaum, Hill, Huff, A. Jensen, Kando, Kawamoto, Klyse, Krabacher, Lan, Lascher, Lee-Sammons, Leezer, Lund, McCrystle, McKee, Newsome, Palmer, Raingruber, Reardon, Scanlan, Scott, Stabinsky, Strahan, Timmer, Turrill, Verdone, G. Wheeler, V. Wheeler, Zucker

Absent: Alexander, Banks, Dokimos, Dundon, Hall, Jacobs, Jew, Kim, Lee, LeFebvre, Lewis, Llamas-Green, Moore, Olson, Phillips, Pickett, Rodriguez, Seid, Serrano, Smith

INFORMATION

1. Tentative Fall 1998/Spring 1999 Faculty Senate Meeting Schedule:
        December 17--
        February 4
        February 11
        February 18 4:15 p.m., Faculty Merit Scholars Reception
        February 25
        March 4
        March 11
        March 18
        March 25
        April 1 Spring Recess
        April 8
        April 15
        April 22 3:00-3:30 p.m., 1999-2000 Senate Nominations; 3:30-5:00 p.m., 1998-99 Senate
        April 29
        May 6 3:00-3:30 p.m., 1999-2000 Senate Elections; 3:30-5:00 p.m., 1998-99 Senate
        May 13 3:00-4:00 p.m.; 4:00-5:30 p.m., Outstanding Teacher Award Reception
        May 20
        May 27 (Finals Week)

2. Senate Home Page (http://www.csus.edu/acse/ *or* CSUS Home Page *then* Administration and Policy *then* Faculty Senate) - Vice Chair Arthur Jensen

3. Report on CSU Academic Conference, November 18-20, Asilomar
   Chair Krabacher and Statewide Academic Senators -- *Postponed*

ACTION ITEMS

FS 98-74/Flr. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of November 5 (#7), 1998, are approved as published.

Carried.

FS 98-81/Flr. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meetings of November 12 (#8) and November 19 (#9), 1998, are approved as published.

Carried.

*FS 98-82/Ex. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS--University

Associate Director of Financial Aid, Selection Advisory Committee:
   VIRGINIA DIXON, Faculty At-large

Carried unanimously.

*FS 98-83/Ex. BIOMEDICAL ENGINEERING PROGRAM, REPORT OF TASK FORCE

The Faculty Senate receives the report of the Biomedical Engineering Task Force (December 10, 1998, Faculty Senate Agenda Attachment A) and recommends adoption of the Task Force Recommendations (Attachments A-1 and A-2 of the report).

Carried.

FS 98-84/Ex. COMMENDATION--BME TASK FORCE

The Faculty Senate commends Professors Juanita Barrena, Arnold Golub, John Oldenburg, Anne-Louise Radimsky, Warren Smith, Tong Zhou, and Miki Vohryzek-Bolden, Dean Braja Das, Associate Deans Marilyn Hopkins and Paul Noble, and Associate Vice President Ric Brown for their lengthy and dedicated service on the Biomedical Engineering Task Force.

Carried unanimously.

*FS 98-85/CPC, GEP/GRC, Ex., Flr. GENERAL EDUCATION PROGRAM REVIEW

The Faculty Senate recommends that the following procedures be adopted for conducting a review of the General Education program:

Procedures for the Program Review of the General Education Program

The separate formation of 1) a task force to prepare the Self Study format, and 2) a Program Review Team for the review of the General Education program.

I. **The Task Force**

A. Membership

The Task Force shall comprise members from the seven Colleges, a member from the Library faculty, a representative of Associated Students, Inc., an "academically related" faculty member, a non-voting liaison member from the Curriculum Policies Committee, and ex officio members from the General Education Policies Committee and Academic Affairs.

B. Method of Selection of Members

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee shall invite the Colleges and the Library to nominate members of the Task Force, the means of selecting nominees to be at the discretion of the Colleges and the Library. ASI shall nominate the student representative. The Curriculum Policies Committee shall nominate its non-voting liaison member. The General Education Policies Committee shall nominate its ex-officio member. Academic Affairs shall nominate its ex-officio member, and an academically related faculty member.

In cases of more than one nominee from a unit, the Executive Committee shall choose one nominee. The Executive Committee shall submit the names of the nominees to the Faculty Senate for approval. In cases of Senate rejection of a nominee, the Executive Committee shall request an additional nominee from the concerned unit.

C. The Charge of the Task Force

The Task Force shall 1) compose the Self Study questions; 2) consulting with Institutional Studies, request the gathering of any data it believes necessary for its work and potentially useful for the Program Review Team; and 3) recommend a time table for the completion of the Review.

D. Procedures of the Task Force

The Task Force is constituted upon Faculty Senate approval of its members and its charge.

The Faculty Senate Chair shall convene the first meeting of the Task Force, which shall then elect its Chair.

The Task Force shall submit a draft of proposed Self Study questions to the General Education Policies/Graduation Requirements Committee for formal comment. Upon consideration of the Committee's response, it shall recommend Self Study questions to the Faculty Senate. Upon the approval of the Faculty Senate and the President, the Self Study format shall stand approved

II. **The Program Renew Team**

A modification of current Blue Book policy regarding the selection and procedures of program review teams:

A. Membership [Note: It is recommended that no more than one-half of the Review Team members be members of the Task Force.]

The Program Review Team shall comprise one faculty representative from each of the Colleges and from the Library and one student representative.

B. Method of Selection

Each College and the Library shall nominate at least two faculty members to serve on the Team. ASI shall nominate at least one student to serve on the Team.

After consultation with the GEP/GRC Committee and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, the Provost shall select the nine members of the Program Review Team. Each of the seven Colleges and the Library shall have one member. The Provost's selections shall be subject to confirmation by the Faculty Senate. If the Senate rejects a nomination, the Provost shall submit a replacement name.

Nominations for Chair of the Program Review Team shall be sought from the faculty at large. The Provost, in consultation with the Faculty Senate Chair, shall select a nominee who shall be confirmed by the Faculty Senate.

C. Charge

The charge of the Program Review Team is the current charge for Program Review Teams: to evaluate the Program and to recommend improvements in it.

D. The Self Study

The GEP/GRC Committee shall, following the approved Self Study format, prepare the Self Study. Academic Affairs and a designee of the Curriculum Policies Committee must approve the Self Study.

E. External Consultants

The Task Force shall recommend the number of external consultants to the Provost. The Provost shall, in consultation with the Program Review Team, select the consultants.

F. Program Review Team Procedures

The Program Review Team shall

- advertise the Review to the campus and provide all interested units and campus personnel an opportunity to meet with it;

- consider CSU General Education policy and General Education programs on other CSU campuses;

- collect studies and surveys relevant to General Education on campus, and with the cooperation of Institutional Studies, conduct such other studies and surveys as it considers necessary;

- consult with the External Consultants; and

- write a draft Program Review. (The Chair of the Program Review Team is responsible for the composition of the draft Review, including any minority opinions.)

The Program Review Team shall submit its draft Review to the General Education Policies Committee for formal comment. After considering those comments and making any advisable changes in the draft, the Program Review Team shall submit its review to Academic Affairs and to the Faculty Senate.

Carried.

FS 98-86/Ex., Flr. CORNERSTONES IMPLEMENTATION PLAN, RESPONSE TO

The CSUS Faculty Senate adopts the Executive Committee's "CSUS Faculty Response to the Draft Cornerstones Implementation Plan" (Attachment). The Faculty Senate strongly urges that the Board of Trustees not adopt any implementation plan for Cornerstones that fails to address the issues raised in the CSUS faculty response. Any plan that fails to do so is unlikely to garner widespread support among CSU faculty and will ultimately prove unworkable.

The report shall be forwarded to the Statewide Academic Senate for inclusion in their report to the Board of Trustees and to CSUS President Gerth and CSU Vice Chancellor Spence.

Carried.

*FS 98-87/Ex. STRATEGIC PLAN (INTERNATIONAL NATURE OF CSUS ACADEMIC
              PROGRAMS)

The Faculty Senate recommends that the following statement be included in the Planning
Priorities of the Academic Programs theme of the CSUS Strategic Plan:

Objective: **To strengthen and expand those aspects of the curriculum that address the
international nature of modern society.**

Rationale. Increasingly, modern society is becoming an international one as information,
peoples, cultures interact over greater and greater distances with growing disregard for
traditional political and cultural boundaries. This is particularly so in the case of California,
with its ethnically and nationally diverse population and its strong economic and cultural ties
to other world regions. One goal of the curriculum at CSUS will be to prepare students to
recognize the international aspects of their society and develop the necessary competence in
dealing with the challenges it presents. A second goal recognizes that it is also important that
students learn to examine critically the consequences of this increasing "internationalization"
on their own society and others. Instructors will be encouraged to expand the international
components of their course curricula and, where possible, students and faculty will be
encouraged to expand their own international experience through travel and study abroad. It
is also important that students be prepared to recognize and deal with the "international"
aspects of their own society on the local, state, and national levels.

Carried.

*FS 98-88/APC, Ex. EXECUTIVE ORDER 665 ON STUDENT RETENTION, IMPACT OF

The Faculty Senate acknowledges the excellent work performed by the CSUS Administration
to implement E.O. 665 and at the same time support the student-centered mission of the
University. In addition, the Faculty Senate recommends that Institutional Studies be asked to
initiate a longitudinal study to ascertain if requiring completion of remedial coursework during
their first year at CSUS enhances the performance of our students.

Carried.

The hour of adjournment having been reached, the following item was postponed to the next
meeting:

FS 98-89/Flr. ENGLISH DIAGNOSTIC TEST--RECISION OF DIFFERENTIAL ENGLISH
              REQUIREMENTS BASED ON NATIONAL ORIGIN

The Faculty Senate finds the University policy that requires undergraduate students who are
permanent residents or international students on visa from non-English speaking countries
to take the English Diagnostic Test in addition to the English Placement Test, and that bars
students from registering for failure to take the exam (pg. 69, 1998-2000 CSUS Catalog), to be

a form of discrimination on the basis of national origin in conflict with the University's non-discrimination policy (pg. 576, <u>CSUS Catalog</u>). Therefore, be it resolved, the Faculty Senate strongly recommends to the President that the policy promulgated under the title "English Requirements for International Students (on visa) and Permanent Residents" (pg. 69, 1998-2000 <u>CSUS Catalog</u>) be rescinded.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:59 p.m.

Janice McPherson

Janice McPherson, Secretary

*Presidential approval requested.

CSU SACRAMENTO FACULTY RESPONSE TO THE
DRAFT CORNERSTONES IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

Introduction

The following response to the draft Cornerstones Implementation Plan has been approved by the California State University Faculty Senate. It is separate from the CSU, Sacramento campus response. While the campus response represents a broad range of viewpoints on the implementation plan, this response reflects what is primarily a faculty perspective.

Many of the principles contained in the original Cornerstones document emphasize desirable goals that have broad faculty support. We as a faculty, however, have serious concerns about and objections to a number of the initiatives in the draft implementation plan. We raise the issues below with the hope that they will be addressed in future versions of the Cornerstones Implementation Plan.

Areas of Concern

1. There is a serious problem with the focus of the draft document. A significant difference exists between the focus of the original Cornerstones document and that of the Cornerstones Implementation Plan. The Cornerstones document is written positively and endorses principles that explicitly acknowledge the importance of a liberal education and a commitment to lifelong learning. These are elements most faculty support as central to the CSU mission. In contrast, the Cornerstones Implementation Plan focuses instead on achieving narrowly-defined quantifiable goals and does not seem to recognize the broader principles set forth in the original document. While recognizing that an implementation plan is, by its very nature, supposed to focus on concrete actions and not broad philosophical issues, the disjunction between the two documents is nonetheless very disturbing.

2. The Cornerstones Implementation Plan must acknowledge as its first priority the importance of providing high quality baccalaureate education. This sets the context in which all subsequent priorities and initiatives should be placed. This priority is not acknowledged in the current draft of the plan.

3. The Cornerstones Implementation Plan places excessive emphasis on easily quantifiable outcomes assessment. It fails to acknowledge that much of what is of value in a university education is not readily reducible to such forms of assessment. The document seems to suggest that easily measurable outcomes should be emphasized as the primary basis for awarding the baccalaureate degree, ignoring the less easily measured goals of a liberal education such as the ability to think critically, a student's intellectual and ethical growth, and the preparation for lifelong learning.

4. The emphasis on outcomes assessment (A-5 in particular) seems to suggest that assessment will drive funding. This can lead to a situation where curricula are tailored to meet assessment requirements and not student needs. The draft plan also fails to acknowledge that outcomes assessment in many areas of learning, if done effectively, is both expensive and will need to involve careful re-evaluation of articulation relationships with other institutions.

5. In efforts to reduce the percentage of students needing remedial education (section E), attention should be given to strategies to enhance preparation of high school and transfer students and caution exercised to avoid lowering of standards.

6. The Cornerstones Implementation Plan seems to place excessive reliance on technology and distributive learning for increasing the efficiency with which the CSU carries out its mission. These new technologies need to be employed carefully and only after due consideration of their appropriateness for certain kinds of student learning. **It is important, therefore, that high priority be given to B-3, which calls for faculty control over the pedagogical approaches used in specific learning situations.**

7. The faculty have three major concerns regarding initiative G, which focuses on faculty development.

   First, the initiative needs to be given greater priority by moving it up to an earlier position on the list. Its current placement as the last initiative in the plan, coupled with the language differences in the way it is written (see the following), suggest that currently it is only of secondary importance.

   Second, an unfortunate difference in tone separates this initiative from those that precede it. While the language in the other initiatives adopts a positive tone, identifying specific goals the CSU "will" achieve, the language relating to faculty development is much weaker, speaking only about making "systematic progress" in areas of faculty development. The language in this initiative needs to be strengthened to bring it in line with the initiatives in other areas, and the goals need to be spelled out more clearly.

   Third, faculty must be directly involved in the decisions over what is needed to promote faculty development and how it is to be implemented. This is particularly important in the case of those items specified in G-1: provision of a fair and reasonable reward system, the expansion of faculty roles, and a redefinition of scholarship. Faculty must be extensively involved in any decision-making in these areas. The current draft does not acknowledge the need for this involvement.

8. The Cornerstones Implementation Plan fails to give sufficient attention to the issue of resources. Without sufficient resources, the major changes, innovations, and expansion called for in the way CSU carries out its mission simply will not come about. The implementation plan must address the resource issue more directly. Elements of the plan on

which there is agreement in principle should not be implemented until resource needs are addressed adequately.

9. The plan fails to acknowledge that innovation requires the opportunity to experiment and take risks without penalty for failure. In the CSU, there currently exist disincentives that act as major barriers to experimentation and innovation in the way courses and programs are offered. Given the magnitude of the changes envisioned in the Cornerstones document, it is necessary that any implementation plan not only require the allocation of necessary resources, but also call for a systematic examination of existing barriers to innovation, such as the current heavy reliance on FTES in resource allocation decisions.

10. The draft of the Cornerstones Implementation Plan presents the picture of a centralized decision-making process in which priorities are set and carried out systemwide. This, however, is not the case. The plan must recognize, as does the original Cornerstones document, that ultimately these initiatives will be implemented on the individual campus, and not the system, level. The plan must also acknowledge that each CSU campus will have different needs, priorities, and opportunities, and allow for flexibility in the way individual campuses choose to implement Cornerstones.

11. The draft includes provisions that raise grave concern regarding intrusion into campus autonomy in curricular matters. In this regard section C-5, which proposes to move toward a common lower division core for each major, is particularly objectionable.

12. There is a surprising absence of initiatives for implementing a number of key Cornerstones principles in the current draft plan. Specifically, there is no mention of student responsibility in the education process (Cornerstones principle #3), there are no initiatives to address the issue of state financing of higher education (Cornerstones principle #8), and no mention is made of administrative responsibility. These gaps need to be addressed in any future version of the Cornerstones Implementation Plan.

Conclusion

The CSUS Faculty Senate strongly urges that the Board of Trustees not adopt any implementation plan for Cornerstones that fails to address the issues raised above. Any plan that fails to do so is unlikely to garner widespread support among CSU faculty and will ultimately prove unworkable.

Adopted by the CSUS Faculty Senate
December 10, 1998