

1999-2000
FACULTY SENATE
California State University, Sacramento

AGENDA

Thursday, September 23, 1999
Foothill Suite, UU

MOMENT OF SILENCE

KAZUO "CASEY" NINOMIYA
Professor of Geography Emeritus
CSUS 1970-1990

ALICE FARRELL
Librarian Emeritus
CSUS 1968-1989

CAROL BERG
Credentials Analyst, College of Education
CSUS 1973-1997

OPEN FORUM

CONSENT CALENDAR

FS 99-63/Ex. PARLIAMENTARIAN

William Dillon, Professor of Government, shall serve as Parliamentarian for the 1999-2000 Faculty Senate.

FS 99-64/CPC, Ex. CURRICULUM REVIEW¹--COMPUTER ENGINEERING PROGRAM

The Faculty Senate receives the commendations and recommendations (Attachment A) of the Curriculum Policies Committee on the program review of the Computer Engineering Program and recommends that the Computer Engineering Program be approved for a period of six years or until the next scheduled program review.

¹ The complete program review is available for review in the Faculty Senate office, SAC 254.

FS 99-65/CPC, Ex. CURRICULUM REVIEW²--DEPARTMENT OF ART

~~Computer Engineering Program~~
ART DEPT

The Faculty Senate receives the commendations and recommendations (Attachment B) of the Program Review Team on the program review of the ~~Computer Engineering Program~~ and recommends that the approval of the BA and MA in Art be extended for two years, pending a report from the department to the Dean of the College of Arts and Letters and the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs by the start of the Spring 2001 semester (rather than Spring 2000 as recommended), demonstrating satisfactory progress on recommendations 1, 2, 9, 11, 12, 23, and 24 of this report, i.e.:

"1. formally develop an Academic Plan. This plan should consist of a Vision Statement that states where the department wishes to go; a Mission Statement that states the department's fundamental values and goals; and a Strategic Plan that states the specific steps that the department will take to achieve these goals. To assist them in this process the Department should hire an outside facilitator. This Academic Plan is to be submitted to the Dean of the College of Arts and Letters and the Vice President of Academic Affairs for their joint approval by Spring, 2000. (pp. 5-6)

"2. undertake a rigorous study of its curriculum starting with a survey of its five-year enrollment pattern in its lower and upper division offerings and also redesign its core program and submit this study to the Dean of Arts and Letters and the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs for their joint approval by Spring, 2000. (p. 7)

"9. prepare a detailed plan for adjusting the faculty work week both collectively and individually in order to focus more effort on teaching, student advising, availability to students outside of class, and department, college, and university committee work. This plan is to be submitted to the Dean of the College of Arts and Letters and to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs for their joint approval by Spring, 2000. (pp. 18-19)

"11. review the policy that requires all graduate students to enroll in Art 222: Studio Critique every semester and provide the Dean of Arts and Letters with a satisfactory justification by Spring, 2000 if a change is not warranted. (p. 21)

"12. conduct a systematic study of its grading practices, including a comparison of the final grades assigned in studio art classes to art history classes and submit a report of its findings and actions to be undertaken to the Dean of Arts and Letters and the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs for their joint approval by Spring, 2000. (p. 23)

"23. conduct a feasibility study on creating a Bachelor of Arts in Art History and submit a report of its findings to the Dean of Arts and Letters and the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs by Spring, 2000. (pp. 30-31)

"24. conduct a feasibility study on creating a concentration in Art Education and submit a report of its findings to the Dean of Arts and Letters and the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs by Spring, 2000. (p. 31)"

The Faculty Senate also recommends that the Chair of the Art Department and the Dean of Arts and Letters meet with the Senate Executive Committee at its first meeting of Fall 2000

² The complete program review is available for review in the Faculty Senate office, SAC 254.

to provide an oral report on the progress the Art Department has made in regard to the recommendations.

FS 99-66/Ex. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS – SENATE

As shown in Attachment C.

FS 99-67/Ex. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS--UNIVERSITY

As shown in Attachment C.

CONSENT INFORMATION

FS 99-46/Ex. VISITING SCHOLARS PROGRAM (Supersedes AS 89-102)

The Faculty Senate recommends adoption of the following (see Attachment D) for purposes of administering any Visiting Scholars Program at CSUS.

FS 99-51/CPC, Ex. CERTIFICATE OF ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT--COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACULTY PREPARATION

The Faculty Senate recommends approval of the Community College Faculty Preparation Certification Program (Attachment E).

FS 99-52/CPC, Ex. PROGRAM REVIEW PROCEDURES, AMENDMENT OF

The Faculty Senate recommends approval of the following two amendments for inclusion in the CSUS Program Review Procedures:

1. Panels have authority to 1) accept either a program review team recommendation or a recommendation (or deletion) proposed by the department, or 2) devise an alternative recommendations specifically related to the issue in dispute.
2. The panel shall first submit its report to the program review team so that the team has an opportunity to make any editorial changes and correct any errors of fact suggested by the panel, and accept any substantive changes in recommendations made by the panel.

FS 99-55/Ex. PROGRAM CHANGE PROPOSAL

The Executive Committee, on behalf of the Faculty Senate, recommends approval of the proposed changes to the Department of Management's Operations Management Concentration (Attachment F).

FS 99-56/Ex. FACULTY MERIT INCREASE PROGRAM (to supersede PM FSA 99-02)

The Executive Committee, on behalf of the Faculty Senate, recommends approval of the proposed Program for Faculty Merit Increase (Attachment G).

FS 99-57/Ex. CREDENTIAL PROGRAM, LIBRARY MEDIA TEACHER SERVICES

The Executive Committee, on behalf of the Faculty Senate, recommends approval of the Library Media Teacher Services Credential Program (Attachment H).

**FS 99-58/Ex. CERTIFICATE OF ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT--READING
CERTIFICATE/READING PROGRAM**

The Executive Committee, on behalf of the Faculty Senate, recommends approval of the Reading Certificate/Reading Program (Attachment I).

FS 99-59/Ex. NAMING OF ATHLETIC TRACK COMPLEX

The Executive Committee, on behalf of the Faculty Senate, unanimously endorses the naming of the CSUS athletic track complex after its benefactor, Alex Spanos.

**FS 99-60/Ex. PETER H. SHATTUCK HIGHER EDUCATION FUND OF THE
SACRAMENTO REGIONAL FOUNDATION, ACCEPTANCE OF FIRST
ANNUAL DONATION FROM THE**

The Senate Chair, on behalf of the Senate, accepts the first annual \$1,000 donation from the "Peter H. Shattuck Higher Education Fund of the Sacramento Regional Foundation" for "the advancement of faculty governance" at CSU, Sacramento. A letter to that effect shall be sent to the Foundation indicating that, according to their instructions, the donation will be deposited in a Faculty Senate account and the Foundation will be provided with an annual accounting of how the money is used.

REGULAR AGENDA**FS 99-61/Flr. MINUTES**

Approval of the Minutes of May 20 (#20), 1999.

FS 99-62/Flr. MINUTES

Approval of the Minutes of April 22 (#1) and May 6 (#2), 1999.

SECOND READING ITEMS (Action may be taken)**FS 99-68A/Ex. WAIVER OF FIRST READING OF FS 99-68**

The Faculty Senate waives the first reading of FS 99-68, Senate Floor Procedures.

FS 99-68/Ex. SENATE FLOOR PROCEDURES (FS 99-05)

The Faculty Senate approves the continuation through Fall 1999 of the "Senate Floor Procedures for the Spring 1999 Semester" (Attachment J), adopted in FS 99-05.

FIRST READING ITEMS (Discussion only; no action)

**FS 99-69/GEP/GRC, Ex. G.E. AREAS--PROCEDURES FOR REVIEW
{Mary Ann Reihman, Chair, General Education Policies/Graduation Requirements
Committee; refer to Attachment K-1 for background.}**

The Faculty Senate approves the proposed procedures for review of G.E. Areas (Attachment K-2).

FS 99-59
FS 99-64

FS 99-65

INFORMATION

1. Tentative Fall 1999 Faculty Senate Meeting Schedule:
 - October 21 John C. Livingston Annual Faculty Lecture, University Theatre Oct 14
 - October 28 Senate Meeting
 - November 18 Senate Meeting -NOV 11
 - December 9 Senate Meeting
2. Senate Home Page (<http://www.csus.edu/acse/> or CSUS Home Page then Administration and Policy then Administration then Faculty Senate) - Senator Arthur Jensen

**COMMENDATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
OF THE PROGRAM REVIEW TEAM
FOR THE COMPUTER ENGINEERING PROGRAM
COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING AND COMPUTER SCIENCE**

The Computer Engineering Program is commended for:

1. The high quality of the program.
2. The faculty's excellent work and flexibility in dealing with a program that has shown continuous growth.
3. The dedication, leadership, and insight provided by the Program Coordinator who has helped build what is considered an enormously successful program.
4. The high reputation it enjoys from its alumni and industry.
5. The Alumni Outcome Assessment and its Implementation Plan.
6. The relationships with the private sector that have helped create internship opportunities.
7. The excellent industry contacts and support system that the faculty in the Program have helped to create.
8. Its continuing effort in maintaining currency.

**The Review Team Recommends that the
Computer Engineering Program and Its Faculty:**

1. Engage in a dialog with the Department of Mathematics and Statistics at CSUS to evaluate the content and depth of coverage of topics in Discrete Mathematics (Math 101) course (page 6).
2. Consider Formalizing a process that would assure CSc and E&EE are made aware of any proposed changes in the CpE curriculum that might affect the offerings in CSc and E&EE and that they have input in those decisions (page 7).
3. Create a triple ladder approach to curriculum so that students can focus on CSc, E&EE or CpE electives (page 7).

4. Place emphasis on increasing the communication (verbal and written) skills within the current class offerings (page 10).
5. Identify in a separate bulletin board the faculty participating in the program each semester and display the advisee list for each CpE faculty. Also, use the homepage of the program to update the names of participating faculty and advisee list each semester (page 11).
6. Investigate, in consultation with E&EE, CSc the development of a governance document to establish the relationship between E&EE, CSc and CpE (page 17).
7. Consider establishing a mechanism for informal peer review for RTP considerations of CpE faculty in their home departments (page 17).
8. Create a system of advising load so all CpE faculty can have equitable advising responsibilities in both the home department and the CpE program (page 17).
9. Form a committee to consider the possibility of offering a Master's in CpE in response to alumni interest (page 18).

**The Review Team Recommends that the
Dean of the College of Engineering and Computer Science:**

1. Consider re-scoping the coordinator's position and compensation to reflect the enormous load of responsibilities the CpE program coordinator is expected to carry (page 9).
2. Develop a mechanism that allows for mentoring of new program coordinators during transitions. In the event that a current member of the faculty is not identified as program coordinator, an external search should occur for the position allowing a period of mentorship during the transition (page 9).
3. Encourage applied research of faculty through release time necessary to develop industry relationships (page 12).
4. Improve accessibility to the building for students during the evenings and the weekends (page 15).

5. Develop a plan together with the CpE faculty to procure more laboratory space (page 16).
6. Assign a secretary dedicated to the CpE Program who reports directly to the CpE Program coordinator (page 16).
7. Consider a means of guaranteeing representation of the CpE program on all College-level policy and decision making panels (page 17).
8. Consider means of easing the advising load of the CpE program coordinator by finding an equitable way of allocating advising responsibilities to faculty in the program (page 17).

Recommendation to the Academic Senate:

The Review Team recommends that the Computer Engineering Program be approved for a period of six years or until the next scheduled program review.

COMMENDATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE PROGRAM REVIEW
REPORT FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF ART

Commendations to the Department of Art

The Department of Art is commended for its:

1. drawing-based curriculum.
2. Visiting Artists Program which brought three distinguished artists-in-residence to the campus in 1997-98.
3. contributions to the Strategic Goals of the University.
4. exhibitions of student art on campus.
5. cooperation with the Departments of Health and Physical Education (Dance), Music, and Interior Design in co-sponsoring exhibitions, workshops, and lectures.
6. its beginning improvements to its advising program and for its attempts to increase communication with its majors.
7. addition of a Career Advising Program.
8. commitment to gender equity as seen in the recent hirings in art history.
9. faculty's distinguished record of creativity and scholarship.
10. graduate program which its students praise for its faculty support and encouragement of individual artistic styles.
11. Chair for providing more effective leadership in addressing the issues raised in the 1992 Program Review and for his cooperation with the current Program Review Team.

Recommendations to the Department of Art

It is recommended that the Department of Art:

1. formally develop an Academic Plan. This plan should consist of a Vision Statement that states where the department wishes to go; a Mission Statement that states the department's fundamental values and goals; and a Strategic Plan that states the specific steps that the department will take to achieve those goals. To assist them in this process the department should hire an outside facilitator. This Academic

Plan is to be submitted to the Dean of the College of Arts and Letters and the Vice President of Academic Affairs for their joint approval by Spring, 2000. (pp.5-6)

2. undertake a rigorous study of its curriculum starting with a survey of its five-year enrollment pattern in its lower and upper division offerings and also redesign its core program and submit this study to the Dean of Arts and Letters and the Vice President for Academic Affairs for their joint approval by Spring, 2000. (p. 7)
3. develop a one unit course or require a non-credit six-hour lecture to introduce its students to the core requirements, portfolio assessment, internships, community and service learning information, and the business of being an artist. (p. 8)
4. review the lower and upper-division course offerings to ensure that they are all offered in the evening on a regular basis. (p. 12)
5. create an Advisory Board composed of faculty, arts patrons, members of the business community, artists, and alumni. (p. 13)
6. create a Department Newsletter. (p. 13)
7. identify high potential projects. (p. 13)
8. include in all faculty vita information on classes taught and service to the department, college, and university. (p. 17)
9. prepare a detailed plan for adjusting the faculty work week both collectively and individually in order to focus more effort on teaching, student advising, availability to students outside of class, and department, college, and university committee work. This plan is to be submitted to the Dean of the College of Arts and Letters and to the Vice President for Academic Affairs for their joint approval by Spring, 2000. (pp. 18-19)
10. provide an accurate and complete analysis of the cost of materials and tools required for each art course, compile a list for each class, and include it in the footnotes of the University's Schedule of Classes each semester. (p. 21)
11. review the policy that requires all graduate students to enroll in Art 222: Studio Critique every semester and provide

the Dean of Arts and Letters with a satisfactory justification by Spring, 2000 if a change is not warranted. (p. 21)

12. conduct a systematic study of its grading practices, including a comparison of the final grades assigned in studio art classes to art history classes and submit a report of its findings and actions to be undertaken to the Dean of Arts and Letters and the Vice President for Academic Affairs for their joint approval by Spring, 2000. (p. 23)
13. appoint a full-time faculty member as Coordinator of the Teacher Preparation Program. (p. 25)
14. review the student teaching experience in order to ensure a more regulated assignment that is consistent with other single subject experiences. (p. 25)
15. review the standards for admission into the credential program to correct the current bias for a portfolio of studio art rather than academic background. (p. 25)
16. appoint an ad hoc committee to design a credential program that can be complete in four and one-half years. (p. 25)
17. submit courses in the art department curriculum to the General Education Committee for GE approval so that Art majors may double count their Advanced Studies course and use lower-division courses to meet Areas C2 and C4. (pp. 25-26)
18. conduct "Town Hall Meetings" for students three times each semester. (p. 26)
19. devote one full-time, step one position to part-time hires. (p. 27)
20. form a partnership with the College Art Association's Professional Development Fellow's Program to employ a recent MFA graduate as a full-time lecturer. (pp. 27-28)
21. as faculty retire, be allowed to hire eight tenure-track positions (art history, art education, studio art) over the next six-eight years. (p. 28)
22. develop a policy that requires all instructors to administer the student evaluation of their classes before the last week of classes (or at least not on the final day of class) and that this policy contain a "script" on the purpose and

procedures for student evaluations in the department to be read at the start of the evaluation, require all faculty to leave the classroom while students fill out the evaluation, and have a designated student be responsible for delivering class evaluations to the department office immediately after class. (p. 30)

23. conduct a feasibility study on creating a Bachelor of Arts in Art History and submit a report of its findings to the Dean of Arts and Letters and the Vice President for Academic Affairs by Spring, 2000. (pp. 30-31)
24. conduct a feasibility study on creating a concentration in Art Education and submit a report of its findings to the Dean of Arts and Letters and the Vice President for Academic Affairs by Spring, 2000. (p. 31)
25. ensure that syllabi for all upper-division courses state explicitly the higher expectations for enrolled graduate students. (p. 32)
26. provide syllabi that state explicitly all course requirements and how the final grade for the course will be determined. (p. 32)
27. require the Chair to check each semester to determine if the content of each course corresponds to its syllabus and to the course description in the University Catalog and submit a report of his findings to the Dean of Arts and Letters at the end of each academic year. (p. 32)
28. provide each student with a two-year schedule of classes and include a flow chart of how individual classes relate to each other for the proper sequence of courses and their prerequisites. (p. 32)
29. develop assessment vehicles and attach them to all newly designed courses. (p. 33)
30. create and include assessment vehicles into core courses. (pp. 33-34)
31. develop assessment vehicles to use when students begin their upper-division course work. (p. 34)
32. construct the capstone/culminating experience course to include a variety of options: written thesis, exhibition, oral discussion/critique, or demonstration. (p. 34)

33. ensure that the assessment vehicles state both a set of learning outcomes and the measures used to assess them and also designate where in the curriculum these expected outcomes are assessed. (p. 34)
34. request renovations to the Art History Lecture Hall that include: increased lighting and dimmer capacity; new seating; full computer station; video conferencing and projection system; remote control slide projector and audio system. (p. 36)
35. request more faculty offices and improvements to existing faculty offices that include: electrical and Internet wiring, increased office light levels, and storage space. (p. 36)
36. request a high-end, multiple-use computer laboratory for its new technology needs. (p. 36)
37. request improvements and renovations to ASL 106 and 108 that include: a functional air-conditioning, heating and ventilation system; formal separation of the two ground floor studios; repair and augmentation of overhead cranes in the metal shop; more storage space; addition of more lighting fixtures and skylights; more studio space for graduate students; removal of the railing in front of roll up doors to create a loading dock; new doors for the north end of ASL 106. (p. 36)
38. request that building of a new Art facility be a top priority in the development of the campus. (p. 37)
39. be allowed to hire a full-time staff person to oversee the department's visual arts resources, slide library, and university collection. (p. 38)
40. keep attendance records and minutes of all department meetings and the meetings of all department committee meetings and submit them to the Chair. The Chair should enter these attendance records into each faculty members' Personnel Action File. (p. 40)
41. provide newly hired faculty formal orientation into the department, college, and university culture and include clear statements of expectation on availability to students, advising, workload, and service on committees and assign each new faculty member a faculty mentor. (p. 40)

42. encourage the Chair to provide strong leadership and take proactive positions. (p. 40)
43. conduct a review of its internal budgetary processes, including the Faculty Budget Committee. (p. 40)
44. review its governance structure, paying special attention to the department By-Laws and the existing committee structure. (p. 41)

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE DEAN OF THE COLLEGE OF ARTS AND LETTERS

It is recommended that the Department of Art

1. submit their Academic Plan to the Dean of the College of Arts and Letters and to the Vice President for Academic Affairs for their joint approval by Spring, 2000. (pp. 5-6)
2. undertake a rigorous study of its curriculum starting with a survey that tracks enrollment patterns in its lower and upper course division offerings over the past five years. This study is to be submitted to the Dean of Arts and Letters and the Vice President for Academic Affairs for their joint approval by Spring, 2000. (p. 7)
3. prepare a detailed plan for adjusting the faculty work week both collectively and individually in order to focus more effort on teaching, student advising, availability to students outside of class, and department, college, and university committee work. This plan is to be submitted to the Dean of the College of Arts and Letters and to the Vice President for Academic Affairs for their joint approval by Spring, 2000. (pp. 18-19)
4. conduct a systematic study of its grading practices, including a comparison of the final grades assigned in studio art classes to art history classes and submit a report of its findings and actions to be undertaken to the Dean of Arts and Letters and the Vice President for Academic Affairs for their joint approval by Spring, 2000. (p. 23)
5. conduct a feasibility study on creating a Bachelor of Arts in Art History and submit a report of its findings to the Dean of Arts and Letters and the Vice President for Academic Affairs by Spring, 2000. (pp. 30-31)
6. conduct a feasibility study on creating a concentration in Art Education and submit a report of its findings to the Dean

of Arts and Letters and the Vice President for Academic Affairs by Spring, 2000. (p. 31)

7. require the Chair to check each semester to determine if the content of each course corresponds to its syllabus and to the course description in the University Catalog and submit a report of his findings to the Dean of Arts and Letters at the end of each academic year. (p. 32)
8. that the Dean of Arts and Letters provide a significant increase in the department's equipment budget in order to replace outdated equipment and to meet the mandated safety requirements of the university. (p. 39)

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

It is recommended that the Department of Art

1. submit their Academic Plan to the Dean of the College of Arts and Letters and to the Vice President for Academic Affairs for their joint approval by Spring, 2000. (pp. 5-6)
2. undertake a rigorous study of its curriculum starting with a survey that tracks enrollment patterns in its lower and upper division course offerings over the past five years. This study is to be submitted to the Dean of Arts and Letters and the Vice President for Academic Affairs for their joint approval by Spring, 2000. (p. 7)
3. prepare a detailed plan for adjusting the faculty work week both collectively and individually in order to focus more effort on teaching, student advising, availability to students outside of class, and department, college, and university committee work. This plan is to be submitted to the Dean of the College of Arts and Letters and to the Vice President for Academic Affairs for their joint approval by Spring, 2000. (pp. 18-19)
4. conduct a systematic study of its grading practices, including a comparison of the final grades assigned to studio art classes to art history classes and submit a report of its findings and actions to be undertaken to the Dean of Arts and Letters and the Vice President for Academic Affairs for their joint approval by Spring, 2000. (p. 23)
5. conduct a feasibility study on creating a Bachelor of Arts in Art History and submit a report of its findings to the Dean

of Arts and Letters and the Vice President for Academic Affairs by Spring, 2000. (pp. 30-31)

6. conduct a feasibility study on creating a concentration in Art Education and submit a report of its findings to the Dean of Arts and Letters and the Vice President for Academic Affairs by Spring, 2000. (p. 31)

RECOMMENDATION TO THE FACULTY SENATE

The Program Review Team recommends that the approval of the BA and MA in Art be extended for two years, pending a report from the department to the Dean of the College of Arts and Letters and the Vice President for Academic Affairs by Spring, 2000 demonstrating satisfactory progress on recommendations 1, 2, 9, 11, 12, 23, and 24 of this report.

3-8-99

FS 99-66/Ex. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS – SENATE

Academic Policies Committee:

TOM KRABACHER, Senator, 2000 (repl. J. Bayard)
HAROLDENE WONDER, At-large, 2002 (repl. G. Wheeler)

Curriculum Policies Committee:

WALTER KAWAMOTO, At-large, 2000 (repl. A. Haffer)

Faculty Endowment Fund Committee:

ALAN WADE, Emeritus, 2001 (repl. R. Curry)
MARILYN KENT, At-large, 2000 (repl. T. Lascher)

Faculty Policies Committee:

LINDA PALMER, At-large, 2000 (repl. F. Baldini)
STEPHEN CROW, At-large, 2002 (repl. L. Buckley)
ORIEL STRICKLAND, At-large, 2002 (repl. W. Kawamoto)

Center for Teaching and Learning Advisory Board:

NANCY LAPP, At-large, 2000 (repl. J. Bayard)
TOM MATTHEWS, At-large, 2001 (repl. R. Rios Kravitz)
HAROLDENE WUNDER, At-large, 2002
MICHAEL SHEA, At-large, 2002
MARK STONER, At-large, 2002

General Education Policies/Graduation Requirements Committee:

ROBERTO QUINTANA, At-large, 2002 (repl. M. Reihman)
ARLINE PRIGOFF, At-large, 2000 (repl. T. Phelps)
TOM PYNE, At-large, 2000 (F'99 repl. J. Bauerly)

FS 99-67/Ex. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS--UNIVERSITY

Alumni Board, CSUS:

ROGER LEEZER, Faculty Alumnus, 2000

Athletic Advisory Board:

KEN DeBOW, Faculty Representative, 2000

Council for University Planning:

BOB BUCKLEY, Executive Committee Member, 2000
JENNIFER WARE, Non-Instructional Faculty, 2000
ARTHUR JENSEN, At-large, 2001

Instruction Related Activities Committee:

MICHAEL FITZGERALD, At-large, 2000

Student Complaint Hearing Panel:

MICHAEL FIZGERALD, At-large, 2002

Student Fee Advisory Committee:

THOMAS KRABACHER, Faculty At-large, 2002

MERLE MARTIN, Faculty At-large, 2002

FS 99/46

CSUS VISITING SCHOLARS PROGRAM

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

The Visiting Scholars Program (VSP) is a valued program at CSUS. It contributes to the scholarly and creative activities of the University and to the enrichment of the life of both the University and the regional community. Furthermore, the Program, through its lecture series and scholarly presentations, furthers the CSUS vision "to develop a campus that is welcoming, inclusive, vibrant, and intellectually stimulating for students, faculty, staff, alumni, and University visitors", and "to develop a campus community whose diversity enriches the lives of all and whose members develop a strong sense of personal and community identity as well as mutual respect."

GUIDELINES

1. As many scholars will be invited to speak on the campus throughout the academic year as circumstances and funding permits.
2. Those recommended for the Program must have established records of accomplishment in their fields.
3. Presentations by visiting scholars shall be free to the University community and to the regional community.
4. Programs shall be scheduled at times and places so as to maximize attendance, with maximum use of appropriate indoor and outdoor University facilities.
5. Programs will be publicized throughout the campus community and the region.
6. Nominations for visiting scholars or performers will be accepted from
 - a) individual faculty members or department/programs, or
 - b) faculty members from two or more disciplines proposing to bring several scholars to campus to discuss a topic of interdisciplinary interest.

ADMINISTRATION

1. The Visiting Scholars Subcommittee of the Faculty Policies Committee has the following members and charge:

a. Membership:

- 1) The Faculty Senate shall appoint eight full-time faculty representatives, one each from the seven Colleges and the Library, who shall serve staggered three-year terms.
- 2) One ex officio non-voting representative appointed by the Office of University Affairs.
- 3) One ex-officio non-voting member, appointed by the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.
- 4) One student, appointed by the A.S.I. Board.

b. Charge:

The Committee:

- 1) Establishes procedures for the solicitation of proposals from the academic community, consistent with the Statement of Purpose and the Guidelines.
- 2) Solicits and accepts proposals from all faculty members.
- 3) Establishes and uses a review process for the selection of the visiting scholars which shall include:
 - a) An emphasis on scholars who have not previously been selected.
 - b) A limitation of one proposal per academic year per faculty member.
- 4) Makes recommendations to the Vice President for Academic Affairs for the visiting scholars to appear at CSUS, and reports on its recommendations to the Senate.

c. Funding:

Costs for the visiting scholars are paid by funds allocated to the Visiting Scholars Program.

FORM B

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO
 PROGRAM PROPOSAL

| | |
|---|--|
| Academic Unit: Interdisciplinary Studies | Date of Submission to School Dean: April 16, 1999 |
| Requested Effective: Fall <u>X</u> , Spring <u> </u> , 1999. | |
| Name of Contact Person, if not Department Chair: Rina DeRose-Swinscoe | |
| Title of the Program: Community College Faculty Preparation Certificate Program | |
| Type of Program Proposal: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New Programs <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New Certificate Program | |
| PLEASE NOTE: Form B is to be used only as a Cover Form. Additional information is requested for each of the above as noted in the corresponding procedure in the Policies and Procedures for Initiation, Modification, Review and Approval of Courses and Academic Programs. | |
| Briefly describe the program proposal (new or change) and provide a justification. Overall objective: The primary objective of this certificate program is to provide quality and relevant course work and experience specifically designed to prepare master's level students and those with master's degrees to teach at the community college level. The program will provide the following graduate level courses: The Community College as an Institution, The Community College Student, Theory and Practice: Effective Teaching and Classroom Communication Strategies, and Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment at the Community College. Second, students will receive two levels of pedagogical experience: on the CSUS campus in formal courses; and at the community college in a faculty-mentored teaching placement in a discipline-specific department. The course work and the mentored teaching placement will provide the students with the competencies (e.g., teaching methods and curriculum development skills) necessary to effectively assume a teaching position at a community college. These objectives are consistent with the requirements of certificates of academic achievement on our campus which require that we "prepare the individual to perform specific tasks, or gain particular competence in one area of the broad field of study." | |
| Approvals: | |
| Department Chair: <u>[Signature]</u> | Date: <u>April 21, 1999</u> |
| College Dean: <u>[Signature]</u> | Date: <u>April 21, 1999</u> |
| University Committee: <u> </u> | Date: <u> </u> |
| Associate Vice President For Academic Affairs: <u>[Signature]</u> | Date: <u>5/11/99</u> |

FORM B

Attachment F
Faculty Senate Agenda
September 23, 1999

**CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SAC
PROGRAM PROPOSAL**

RECEIVED
Department of
Management
151617181920212223242526272829

| | |
|---|--|
| Academic Unit: College of Business Administration Department of Management | Date of Submission to School Dean: _____ |
| Requested Effective: Fall <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> , Spring _____, 2000. | |
| Name of Contact Person, if not Department Chair: Larry Takeuchi, Chair Herbert Blake, Jr., OSM Area Representative | |
| Title of the Program: Operations Management Concentration | |
| Type of Program Proposal: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Modification in Existing Program: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Substantive Change _____ Non-Substantive Change _____ Deletion of Existing Program _____ New Programs _____ Initiation (Projection) of New Program on to Master Plan _____ New Degree Programs _____ Regular Process _____ Fast Track Process _____ Pilot Process _____ New Minor, Concentration, Option, Specialization, Emphasis _____ New Certificate Program | |
| PLEASE NOTE: Form B is to be used only as a Cover Form. Additional information is requested for each of the above as noted in the corresponding procedure in the Policies and Procedures for Initiation, Modification, Review and Approval of Courses and Academic Programs. | |
| Briefly describe the program proposal (new or change) and provide a justification. The Operations Management (OM) Concentration has been reworked to improve its courses and its learning experience for OM students. Four courses previously available for OM students are being consolidated into two integrated courses. Except for those having relevant work experience of significant level and duration in the OM discipline, students will be required to complete an experiential learning experience. The required number of units is being reduced from 21 to 18. Details of the changes are provided in the supporting documentation. These changes incorporate the most recent changes in the OM discipline and ensure that OM graduates will have knowledge of current theory and practices in operations management and some work experience to enhance their career prospects. | |
| Approvals: | |
| Department Chair: <u>Jamona R. Takeuchi</u> | Date: <u>12/3/98</u> |
| School Dean: <u>[Signature]</u> | Date: <u>2/4/99</u> |
| University Committee: <u>[Signature]</u> | Date: <u>3-9-99</u> |
| Associate Vice President For Academic Affairs: <u>[Signature]</u> | Date: <u>2/18/99</u> |

11
CJ 3-9-99

Programmatic or fiscal impacts on other academic units' programs.

There should be virtually no impact on other CSUS or CBA programs. The Department of Economics has been notified that ECON 100B, which is currently an available elective, is not included in the new program. The Department of MIS has been notified that MIS 125 has been substituted for MIS 121 on the elective list. The Department of Organization Behavior and Environment has been notified that the [elective] placement of OBE 153 has been changed, and that OBE 158 has been added to the elective list. One or two enrollments may be lost for some electives as the new program specifies a choice of one rather than two elective courses.

Fiscal analysis of the proposed changes.

- a. The new OM program will require a total of 18 units rather than 21 units currently required. Since the OM program is small, the loss of FTES to the Department, CBA and CSUS will be negligible:

$$[30 \text{ students} * 3 \text{ credit units} = 90 \text{ SCU's} \div 6 \text{ semesters/student} = 15 \text{ credit units/semester or } \underline{1 \text{ FTES/semester.}}]$$

- b. The proposed changes will require no additional resources.
- c. No additional space, equipment, operating expenses, library, computer or media resources, clerical/technical support, or other resources will be needed.

| Proposed Changes: | |
|--|---|
| 1. The 5 required upper division courses are restructured. 2. The allowable elective courses are reduced from 2 to 1. | |
| NEW PROGRAM | OLD PROGRAM |
| (3) MGMT 160 Principles of Quality Management ++++++ (3) MGMT 181 Supply Chain Logistics Mgmt. ++++++ (3) MGMT 186 Ops. Planning & Inventory Control ++++++ (3) MGMT 188 Ops. Strategy & Design (3) MGMT 195E Internship in Operations Mgmt.* <hr/> (3) Select one of the following: ACCY 161A Cost Accounting ++++++ MGMT 105 Business Forecasting ++++++ MGMT 161 Fundamentals of Project Mgmt. ++++++ ++++++ ++++++ MGMT 196 Experimental Offerings in OM MGMT 199E Special Problems in OM ++++++ MIS 125 Microcomputers for Managers MIS 132 Mgmt. Science Techniques MIS 135 Simulation for Mgrl. Dec. Making OBE 153 Mgmt. Of Human resources OBE 157 Industrial relations OBE 158 Labor/Employment Laws, Policies and Practices | (3) MGMT 160 Principles of Quality Management Or OBE 153 Mgmt. Of Human resources (3) MGMT 181 Purchasing & Materials Mgmt. (3) MGMT 183 Ops. Systems Design (3) MGMT 186 Ops. Planning & Inventory Control (3) MGMT 171 Distribution Management Or MGMT 188 Operations Strategy ++++++ ++++++ <hr/> (6) Select two of the following: ACCY 161A Cost Accounting ECON 100B Intermediate Micro. Theory MGMT 105 Business Forecasting MGMT 160 Principles of Quality Management* ++++++ MGMT 170 Management Problems MGMT 171 Distribution Management* MGMT 188 Operations Strategy* MGMT 196 Experimental Offerings in OM ++++++ MIS 121 Computer-Based Info. Systems ++++++ MIS 132 Mgmt. Science Techniques MIS 135 Simulation for Mgrl. Dec. Making ++++++ OBE 157 Industrial Relations ++++++ |
| *Based on work experience, an elective course may be substituted for the 195E requirement. | *If not used previously, can be counted as an elective. |

DRAFT

**PROGRAM FOR
FACULTY MERIT INCREASE**

The amount of funds dedicated to this program shall be based upon the number of full time equivalent faculty positions (FTEF). There shall be no requirement to expend all the funds identified for this program. Any portion of funds not expended in any fiscal year shall automatically be added to the merit pool for the next year.

A Faculty Merit Increase shall normally be in the form of a permanent increase in the base salary of the individual or shall be in the form of a bonus (not a permanent increase in the base salary of the individual) of no more than the equivalent of an annual salary increase of seven and one-half percent (7.5%) in the case of faculty members who have reached the top of his/her rank or classification in the salary schedule. Instructional faculty members holding the rank of Professor may be paid at a salary rate above the performance maximum for that classification. An individual shall not receive more than a seven and one-half percent (7.5%) increase in any year.

The recognition of a faculty member may be in the form of a bonus (not a permanent increase in the base salary of the individual) of no more than the equivalent of an annual salary increase of seven and one-half percent (7.5%) in the case of faculty members whose demonstrated performance was part of an activity or project conducted by a team, department or group of employees.

I. ELIGIBILITY

All faculty unit employees, including full and part time employees, lecturers, probationary or tenured faculty including library and counselor faculty, and coaches shall be eligible for Faculty Merit Increases for demonstrated performance, commensurate with rank, work assignment, and years of service. Faculty whose performance does not include assignments in all of the areas included in Section IV of this policy, shall nonetheless be eligible for a Faculty Merit Increase on the basis of their performance in the individual areas of their assignment.

II. INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED

In order to facilitate the process, Faculty and Staff Affairs will provide each college¹ and department with the following information:

¹ For purposes of these procedures, the Library, Athletics and Academic Affairs/Student Affairs (for Counselors) are each treated as a college.

- (1) the name of each faculty unit employee in the unit
- (2) the rank or classification of each faculty unit employee in the unit
- (3) the date of appointment of each faculty unit employee in the unit
- (4) the monthly salary of each faculty unit employee in the unit
- (5) the timebase of each faculty unit employee in the unit
- (6) SSI eligibility for each faculty unit employee in the unit

III. FACULTY ACTIVITY REPORTS

- A. All faculty unit employees shall submit a completed activity report and shall be considered for a Faculty Merit Increase unless they indicate on the activity report that they decline to participate in the Faculty Merit Increase program.
- B. The format for the activity report shall be the format provided by the California State University. Faculty members may not append evidentiary documents or otherwise supplement the information requested in these reports.
- C. For the 1998-99 and 1999-2000 Fiscal Year Faculty Merit Increase, all faculty members shall submit three copies of two separate Faculty Activity Reports (FAR) to their college dean by **September 20, 1999**. The first report will cover the period July 1, 1997 to June 30, 1998, and the second report will cover July 1, 1998 to June 30, 1999. These reports shall detail in separate sections all appropriate activities for the review periods and shall include the faculty member's 1) name; 2) rank; 3) appointment status (i.e., tenured, probationary, or temporary); and 4) Service Salary Increase (SSI) eligibility.
- D. For the 2000-01 Fiscal Year Faculty Merit Increases

All faculty members shall submit three copies of the faculty activities report to their college dean no later than the **third Monday of September of each year thereafter** which shall be utilized for the consideration for Faculty Merit Increases.

This report shall detail the following:

- 1) all appropriate activities for the period **July 1, 1999 through June 30, 2000**, for fiscal year 2000/01 to be effective July 1, 2000, and
 - 2) these reports shall detail in separate sections all appropriate activities for the review period and shall include the faculty member's 1) name; 2) rank; 3) appointment status (i.e., tenured, probationary, or temporary); and 4) Service Salary Increase (SSI) eligibility.
- E. Faculty annual reports and the notification of all Faculty Merit Increase decisions may be placed in both the Personnel Action File and any Working Personnel Action File established for the purpose of conducting evaluations pursuant to Article 15, Evaluation, at the discretion of the faculty unit employee.

IV. CRITERIA

- A. Faculty shall be eligible for Faculty Merit Increases for demonstrated performance, commensurate with rank, work assignment and years of service, consistent with the criteria listed below. For purposes of the FMI process, "demonstrated performance" shall mean performance that effectively fulfills the obligation of the work assignment. 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.
- B. Consistent with Section IV.A. of this policy, Faculty Merit Increases may be granted for:
 - the quality of the unit member's teaching alone;
 - teaching and scholarship;

- teaching and service to the University and community; or
 - teaching, scholarship, and service to the University and community.
1. Teaching is broad and inclusive. Teaching encompasses instruction and such activities as advising, mentoring, supervision (e.g., individual studies, thesis direction, field supervision), and a range of contributions to improving student learning (e.g., curriculum revision, course and program coordination, assessment of learning outcomes, and applications of technology).
 2. Scholarship is also broad. Scholarship includes discovery (traditionally labeled research, especially published or presented to professional audiences), integration (e.g., inter-or cross-disciplinary efforts), application (e.g., used in teaching or solving social, community, or technical problems), and creative activity (e.g., works of art, performances).
 3. Service to the University and community is likewise broad. Service to the University and community includes the activity necessary to the faculty role in shared governance of the institution (CSU and its campuses) and activity applying the unit employee's expertise to benefit the University and its community in general. Examples of service include significant committee work; student outreach and retention; participation in university and community organizations, professional associations, California Faculty Association, and appropriate governmental boards and commissions; advancement of public support for the University; and lectures and seminars to community groups.

V. PROCEDURES

A. General Guidelines

The following are the general procedures that apply to the entire process.

1. The department chair and the dean are responsible to assure procedures and established timelines are followed.
2. All deliberations related to recommendations regarding Faculty Merit Increase shall remain confidential.
3. Each level shall make an independent recommendation from the activity report presented. Department level recommendations shall include not only whether the faculty member who submitted an activity report is recommended to receive a Faculty Merit Increase, but also the percent and the amount of increase as described in Sections B(2)(c) and B(3)(a) of this policy.
4. A faculty member may review, and submit a written rebuttal to, the recommendations at each step of the FMI process. The rebuttal must be submitted to the next review level no later than five (5) calendar days after receipt of the recommendation. The faculty member shall also provide a copy of the rebuttal to the committee or individual that made the recommendation within the five-day time period.
5. A faculty member shall not review his/her own activity report for a Faculty Merit Increase. However, no faculty member shall become ineligible for service on a departmental committee because he/she submitted an activity report.
6. Failure to meet any established deadline for recommendations shall automatically result in the forwarding of all activity reports to the next level of review.
7. All activity reports for Faculty Merit Increases and all recommendations shall be forwarded to the President by no later than November 5, 1999 for fiscal years 1998/99 and 1999/2000 and no later than November 5 of each year thereafter.

8. The award of a Faculty Merit Increase shall not be considered a personnel recommendation, decision or action which must be based upon a faculty member's Personnel Action File. However, this provision shall not preclude review of a faculty member's Personnel Action File by the department chair, college dean or President.
9. At the written request of any review level, a faculty member shall provide evidence that supports or clarifies statements contained in the faculty activity report, e.g. citations, nominations, letters, publications, and/or similar information specifically referenced in the report.

B. Department Level Review

1. Departmental recommendations shall be made by either a committee of faculty unit employees, the department chair, designee, or combination of the above at the discretion of the department.
2. **If a committee is formed:**
 - a. Each department shall elect a Department Level Review Committee consisting of at least three (3) faculty members plus an alternate or up to a maximum of five (5) faculty members plus an alternate. The department chair shall not serve on the DLRC if he/she is conducting a separate evaluation.
 - b. If there are not enough faculty in a department to comprise the DLRC, faculty from another department within the college shall be elected to sit on the DLRC.
 - c. The DLRC shall forward a recommendation to the department chair on each faculty member in the department considered for an FMI. The recommendation shall include not only whether a faculty member who submitted an activity report is recommended to receive a Faculty Merit Increase, but also the percent and amount of increase. The recommended percent of increase shall not exceed seven and one-half percent (7.5%). The DLRC shall review and forward a recommendation on the department chair directly to the dean.
 - d. Abstentions shall not be interpreted as either a "yes" or "no" vote, or included in the voting base when determining a simple majority of the votes cast.
 - e. The recommendations of a DLRC shall be made in accordance with the following process and procedures:
 - 1) The DLRC shall decide, by a simple majority vote, if a faculty member should receive an FMI for the specified time period. A "NO" or "TIE" (which shall be interpreted as "No Recommendation") vote on performance shall end the DLRC's evaluation of the faculty member. The DLRC shall proceed with its recommendation for an FMI award only on those applications receiving a "YES" vote.
 - 2) For each activity report receiving a "YES" vote for an FMI, the DLRC shall, by simple majority vote, indicate the percent and amount of the increase. **Recommendations from the department shall not exceed the amount of funds allocated for use at this level.**
 - f. If a DLRC does not make a recommendation by the established deadline to do so, the activity report shall be considered by the next level of review without the recommendation of the DLRC.
 - g. The DLRC shall provide its written recommendations to each faculty member considered for an FMI.

3. If Department Chair Conducts Separate Evaluation

- a. The department chair shall make an independent review of all the activity reports submitted, and the recommendations of the DLRC (if any). The department chair may review the Personnel Action File of any faculty member in his/her department. The department chair shall forward an independent recommendation on each faculty member considered for an FMI. For each activity report receiving a yes for an FMI, the department chair shall recommend both percent and amount.
- b. If a department chair does not make a recommendation by the established deadline to do so, the application shall be considered by the dean without the recommendation of the department chair.
- c. The department chair shall not make a recommendation concerning him/herself.
- d. The department chair shall provide his/her written recommendation to each faculty member considered for an FMI.

C. Dean's Review

1. The recommendations of the DLRC and/or department chair and any rebuttals shall be reviewed by the college dean. The dean may concur or disagree with the recommendations, may change the amount of any recommended increase, and/or may recommend an increase for any member of the department that was not recommended by the committee or departmental chair. The dean may recommend that an individual faculty member receive a Faculty Merit Increase of any amount up to seven and one-half percent (7.5%). Recommended increases may result in the placement of faculty unit employees between the rates for a step of his/her rank or classification.
2. The dean shall provide his/her written recommendation to each faculty member considered for an FMI.

VI. PRESIDENT'S DECISION

- A. All recommendations from each department and college dean and any rebuttals as well as all faculty activity reports shall be submitted to the President. The President may concur or disagree with the recommendations, may change the amount of any recommended increase, and/or may grant an increase for any member of the department that was not recommended by the DLRC or department chair, or by the college dean. The President may grant that an individual faculty member receive a Faculty Merit Increase of any amount up to seven and a half percent (7.5%). Increases may result in the placement of faculty unit employees between the rates for a step of his/her rank or classification. The total of the recommendations at this level shall not exceed the pool for the President.
- B. The President or designee shall, after consideration of all appropriate recommendations, select the recipients of the increases by no later than November 20, 1999 for fiscal years 1998/1999 and 1999/2000, and no later than November 20 for years thereafter. He/she shall also determine the appropriate amount of the increase to be granted. The decision to grant or deny a Faculty Merit Increase, and the amount of the increase, shall not be subject to the grievance procedure as provided in Article 10 of the Unit 3 Agreement, but shall be subject to the Faculty Merit Increase Appeal Process of Article 31 of the Agreement.

VII. FACULTY MERIT INCREASE APPEAL PROCESS

- A. A faculty member who has received a positive recommendation from the department or the college dean may appeal the President's decision that denies a Faculty Merit Increase, or decreases the amount of a Faculty Merit Increase that is recommended by the department or the college dean. Appeals of the President's decision may be filed by the affected employee requesting that CSU grant or increase the award.
- B. The faculty member may file an appeal with the President no later than fourteen (14) days after receipt of the President's decision. The appeals shall be heard by a committee of five (5) faculty unit employees chosen by lot from an appeals panel elected by the faculty unit employees at the campus. Faculty unit employees who are appealing Faculty Merit Increase decisions shall not serve on the committee during that year. The committee will hear all such appeals of the President's decision at the campus that year in a single hearing. The CSU and the faculty unit employee (and/or his/her representative) may present evidence to the panel at the hearing. A majority decision by the committee shall be required in order to grant any appeal.
- C. Five (5) percent of the pool available for all Unit 3 faculty merit increases at the campus (excluding campus funds) shall be reserved to fund any additional increases granted under this process. The committee may not grant any increases that total more than the amount of the reserved campus pool. The decision of the appeal committee shall be final and binding. Any portion of such reserved campus pool that is not expended in the above manner shall be rolled over and added to the pool for faculty merit increases for the following fiscal year.

VIII. SPECIAL PROVISIONS GOVERNING FMI AWARDS

- A. There shall be the following distribution of funds for the Faculty Merit Increase Program on a campus:
 - 1) Five percent (5%) of total campus funds are withheld to fund successful appeals.
 - 2) President withholds ten percent (10%). The expenditure of these funds shall be reported as a distinct category of the campus report as required in the Unit 3 Agreement.
 - 3) All remaining funds, eighty-five percent (85%), distributed to departments on an FTEF pro rata basis.

IX. PUBLICATION OF FACULTY MERIT PAY INCREASES

- A. For each year that there are Faculty Merit Increases, the CSU shall provide to the CFA, no later than four (4) months after final decisions regarding such increases, a report containing a list by campus of individual faculty unit employees receiving Faculty Merit Increases, the amount of each increase and the total funds expended on the increases for the July pay period.
- B. In addition, a list of individual faculty unit employees receiving Faculty Merit Increases, their rank, the amount of the increase received, and their department shall be made public on each campus no later than one (1) month after final decisions regarding such increases.
 - 1) Awards shall also be reported by amount of increase, gender, and ethnicity but without individual names.
- C. For each year in which FMI awards are made, the President or designee shall prepare a report listing by colleges and departments, the number of faculty considered for an FMI award, and the number of faculty receiving FMI's. In addition, the report shall identify the total number of faculty who received a positive recommendation by the department committee (DLRC), the department chair and the college dean, and the number of faculty

from within each group who received an FMI award. This report shall be maintained for a period of five (5) years, and shall be readily available for public review.

X. SERVICE SALARY INCREASES - FISCAL YEAR 1999/2000 AND 2000/2001

- A. As part of the CSU merit program in fiscal years 1999/2000 and 2000/2001, there shall be a separate pool for bargaining unit members eligible for Service Salary Increases. It shall be calculated by multiplying the total salary and benefits of such employees by two and sixty-five one-hundredths percent (2.65%).
- B. During fiscal years 1999/2000 and 2000/2001, the criteria to be used when evaluating employees for the award of a Service Salary Increase shall be whether the faculty unit employee has demonstrated satisfactory performance commensurate with rank, work assignment, and years of service.
- C. During fiscal years 1999/2000 and 2000/2001, faculty members eligible for a Service Salary Increase (SSI) shall be reviewed by either a committee of faculty, the department chair, designee, or combination of the above at the discretion of the department. The DLRC and/or department chair shall provide their written recommendations to each faculty member considered for a SSI. The department level recommendation(s) shall be forwarded to the college dean who shall either grant or deny the SSI. These reviews shall take place prior to the review of faculty under the FMI program. A faculty member who receives an SSI in fiscal years 1999/2000 and 2000/2001 shall receive a two and sixty-five one-hundredths percent (2.65%) increase, and such an employee may also receive up to an additional seven and one-half percent (7.5 %) FMI.
- D. The college dean shall provide his/her written recommendation to each faculty member considered for a SSI.
- E. The decision to grant or deny a Service Salary Increase to a bargaining unit member during fiscal years 1999/2000 and 2000/1001 shall not be subject to the grievance procedure as provided in Article 10 of the Unit 3 Agreement, but shall be subject to the Service Salary Increase Appeal process of that article.

XI. SERVICE SALARY APPEAL PROCESS - FISCAL YEAR 1999/2000 AND 2000/2001

- A. A faculty member may appeal the decision to deny a Service Salary Increase to the President no later than fourteen (14) days after receipt of the college dean's decision. The appeals shall be heard by a committee of five (5) faculty unit employees chosen by lot from the Faculty Merit Increase appeals panel. Faculty unit employees who are appealing Service Salary Increase decisions shall not serve on the committee during that year. The committee will hear all such appeals of the college dean's decision at the campus that year individually. The administration and the faculty unit employee (and/or his/her representative) may present evidence to the committee at the hearing. A majority decision by the committee shall be required in order to grant any appeal.
- B. All unexpended funds from the pool for SSI-eligible employees in fiscal years 1999/2000 and 2000/2001 shall be available to fund successful appeals. The decision of the appeal committee shall be final and binding. Any portion of such reserved campus pool that is not expended in the above manner shall be rolled over and added to the pool for Faculty Merit Increases for the following fiscal year.

FORM B

**CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO
 PROGRAM PROPOSAL**

| | |
|--|--|
| Academic Unit: Teacher Education | Date of Submission to School Dean: April 19, 1999 |
| Requested Effective: Fall <u>X</u> , Spring __, 1999. | |
| Name of Contact Person, if not Department Chair: Rina DeRose-Swinscoe | |
| Title of the Program: Library Media Teacher Services Credential Program | |
| Type of Program Proposal: <u>X</u> New Programs <u>X</u> New Credential Program | |
| PLEASE NOTE: Form B is to be used only as a Cover Form. Additional information is requested for Each of the above as noted in the corresponding procedure in the Policies and Procedures for Initiation, Modification, Review and Approval of Courses and Academic Programs. | |
| Briefly describe the program proposal (new or change) and provide a justification. Overall objective: This credential program will serve as a response to challenges presented in the shortage of school library media teachers in California. California ranks last in students per school librarians—one library per 6,179 students, compared to the national average of one for every 882 students. <u>California School Library Newsletter</u> Vol. 21, No. 1. This credential program will address the needs of the Sacramento region and Northern California in filling certificated library positions which have been managed by paraprofessionals or volunteers in the K-12 public schools. This program is designed to offer courses in the library—media—technology area, providing information and training to participants so they can respond to current and future educational needs of their students and teachers; manage school library media centers; organize information and learning resources; evaluate and select learning resources and information services for their centers; research literature K-12; identify curriculum which can be cooperatively planned and presented with the classroom teacher through the content areas; and knowledge of reference works and on-line services such as the Internet in seeking answers. | |
| Approvals: | |
| Department Chair: <u>Edward Arnsdorf</u> | Date: <u>4-22-99</u> |
| College Dean: <u>Maurice Pod</u> | Date: <u>4-22-99</u> |
| University Committee: _____ | Date: _____ |
| Associate Vice President For Academic Affairs: <u>Cecilia Gray</u> | Date: <u>5/11/99</u> |

FORM B

**CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO
 PROGRAM PROPOSAL**

| | |
|---|--|
| Academic Unit: Teacher Education | Date of Submission to School Dean: April 20, 1999 |
| Requested Effective: Fall <u>X</u> , Spring __, 1999. | |
| Name of Contact Person, if not Department Chair: Rina DeRose-Swinscoe | |
| Title of the Program: Reading Certificate/Reading Program | |
| Type of Program Proposal: <u>X</u> New Programs <u>X</u> New Certificate Program | |
| PLEASE NOTE: Form B is to be used only as a Cover Form. Additional information is requested for each of the above as noted in the corresponding procedure in the Policies and Procedures for Initiation, Modification, Review and Approval of Courses and Academic Programs. | |
| Briefly describe the program proposal (new or change) and provide a justification. Overall objective: This certificate program will provide candidates with the knowledge, attitudes and skills to work with a widely diverse population through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addressing differing varieties of classroom organizational patterns for literacy instruction appropriate for individuals, small groups, classes and entire schools (EDTE 201 <i>Literacy Instruction and Assessment in the Classroom</i>) and EDTE 203 (<i>Strategies in Teaching Reading/Language Arts</i>). • Learning to apply diagnostic and assessment procedures for individual students, classroom, and school reading programs (EDTE 201 and EDTE 207, <i>Practicum in Beginning Literacy: Assessment and Intervention</i>). • Analyzing a wide variety of current strategies for literacy instruction that would be accessible to second language learners (EDTE 200, <i>Issues in Language and Literacy</i>) and EDTE 203. The program is designed to prepare certificate candidates to provide effective reading/language arts instruction to students based on student need. Specific course objectives are available on the course syllabi. These courses provide the knowledge base, foundations, strategies and techniques needed by a practitioner in a culturally and linguistically diverse society. These courses all establish a base for the Reading/Language Arts Specialists Credential program which requires an additional 12 units (Four 3-unit courses) to complete. | |
| Approvals: | |
| Department Chair: <u>Edward Arnsdorph</u> | Date: <u>4-22-99</u> |
| College Dean: <u>Maurice F. [Signature]</u> | Date: <u>4-22-99</u> |
| University Committee: _____ | Date: _____ |
| Associate Vice President For Academic Affairs: <u>Debra Gray</u> | Date: <u>5/11/99</u> |

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.



SEP 21 1999

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO
FACULTY SENATE

Faculty
413

Senate Received

TO: Thomas Krabacher, Chair
CSUS Faculty Senate

FROM: Mary Ann Reihman, Chair *Mary Ann Reihman*
General Education Policy and Graduation Requirements Committee
(GEP/GRC)

SUBJECT: Recommendation for change to GE Area review policy

DATE: May 20, 1999

The General Education Policy/Graduation Requirements Committee (GEP/GRC) recommends that the current Senate policy governing GE Area review procedures be changed. The committee's recommended procedures for GE Area review are attached.

One of the reasons GEP/GRC is recommending a change in Area review procedures is that a new subcommittee has been established for GE course review. As you know, the GE Course Review Committee (which is referenced in the Senate policies document) disbanded in Fall 1996. The GEP/GRC request for the establishment of a GE Course Review Subcommittee in Fall 1995 was denied by the Senate Executive Committee. For three semesters, GE course review was done by an ad hoc committee. During this time period, the Faculty Coordinator for General Education was reluctant to ask an ad hoc committee to take on the additional duty of GE Area Review.

While GEP/GRC assessed some GE Areas (B1, B2, and Advanced Study), progress was slow due to the other agenda items before the committee. Additionally, the assessment instruments developed by GEP/GRC gauged student perceptions of whether their course met area requirements and, in Area B, attempted some assessment of content mastery. The Area review did not include examination of syllabi and course outlines for compliance with Area criteria and requirements.

The new policy which I am forwarding to the Senate Executive Committee proposes a procedure which involves both GEP/GRC and the GE Course Review Subcommittee (GECRS) in the Area review process. The proposed process includes both critical review of course syllabi and outlines (by GECRS) and the development and administration of assessment instruments (by GEP/GRC)

FS 99-69
GE AREA REVIEW PROPOSAL
Amended for 5/17/99

PASSED BY
SENATE 10/14/99
APP. BY PRES.
10/29/99

RATIONALE:

- Need to undertake regularized, cyclical 5-year review of GE areas (Senate policy)
- Need for area review to be done by faculty with some knowledge of area
- Desire to share workload between GEP/GRC and GE Course Review Subcommittee (GECRS)

PROCESS:

Spring semester before review year:

1. GEP/GRC notifies GECRS of upcoming area review
2. GEP/GRC and GECRS organize area review working groups. The GECRS working group includes a liaison member from GEP/GRC.
3. Faculty Coordinator for General Education for GECRS notifies department chairs of need to provide course syllabi for current and upcoming fall course offerings. The call for syllabi will include sending a copy of the area criteria to chairs with a request that the criteria be distributed to all faculty who will be teaching GE courses in fall.
4. Area working groups convene to prepare for review

Fall semester of review year:

1. Syllabi collected by GE coordinator's office during first 3 weeks of fall semester
2. GECRS working group reviews syllabi for compliance
 - A. If syllabi are found which are not in compliance, this will be reported to the department chair to allow remedial action. Remedial action must be taken by the end of the fall semester and a revised syllabus for use the following spring must be submitted.
 - B. The working group will report its findings to GEP/GRC and GECRS by the end of the fall semester.
3. GEP/GRC working group develops assessment instrument(s) for area review
 - A. The working group consults with department chairs or designees in development of the assessment instrument(s).
 - B. The working group bring the assessment instrument(s) to GEP/GRC for approval by the end of fall semester.

Spring semester of review year

1. GEP/GRC working group administers assessment instrument(s) to all students in all classes in area of review (or to a statistically valid sampling of the students in these classes)
2. GEP/GRC working group begins final report on results of assessment

3. GECRS working group reports on any syllabi which are not in compliance to GECRS and may recommend removal from GE of non-compliant course or section of course to GECRS
- 4.

Fall semester after review year

1. GEP/GRC working submits report to GEP/GRC and Executive Committee of Faculty Senate by mid-term
2. GECRS reports on any courses/sections which have been removed for non-compliance to GEP/GRC

* CALENDAR:

| | |
|-----------|---|
| 1999-2000 | Area B |
| 2000-2001 | Area C |
| 2001-2002 | Area D |
| 2002-2003 | Area E and Foreign Language Proficiency Requirement |
| 2003-2004 | Area A and ENGL 20 |

Cycle repeats

* As courses in GE Areas are reviewed, the courses that are also graduation requirements: Race and Ethnicity and Advanced Study and, if applicable, Foreign Language Requirement, will be reviewed for compliance to criteria for these graduation requirements when they are reviewed in Areas. This will prevent reviewing some courses twice.