

**Note: You'll want to bring the following: May 11, Attachment F**

1999-2000  
FACULTY SENATE  
California State University, Sacramento

**AGENDA**

Thursday, May 25, 2000  
Foothill Suite, University Union  
3:00 -5:00 p.m.

**OPEN FORUM**

**CONSENT CALENDAR**

**FS 00-57/GEP/GRC, Ex. GENERAL EDUCATION ASSESSMENT PROCESS**

The Faculty Senate receives and recommends approval of the "Proposal for GE Assessment Process: Description of Process and Principles to be Used to Establish Learning Outcomes and Assessment Methods for General Education" (Attachment).

**REGULAR AGENDA**

**FS 00-56/Flr. MINUTES**

Approval of Minutes of May 18 (#17), 2000.

**SECOND READING**

*[Action may be taken]*

**FS 00-43B/FPC, Ex., Flr. FACULTY MERIT INCREASE (FMI) PROGRAM—  
PROCEDURES, PART I, CSUS (Amends FS 99-56)**

The Faculty Senate recommends adoption of the following procedures for implementation of the 2000-2001 Faculty Merit Increase Program at CSUS [strikeouts and underlining reflect amendments approved at the May 18<sup>th</sup> Senate meeting]:

## GENERAL GUIDELINES

FMI criteria will be available to all faculty in advance of their decision to participate and to submit a Faculty Activity Report. Each Department and Program, as well as each Dean and the President, must develop and publish the criteria and the procedures they will use to evaluate their faculty and to decide upon the awards to be given. Each Department and Program will inform its faculty of the schedule of activities to be performed in evaluating and ~~making~~ recommending FMI awards at that level, just as Faculty and Staff Affairs provides a schedule for the whole process.

## CHOICE OF CATEGORIES

~~Within the categories of faculty activity set forth in the bargaining agreement, each faculty member may decide how to be evaluated. Faculty may choose to be evaluated for the quality of:~~

- ~~1. Teaching~~
- ~~2. Teaching and Scholarship~~
- ~~3. Teaching and Service to the University and Community~~
- ~~4. Teaching, Scholarship and Service to the University and Community~~

~~The choice of category shall not affect the maximum award to which an individual faculty member is eligible. Each Department and Program shall devise a system for evaluating and ranking the applicants within the categories chosen and the Department or Program Committee shall publish this system before faculty submit their Faculty Activity Reports.~~

~~While faculty members are allowed to choose the category(s) for evaluation, each shall address all aspects of their job assignment in their Faculty Activity Report.~~

Faculty will be evaluated on their work assignment within the categories of faculty activity set forth in the bargaining agreement, namely (1) quality and effectiveness of teaching, (2) scholarly and creative activities, and (3) service to the University and community. Each department shall use a system that will give appropriate weight, or range of weights, to these categories, consistent with their use in that department's retention, tenure and promotion (RTP) procedures.

Faculty unit employees whose performance does not include assignments in all of the areas shall nonetheless be eligible for a Faculty Merit Increase on the basis of their performance in the individual areas of their assignment. In cases wherein the individual's workload assignment deviates from or interferes with the performance of standard expectations, the faculty member shall be evaluated using criteria consistent with his/her assignment.

Submitted FARs must demonstrate satisfactory performance in all areas of the faculty member's work assignment. For purposes of the FMI process, "demonstrated satisfactory

performance” shall mean performance that effectively fulfills the obligation of the work assignment. Once satisfactory performance is demonstrated the individual’s choice of categories will control further review and will be the basis for recommending a FMI.

FS 00-43C/FPC, Ex. FACULTY MERIT INCREASE (FMI) PROGRAM--PROCEDURES,  
PART II, CSUS (Amends FS 99-56)

The Faculty Senate recommends adoption of the following procedures for implementation of the 2000-2001 Faculty Merit Increase Program at CSUS:

### **GENERAL GUIDELINES**

It is desirable that the Deans and the President will follow the judgements of the Departments or Programs in recommending FMI awards. Exceptions will be made where there are compelling reasons for acting otherwise. Such compelling reasons would include instances where 1) the FMI award process could be characterized as capricious or arbitrary, and 2) the FMI award clearly was not reflective of the person’s demonstrated performance.

FMI money is allocated to Departments and Programs on the basis of FTEF. In those cases when a Department or Program is able to recommend larger awards due to a low number of faculty applying for FMI awards, money may be moved by either the Dean or President to correct relative inequities between that Department or Program and others.

In such cases when a Dean or the President moves money, a published, written explanation must go out to the campus community detailing what amounts have been moved, where it was moved, and the rationale for doing so.

The Department level review committees or the chairs, Deans, and the President shall not systematically reduce the potential for part-time faculty within a unit to receive FMIs simply because of their part-time status.

### **AWARDS BY DEANS AND THE PRESIDENT**

Deans may recommend an FMI award independent of the award recommended at other levels based upon value added by a faculty member to the College through service performed. Similarly, the President may make an FMI award independent of the award recommended at other levels based upon value added by a faculty member to the University through service performed.

### **FULL DISCLOSURE**

The Department or Program must include a statement of the criteria and the process used when forwarding their list of recommended FMI awards to their Dean. The names of those recommended, those who receive awards and the size of the awards must be made public.

The Department or Program must disclose to individual faculty member the basis for their FMI award. In addition, the Dean must disclose to the individual faculty member the basis for the Dean's reduction or elimination of their FMI award. Likewise, the President must disclose to the individual faculty member the basis for the President's reduction or elimination of their FMI award. The disclosure at all levels will not be made public.

FS 00-43A/FPC, Ex. FACULTY MERIT INCREASE (FMI) PROGRAM--PRINCIPLES,  
CSUS

The Faculty Senate recommends adoption of a statement of principles, providing the rationale for the campus "Procedures for Implementing the Faculty Merit Increase (FMI) Program" (May 11, 2000, Faculty Senate Agenda Attachment F).

## INFORMATION

1. Report on Faculty Endowment Fund (B. Buckley)
2. Reminder to mark your calendars: Senate Retreat, Wednesday, August 23, 2000
3. Senate Home Page: <http://www.csus.edu/acse/> or CSUS Home Page *then* Administration and Policy *then* Administration *then* Faculty Senate

California State  
9500 J Street  
Sacramento, California 95819-6036

5/25/00

Faculty Senate Received  
413

May 10, 2000

TO: Bob Buckley, Chair  
Faculty Senate

FROM: Mary Ann Reihman, Chair  
GEP/GRC

RE: Proposal for GE assessment process

*MAR*

*FS 00-57  
Withdrawn  
5/25/00*

Issue:

CSU system campus accountability reporting requirements specify that each campus is to submit a report that describes the processes and principles by which the campus is establishing learning outcomes and assessment methods for both degree programs and general education. The first such report is due in August 2000. Subsequent yearly reports must include a description of the methods that will be used to assure that students are achieving core competencies of general education.

Background:

The CSUS Policies Pertaining to the General Education Program and Course/Proficiency Requirements for Graduation with the Baccalaureate Degree document (1991) outlines a procedure for GE Area review and assessment. While Area assessment was begun by GEP/GRC, the process was never fully implemented. In Fall 1999, the Faculty Senate approved a new procedure for GE Area Review. The difficulty is that this process would require five years to complete and the CSU has specified that assessment results for all GE areas be reported in approximately two years. The attached proposal describes a process have an assessment process in place within the required timeframe.

Committee's Recommended Action:

GEP/GRC proposes that the attached proposal for a GE assessment process be endorsed by the Senate Executive Committee.

Arguments in favor:

The described process will allow broad faculty consultation in developing GE learning outcomes and assessment methods, provides a timeframe that allows the campus to develop GE learning outcomes in a thoughtful manner and also to respond to CSU system reporting requirements, and requests University resources to support the assessment effort.

Arguments against. None noted

**PROPOSAL FOR GE ASSESSMENT PROCESS:  
DESCRIPTION OF PROCESS AND PRINCIPLES TO BE USED TO ESTABLISH  
LEARNING OUTCOMES AND ASSESSMENT METHODS FOR GENERAL  
EDUCATION**

**Introduction**

In March 2000, CSUS received a memorandum documenting timelines and expectations for campus accountability reports. Beginning in August 2000, CSUS is to submit a report that describes the processes and principles by which the campus is establishing learning outcomes and assessment methods for both degree programs and general education. The report is to include a description of the methods that will be used to assure that students are achieving the core competencies or foundational skills of general education.

Also in March 2000, CSUS faculty attended the CSU Conference on Assessing General Education Learning Outcomes. The recurring themes presented at the Conference help frame this proposal for the process and principles to be used in assessing learning outcomes for General Education at CSUS.

Additionally, the proposal for an assessment seminar focused on General Education that was developed by Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Programs and the GE Area Review Proposal approved by the Faculty Senate in Fall 1999 have been incorporated in this current proposal.

**Rationale for proposal**

In his summary of the CSU Conference on Assessing General Education Learning Outcomes, Professor William Dorman outlined several principles the participants learned. These two of these principles are: 1) assessment must be faculty owned and consultation must be as broad as possible and 2) avoid the ready-aim-fire syndrome (successful assessment involves a series of steps and a sequence in which they must be taken). One of the Principles of Good Practice for Assessing Student Learning that were developed under the auspices of the AAHE Assessment Forum is that “assessment works best when it is ongoing, not episodic ... [and] is a process whose power is cumulative.” In his address to the participants of the conference, Dr. Dan Barwick (Provost Fellow, SUNY) stressed that assessment done properly is a major initiative that requires time, money, and energy.

While recognizing the need for a concentrated effort to develop GE student learning outcomes and assessment methods, GE assessment should be an ongoing process that the University supports with adequate resources. This proposal calls for a year-long process to develop GE area learning outcomes and assessment plans. Area coordinators with assigned time will convene area faculty to develop consensus on area goals, learning outcomes and possible assessment methods. The proposal also describes a second year process that has the potential to be developed into an ongoing means for coordinating GE

assessment. The processes described involve broad faculty consultation, follow a logical sequence, can evolve into an ongoing process, and require University resources.

### **Process for establishing GE learning outcomes and methods of assessment**

#### **GE Area Coordinators Fall 2000-Fall 2001**

As proposed by the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, area coordinators will be appointed for each of the five GE Areas. The GE Area Coordinators will be selected in Fall 2000. During the Fall semester, the Coordinators will be expected to participate in weekly meetings convened by the Interim University Assessment Coordinator. The goal of this activity will be to familiarize the area coordinators with such aspects of GE assessment as methods for developing learning outcomes and types of assessment instruments in current use. The GE Area Coordinators may also initiate conversations with area faculty.

In Spring 2001, each area coordinator will convene faculty from all departments that teach courses in their respective GE area (in those areas with sub-areas, several such groups could be convened) for conversations about "...what constitutes outcomes that can and should be assessed within that area" (as describe by Professor Dorman in his conference summary). The goal of this activity is to develop explicit, agreed upon student learning outcomes in each GE area. These will be reported by the end of Spring 2001 and Fall 2001 semester to the GE Policy/Graduation Requirements Committee (GEP/GRC).

With the assistance of the Interim University Assessment Coordinator, the GE area coordinators will be responsible for examining the assessment literature for "best assessment practices", possible outcome models, and available testing instruments that could potentially be used in their area. These materials will be brought to the area faculty for discussion. (Dorman conference summary). The goal of this activity is to define assessment plans for each GE area. These plans will be reported to GEP/GRC by the end of Spring 2001 and Fall 2001.

The GE area coordinators will also be expected to meet periodically as a group to discuss progress in the development of learning goals and assessment plans. The Interim University Assessment Coordinator could serve as the convener of the area coordinators.

Each GE area coordinator will receive 3 units of assigned time per semester for Spring 2001 and Fall 2001.

#### **Principles to be used in the development of learning outcomes (as summarized by Professor Dorman)**

1. GE assessment must only be used to improve teaching and learning.

2. Assessment must be faculty owned and consultation must be as broad as possible.
3. Patience is absolutely essential.
4. There is no need to reinvent assessment methods. (There is a robust literature.)
5. GE program assessment must not be based on too many goals and objectives.
6. There is a series to steps that should be followed in developing learning outcomes and assessment methods.

### **GE Assessment Coordinator (beginning in Spring 2001)**

The GE Assessment Coordinator will be responsible for overseeing and coordinating the assessment plans developed in the previous year. The duties of this position will be to meet or communicate with faculty in each area to clarify the assessment activities that will occur in the area and to serve as a resource person to facilitate the process. At the conclusion of each semester, the assessment coordinator will compile a report on the types of assessment activities that occurred and how area faculty will use the results obtained. The report will be presented to GEP/GRC. The GE Assessment Coordinator will also convene area faculty to obtain their input on the assessment plan and help faculty evaluate the plan.

The GE Assessment Coordinator will receive six units of assigned time per semester.

This position will be evaluated at the end of Spring 2001 to determine whether the level of funding is appropriate.

### **GEP/GRC role**

Early in Fall 2000, the GE Policy/Graduation Requirements Committee will develop a glossary of assessment vocabulary for use by area faculty in the development of student learning outcomes and assessment plans. (Suggested in Professor Dorman's conference summary.)

After receiving the reports of the Area Coordinators in Spring 2001 and Fall 2001, GEP/GRC will be responsible for drafting a report describing the process and principles used to develop GE learning outcomes and methods of assessment. The report will include a summary of the learning outcomes and assessment plans developed by the five GE areas. This report will be forwarded to the Faculty Senate and the Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Education.

Upon receipt of the report of the GE Assessment Coordinator, GEP/GRC will forward the reports to the Senate and the Associate Vice President.

During Spring 2001, GEP/GRC will evaluate the GE Assessment Coordinator position and will provide a recommendation to the Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Programs on level of funding and role of the position.



### **General Education Course Review Subcommittee (GECRSC) role**

While the role of GEP/GRC in the GE Review process approved by the Faculty Senate in Fall 1999 will be replaced by the process described above, the GECRSC will continue the area by area syllabus review process approved by the Senate. Syllabi for one GE area will be collected and reviewed during each academic year, as described in the Senate document. The committee workload would be too great if all GE courses were reviewed during a single academic year.

**Faculty Merit Increase (FMI) Program  
PROPOSED REVISIONS TO CSUS PROCEDURES**

**“Table of Contents”**

**FS 0043B/FPC,Ex. FACULTY MERIT INCREASE (FMI) PROGRAM  
PROCEDURES, PART I, CSUS  
(amends FS 99-56)**

**GENERAL GUIDELINES - original**

*MOTION #1. DON HALL*  
*MOTION #2. MARJORIE GELUS*

**CHOICE OF CATEGORIES - original**

*MOTION #3. MARJORIE GELUS*  
*MOTION #4. PETER LUND and LEW ROBINSON*  
*MOTION #5. DON HALL*  
*MOTION #6. JOAN BAUERLY*  
*MOTION #7. BILL ZACK and MATT MCCORMICK*

**FS 0043C/FPC,Ex. FACULTY MERIT INCREASE (FMI) PROGRAM  
PROCEDURES, PART II, CSUS  
(amends FS 99-56)**

**GENERAL GUIDELINES - original**

*MOTION #8. JOAN BAUERLY*

**AWARDS BY DEANS AND THE PRESIDENT - original**

*MOTION #9. MARJORIE GELUS*

**FULL DISCLOSURE - original**

*MOTION #10. PETER LUND*  
*MOTION #11. MARJORIE GELUS*

FS 0043B/FPC, Ex. FACULTY MERIT INCREASE (FMI) PROGRAM  
PROCEDURES, PART I, CSUS  
(amends FS 99-56)

GENERAL GUIDELINES - original

FMI criteria will be available to all faculty in advance of their decision to participate and to submit a Faculty Activity Report.

Each Department and Program must develop and publish the criteria they will use to evaluate their faculty and to decide upon the awards to be given.

Each Department and Program will inform its faculty of the schedule of activities to be performed in evaluating and making FMI awards.

*recommending*  
*Carried*

\*\*\*\*\*

MOTION #1. DON HALL

Change the second sentence (above) to the following:

*Each Department and Program must develop and publish the criteria and the procedures they will use to evaluate their faculty and to decide upon the awards to be given.*

NOTE. The word "procedures" is added to criteria.

\*\*\*\*\*

MOTION #2. MARJORIE GELUS

*Carried*

Change the second sentence (above) to the following:

*Each Department and Program, as well as each Dean and the President, must develop and publish the criteria they will use to evaluate their faculty and to decide upon the awards to be given.*

NOTE: "as well as each Dean and the President" is added.

Add to the end of the last sentence (above) the following:

*...at that level, just as Faculty and Staff Affairs provides a schedule for the whole process.*

\*\*\*\*\*

## CHOICE OF CATEGORIES - original

Within the categories of faculty activity set forth in the bargaining agreement, each faculty member may decide how to be evaluated. Faculty may choose to be evaluated for the quality of:

1. Teaching
2. Teaching and Scholarship
3. Teaching and Service to the University and Community
4. Teaching, Scholarship and Service to the University and Community

The choice of category shall not affect the maximum award to which an individual faculty member is eligible. Each Department and Program shall devise a system for evaluating and ranking the applicants within the categories chosen and the Department or Program Committee shall publish this system before faculty submit their Faculty Activity Reports.

While faculty members are allowed to choose the category(s) for evaluation, each shall address all aspects of their job assignment in their Faculty Activity Report.

\*\*\*\*\*

### **MOTION #3. MARJORIE GELUS**

*Rename and replace CHOICE OF CATEGORIES with FOCUS OF EVALUATION and the following statement:*

*Faculty will be evaluated in the area(s) of their work assignment as described in the MOU, commensurate with rank. While all criteria must be consistent with the language of the MOU, there are legitimate reasons why those at different levels of review might vary in detail and emphasis. What is important is that the criteria at all levels be published in advance.*

*NOTE: From Article 31, Section 7:*

*“Faculty shall be eligible for FMI awards for demonstrated performance commensurate with rank, work assignment, and years of service, for:*

- a. The quality of the unit member’s teaching alone;*
- b. The quality of the unit member’s teaching and scholarship*
- c. The quality of the unit member’s teaching and service to the University and community; **OR***
- d. The quality of the unit member’s teaching, scholarship, and service to the University and community.”*

## **CHOICE OF CATEGORIES - original**

Within the categories of faculty activity set forth in the bargaining agreement, each faculty member may decide how to be evaluated. Faculty may choose to be evaluated for the quality of:

1. Teaching
2. Teaching and Scholarship
3. Teaching and Service to the University and Community
4. Teaching, Scholarship and Service to the University and Community

The choice of category shall not affect the maximum award to which an individual faculty member is eligible. Each Department and Program shall devise a system for evaluating and ranking the applicants within the categories chosen and the Department or Program Committee shall publish this system before faculty submit their Faculty Activity Reports.

While faculty members are allowed to choose the category(s) for evaluation, each shall address all aspects of their job assignment in their Faculty Activity Report.

\*\*\*\*\*

### ***MOTION #4. PETER LUND AND LEW ROBINSON***

*Rename and replace CHOICE OF CATEGORIES with DEPARTMENT PROCEDURES and the following:*

*Each Department and Program shall devise procedures for evaluating applicants and recommending awards. To the extent possible, given FMI timelines and incompatibilities between FMI and ARTP structures, existing ARTP policies and procedures shall be used. In particular, the job performance categories evaluated with existing ARTP procedures shall be evaluated for FMI awards.*

## CHOICE OF CATEGORIES - original

Within the categories of faculty activity set forth in the bargaining agreement, each faculty member may decide how to be evaluated. Faculty may choose to be evaluated for the quality of:

1. Teaching
2. Teaching and Scholarship
3. Teaching and Service to the University and Community
4. Teaching, Scholarship and Service to the University and Community

The choice of category shall not affect the maximum award to which an individual faculty member is eligible. Each Department and Program shall devise a system for evaluating and ranking the applicants within the categories chosen and the Department or Program Committee shall publish this system before faculty submit their Faculty Activity Reports.

While faculty members are allowed to choose the category(s) for evaluation, each shall address all aspects of their job assignment in their Faculty Activity Report.

\*\*\*\*\*

**MOTION #5.**

**DON HALL**

*Carried*

Replace and rename *CHOICE OF CATEGORIES* with ***GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATIVE CRITERIA AND STANDARDS*** and the following:

*Faculty will be evaluated on their work assignment within the categories of faculty activity set forth in the bargaining agreement, namely (1) quality and effectiveness of teaching, (2) scholarly and creative activities, and (3) service to the University and community. Each department shall use a system that will give appropriate weight, or range of weights, to these categories, consistent with their use in that department's retention, tenure and promotion (RTP) procedures.*

*Faculty unit employees whose performance does not include assignments in all of the areas shall nonetheless be eligible for a Faculty Merit Increase on the basis of their performance in the individual areas of their assignment. In cases wherein the individual's workload assignment deviates from or interferes with the performance of standard expectations, the faculty member shall be evaluated using criteria consistent with his/her assignment*

*As the depth, breadth and sophistication are gained with experience; expectations of performance may in some respects be greater for Full Professors than for Associate Professors; greater for Associate Professors than for Assistant Professors, and greater for increasing years of service within each rank.*

**CHOICE OF CATEGORIES - original**

Within the categories of faculty activity set forth in the bargaining agreement, each faculty member may decide how to be evaluated. Faculty may choose to be evaluated for the quality of:

1. Teaching
2. Teaching and Scholarship
3. Teaching and Service to the University and Community
4. Teaching, Scholarship and Service to the University and Community

The choice of category shall not affect the maximum award to which an individual faculty member is eligible. Each Department and Program shall devise a system for evaluating and ranking the applicants within the categories chosen and the Department or Program Committee shall publish this system before faculty submit their Faculty Activity Reports.

While faculty members are allowed to choose the category(s) for evaluation, each shall address all aspects of their job assignment in their Faculty Activity Report.

\*\*\*\*\*

**MOTION #6. JOAN BAUERLY**

*mito # 5 awarded*

Replace the last paragraph with the following:

*Submitted FARs must demonstrate satisfactory performance in all areas of the faculty member's work assignment. For purposes of the FMI process, 'demonstrated satisfactory performance' shall mean performance that effectively fulfills the obligation of the work assignment (from Don Hall). Once satisfactory performance is demonstrated the individual's choice of categories will control further review and will be the basis for ~~awarding a FMI.~~  
*recommending**

\*\*\*\*\*

**MOTION #7. BILL ZACK AND MATT MCCORMICK**

*In the case of temporary faculty, each faculty member's merit should allow for consideration of scholarship and/or service to the University and the community.*

**FS 0043C/FPC,Ex. FACULTY MERIT INCREASE (FMI) PROGRAM  
PROCEDURES, PART II, CSUS  
(amends FS 99-56)**

**GENERAL GUIDELINES - original**

It is desirable that the Deans and the President will follow the judgements of the Departments or Programs in recommending FMI awards. Exceptions will be made where there are compelling reasons for acting otherwise. Such compelling reasons would include instances where 1) the FMI award process could be characterized as capriciously or arbitrarily made, and 2) the FMI award clearly was not reflective of the person's demonstrated performance.

FMI money is allocated to Departments and Programs on the basis of FTEF. In those cases when a Department or Program is able to make larger awards due to a low number of faculty applying for FMI awards, money may be moved by either the Dean or President to correct relative inequities between that Department or Program and others.

In such cases when a Dean or the President moves money, a published, written explanation must go out to the campus community detailing what amounts have been moved, where it was moved, and the rationale for doing so.

The Department level review committees or the chairs, Deans, and the President shall not systematically reduce the potential for part-time faculty within a unit to receive FMIs simply because of their part-time status.

\*\*\*\*\*

**MOTION #8.      JOAN BAUERLY**  
★ #11,

*Replace the last sentence in the first paragraph with:*

*Such compelling reasons would be the failure of a Department or Program to publish their FMI evaluation criteria or to make FMI awards consistent with their published FMI evaluation criteria.*



**AWARDS BY DEANS AND THE PRESIDENT - original**

Deans may recommend an FMI award independent of the award recommended at other levels based upon value added by a faculty member to the College through service performed. Similarly, the President may make an FMI award independent of the award made at other levels based upon value added by a faculty member to the University through service performed.

\*\*\*\*\*

***MOTION #9. MARJORIE GELUS***

*Delete this section.*

**FULL DISCLOSURE - original**

The Department or Program must include a statement of the criteria and the process used when forwarding their list of recommended FMI awards to their Dean.

The names of those recommended, those who receive awards and the size of the awards must be made public. The Department or Program must disclose to individual faculty member the basis for their FMI award. In addition, the Dean must disclose to the individual faculty member the basis for the Dean's reduction or elimination of their FMI award. Likewise, the President must disclose to the individual faculty member the basis for the President's reduction or elimination of their FMI award. The disclosure at all levels will not be made public.

\*\*\*\*\*

**MOTION #10. PETER LUND**

*Change to indicate that disclosures to individual faculty members would be at their request. Replace the paragraph with the following:*

*The names of those recommended, those who receive awards and the size of the awards must be made public. The Department or Program must disclose to individual member faculty, **at their request**, the basis for their FMI award. In addition, the Dean must disclose to the individual faculty member, **at their request**, the basis for the Dean's reduction or elimination of their FMI award. Likewise, the President must disclose to the individual faculty member, **at their request**, the basis for the President's reduction or elimination of their FMI award. The disclosure at all levels will not be made public.*

\*\*\*\*\*

**MOTION #11. MARJORIE GELUS**

*Replace paragraph with the following:*

*The FMI process must be characterized by openness. The names of those recommended, those who receive awards, and the size of the awards must be public knowledge. In addition, the rationale used for making awards must be clearly communicated. In those cases where an award is reduced or eliminated, the reasons must also be communicated to the affected faculty person. Furthermore, a fair and equitable appeal process requires that appellants be provided with a clear explanation of all actions taken.*

*NOTE. This is a copy of Principle 7 from FS 00-43A.*

5/25/00

Unit senators/alternates who have been absent for at last two meetings:

1. Bayard
2. Cameron-Wedding
3. Carper
4. Gunston-Parks
5. Jaoudi
6. Kim
7. LeFebvre
8. Lewis
9. Maxwell
10. Rosegard
11. Russell
12. Smith
13. Tice

$$66 - 13 = 53/2 = 26.5$$

$$\text{Quorum} = 28$$