

Senators, please note: You'll need Attachments K-1 and K-2 from your September 23, 1999, agenda.

1999-2000
FACULTY SENATE
California State University, Sacramento

AGENDA

Thursday, October 14, 1999
Foothill Suite, UU
3:00-5:00 p.m.

OPEN FORUM

CONSENT CALENDAR

FS 99-71/Ex. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS – SENATE

Pedagogy Enhancement Awards Subcommittee:
SUSAN ULLRICH, H&HS, 2002

FS 99-72/Ex. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS—UNIVERSITY

(See Attachment A)

FS 99-73/UARTP, Ex. UNIVERSITY ARTP DOCUMENT—AMEND SECTION 5.07

The Faculty Senate recommends that section 5.07 of the University ARTP document be amended as follows [strikeover = deletion; underscore = addition]:

5.07 Early Promotion

~~Candidates who apply for promotion prior to having been granted four (4) Merit Salary Adjustments (MSA's) or reaching the maximum salary for a given rank~~ Probationary faculty who apply for promotion prior to receiving tenure and tenured faculty who are not yet eligible for promotion under Section 8.01.D of this document shall demonstrate outstanding performance in teaching, which shall be given primary weight, and possess appropriate academic preparation. In addition, outstanding performance must be demonstrated in at least two (2) of the remaining three (3) university criteria for retention, tenure, and promotion: scholarly and creative achievement, contribution to the institution, and contribution to the community. (Please see Section 8.01.E of this document.)

REGULAR AGENDA

FS 99-70/Flr. MINUTES

Approval of the Minutes of September 23, 1999.

SECOND READING ITEMS (Action may be taken)

Carried

FS 99-69/GEP/GRC, Ex. G.E. AREAS--PROCEDURES FOR REVIEW {**Mary Ann Reihman**}

[Refer to September 23, 1999, Faculty Senate Agenda Attachment K-1 for background.]

The Faculty Senate approves the proposed procedures for review of G.E. Areas (*September 23, 1999, Faculty Senate Agenda Attachment K-2*).

FIRST READING ITEMS (Discussion only; no action)

FS 99-74A/Ex. WAIVER OF FIRST READING OF FS 99-74.

The Faculty Senate waives the first reading of FS 99-74, General Education Program Review Self-Study Questions.

Carried

FS 99-74/GEP/GRC, Ex. GENERAL EDUCATION PROGRAM REVIEW SELF-STUDY QUESTIONS {**Mary Ann Reihman**}

The Faculty Senate recommends the following questions (see Attachment B) in the development of the Self-Study for the CSUS General Education Program.

FS 99-75A/Ex. WAIVER OF FIRST READING OF FS 99-75

The Faculty Senate waives the first reading of FS 99-75, Faculty Merit Increase Appeals Panel.

Carried

FS 99-75/FPC, Ex. FACULTY MERIT INCREASE APPEALS PANEL {**Fred Baldini**}

The Faculty Senate recommends the following process (see Attachment C) for selection of the Faculty Merit Increase Appeals Panel:

INFORMATION

1. Report on September 24 meeting of Campus Senate Chairs with CSU Academic Senate Executive Committee – Bob Buckley
2. Program Review Process – Ann Haffer
3. Tentative Fall 1999 Faculty Senate Meeting Schedule:
 - October 21, 3:00 p.m., University Theatre--The John C. Livingston Annual Faculty Lecture: "**Opportunities and Responsibilities for the Professoriate in K-12 Education**" will be delivered by Scott Farrand, Professor of Mathematics. A reception will follow.
 - October 28 Senate Meeting
 - November 18 Senate Meeting
 - December 9 Senate Meeting
4. Senate Home Page (<http://www.csus.edu/acse/> or CSUS Home Page *then* Administration and Policy *then* Administration *then* Faculty Senate) - Senator Arthur Jensen

Re: FS 99-72

Attachment A
Faculty Senate Agenda
October 14, 1999

AIDS Advisory Committee:

KERRY PHILLIPS, Faculty Senate Chair/Designee, 2000
MARY BRAHAM, Faculty At-large, 2001

ASI Appellate Council:

WILLIAM DILLON, At-large, 2000

ASI Board, Faculty Representative to:

ROBYN NELSON, At-large, 2000

ASI Elections Complaint Committee:

MICHAEL FITZGERALD, At-large, 2000

Athletic Advisory Board:

SCOTT MODELL, Faculty Representative, 2000

Campus Cooperative Education Advisory Committee:

ANNE-LOUISE RADIMSKY, At-large, 2000

Diversity Awards, Committee for:

OLIVIA CASTELLANO, Faculty At-large, 2001
PIA WONG, Faculty Policies Committee Member, 2000
LILA JACOBS, Faculty Policies Committee Member, 2000

Energy Management Committee:

KARL STOFFERS, Faculty, 2001

Financial Aid Satisfactory Progress Appeals Board:

ANN MOTEKAITIS, At-large, 2001

Grade Appeal Procedural Appeals Board:

KEN DeBOW, At-large, 2000
ANN MOTEKAITIS, At-large, 2000
WILLIAM DILLON, At-large, 2000

Honorary Degrees Committee:

CHERYL OSBORNE, Faculty At-large, 2001

Institutional Scholarship Committee:

ALAN WADE, At-large (emeritus), 2001

- over -

Instruction Related Activities Committee:

ANNE-LOUISE RADIMSKY, At-large, 2000

Multicultural Center Advisory Board:

ELAINE O'BRIEN, Faculty At-large, 2001

RITA CAMERON WEDDING, Faculty At-large, 2000

JANIE LOW, Faculty At-large, 2001

Persons with Disabilities, Committee for:

SUSAN EDMOND, Instructional Faculty, H&HS, 2001

Public Safety Advisory Committee:

DEBORAH METZGER, At-large, 2002

Student Academic Development Committee:

MARY ANN REIHMAN, At-large, 2001

TOM PYNE, At-large, 2001

MARIE HELT, At-large, 2000

Student Complaint Hearing Panel:

ANGUS DUNSTAN, At-large, 2002

Student Health Advisory Committee:

LOIS BOULGARIDES, At-large, 2000

University Copyright and Patent Committee:

ARTHUR JENSEN, Faculty At-large, 2002

SEP 30 1999

GENERAL EDUCATION PROGRAM REVIEW
SELF STUDY QUESTIONS

Faculty
413

Senate Received

I. Overview of the history and current status of the General Education Program

1. What is the structure of the CSUS GE program and its relationship to CSU system requirements? [comparison chart]
2. What are the characteristics and objectives of the GE program? [1991 GE policy]
3. What are the CSUS-specific general education and graduation requirements and their relationship to CSU system requirements? [comparison chart]
4. What is the relationship of the GE program to the goals of the University's Strategic Plan? [Strategic Plan]
5. What were the responses to the recommendations of the last program review. (This section is to provide an explanation of how various campus constituencies, including the Faculty Senate, responded to each recommendation.) [1989 program review, Senate actions, research response of administration and colleges]
6. Have there been changes other than those recommended by the program review? If so, when were these changes introduced? [Senate action on Foreign Language, second semester composition, new administrative change]

II. Objectives of the General Education Program

1. Are the objectives of the GE program **effectively** communicated to faculty? [faculty questionnaires and focus groups]
2. Are the objectives of the GE Program **effectively** communicated to students? [CASPER results and focus groups]
3. **What evidence do we have that the objectives of the GE program are being met?** [faculty questionnaires, CASPER results]

4. How do faculty perceive that *General Education* enhances a student's education? [faculty questionnaires and focus groups]
5. How do students perceive that *General Education* enhances their education? [CASPER results and focus groups]
6. **What kind of evidence do we gather about the effectiveness of the program? What kind of additional data should we gather?** [area assessments]

III. Policy making and administration

1. **What changes in program administration and policy making have occurred since the last review?** [1991 GE policy; Senate actions, administrative actions]
2. **Do we have any assessment of the changes in GE administration and policy making?** [Do we have any assessment? Or even hearsay]
3. **What evidence is there that these administrative changes have been effective and support the effectiveness of the GE program?** [Senate actions, department chair interviews?]
4. **Across the University, how consistent has implementation of GE/Graduation requirements policies been with the stated program objectives? What evidence supports these conclusions?** [minutes of course review committee, GEP/GRC minutes, College dean interviews, department chair interviews]
5. **How is compliance with GE goals and criteria monitored (at the department/division, college and university levels)? What assessment instruments have been developed (at the department/division, college and university levels) to assess compliance with GE goals and criteria?** [department chair interviews, college dean interviews, assessments: Race and Ethnicity, Advanced Study, Area B]
6. **Are assessment data used by administrators and policy makers to effect change?** [data from assessments listed above]

IV. Program content and standards

A. Procedures for inclusion and retention of courses in the GE program

1. **Why are courses included and retained in the GE program?** [procedures of course review committee; new course review policy, syllabus review]
2. Where there are multiple sections of GE courses, what means do departments employ to impose general standards that assure compliance with GE objectives for all sections? What means are used to assure that departments impose general standards? [syllabus review, department chair interviews, college dean interviews]
3. What assessment instruments been developed to determine whether courses meet GE Area standards? What were the results and how were they used to maintain Area standards? [area assessments listed above and results of those]

B. Coherence and sequencing of the GE program

1. Is the current GE program perceived as being a coherent program by students? What evidence supports this conclusion? [focus groups; faculty questionnaires]
2. Is the current GE program perceived as being a coherent program by faculty? What evidence supports this conclusion? [focus groups, CASPER data]
3. On what bases do students select GE courses? [focus groups, GE advisor interviews]
4. Are there identifiable GE enrollment patterns by major? If so, are such enrollment patterns consistent with GE objectives? [Institutional Studies data]
5. What percentage of students complete all or most of their general education coursework at other colleges and universities? [Institutional Studies data]

C. Scheduling and accessibility

1. Data is provided in the appendix on how many courses and sections are offered in each GE area, the enrollments in each section, the mode of instruction for each course, and how often each course is offered during the academic year. **How many courses/sections in each GE Area are offered in each semester?** [Institutional Studies data]
2. Data is provided in the appendix on how many different courses and sections are offered by department in each GE area, the enrollments in each section, the mode of instruction for each course, and how often each course is offered during the academic year. **How many courses/sections in GE/grad requirements are offered each semester by college and department.** [Institutional Studies data]
3. **Are required/sequenced/high demand courses scheduled in sufficient quantity and regularity to meet demand?** [enrollment reports; Institutional Studies data]
4. **How are GE and graduation requirement courses scheduled to ensure maximum student access (e/w, intersessions, issues of cost)?** [schedules of classes]
5. **What is the administrative role in oversight of GE/grad requirement scheduling?** [Academic Affairs, Deans]
6. **What is the administrative role in funding sections to meet student demand?** [Academic Affairs, Deans]
7. **What is the mode and level in which GE courses are offered by GE area and by department? How do the percentages of courses offered at each mode and level compare with the percentages at each mode and level of other courses by the University?** [Institutional Studies]
8. **How do class size caps in GE/grad requirement courses compare with the caps in non-GE courses? Have GE courses increased their caps in the same proportion to increases in discipline-based courses over the past 10 years?** [Institutional Studies]

9. Are there reasons why some GE/grad requirement (e.g., advanced study, foreign language, labs) courses should not be offered in alternative formats ("compressed" inter-sessions, distance)? [interviews with Deans and Department chairs]

D. Consistency

1. Provide grading distributions for GE/Graduation Requirements courses and sections by GE Area, Graduation Requirement, and department. Provide analysis of data and preliminary conclusions in terms of consistency. [Institutional Studies]
2. What changes in GE certification lists have taken place since the last review? How often are these updated or reviewed? Under what circumstances? [articulation officers]
3. Is there reciprocity between GE/Graduation Requirements patterns for CSU transfer students? [evaluations staff]
4. Is there a pattern to GE/Graduation Requirements choices taken by transfer students? By major? By GE area? By Graduation Requirement? By class level? [Institutional Studies]
5. What procedures allow the granting of exceptions/substitutions to CSUS GE/Graduation Requirements policies? [GEP/GRC minutes, Senate minutes, Evaluations staff]
6. What programmatic exceptions have been granted to CSUS GE/Graduation Requirements policies? Are such deviations consistent with the objectives of the GE program/Graduation Requirements? [GEP/GRC and Senate minutes]
7. What differences exist in the evaluation of "native" and transfer students' GE/Graduation Requirement patterns? What is the implication of these findings? [evaluations staff, GE advisors, GEP/GRC minutes, Senate minutes]
8. What sorts of exceptions/substitutions to CSUS GE/Graduation Requirements policies are/have been granted to students by GE administrators? Have such deviations been consistent with GE policy and/or the objectives of the GE program? [files in GE office]

V. Institutional support

A. Faculty

1. How are GE staffing decisions made? What departmental and university policies govern these decisions? [Department chair and Dean interviews, MOU]
2. **What are the distributions (by rank and demographic data) of the faculty who teach GE/grad requirement courses (by Area and department)?** [Institutional Studies]
3. What benefits and problems are associated with the use of adjunct faculty in GE/grad requirement courses? [Department chair and Dean interviews; focus groups with faculty and students]

B. Physical Resources

1. **How well do science and language laboratories and tutorial facilities support students in GE/grad requirement courses?** [Department chair and Dean interviews, focus groups with faculty and students]
2. **How do GE /grad requirement classes and students use university computer facilities (both classroom and lab)? How effectively are such resources used by classes and students to support GE/grad requirement objectives?** [Department chair and Dean interviews, Space Management, focus groups with faculty and students]
3. **How do GE/grad requirement classes use library resources? How effectively do library resources support students in GE/grad requirement courses?** [Library Dean, focus groups with faculty and students]

C. Fiscal Resources

1. **How is the amount of departmental budgets devoted to GE/grad requirement classes determined? What principles/model for funding is used?** [Academic Affairs, Department chair and Dean interviews]
2. **How does funding (appear) to effect GE program development and department offerings of existing courses?** [Department chair and Dean interviews]

3. **Are there alternative funding models for GE in the CSU system?** [GE administrators on other campuses]

VI. Advising

1. **How and where** do students receive GE advising? [focus groups with students and faculty, CASPER, GE advisors]
2. **What are student perceptions of the accessibility and accuracy/usefulness** of GE advising? [focus groups with students, CASPER]
3. **If students have encountered problems in advising, what have been the sources of their difficulties?** (e.g., advising errors from community college, advising errors at CSUS, unavailability of consistent advising, variations in GE/grad requirements among CSU's) [student and faculty focus groups, GE advisors, evaluations staff, outreach counselors, articulation officers]
4. **What are faculty perceptions about the accessibility and accuracy/usefulness** of GE advising? [focus groups, faculty questionnaires]
5. **How do faculty advise students about GE/grad requirements?** [focus groups, GE advisors]

IX. Conclusion

Summarize program strengths and weaknesses which have been highlighted by the responses to the self study questions posed above.

**Process for Selection of the
Faculty Merit Increase Appeals Panel**

As described in PM FSA: 99-03, VII, 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. The faculty member may file an appeal with the President no later than fourteen (14) calendar 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. Below is the process to be used to select the members of the Faculty Merit Increase Appeals Panel.

1. All faculty unit employees, including full and part time employees, FERP faculty, lecturers, probationary or tenured faculty including library and counselor faculty, and coaches shall be eligible to be elected to the Faculty Merit Increase Appeals Panel.
2. Each College will elect 4 unit employees to the Faculty Merit Increase Appeals Panel. All faculty unit employees shall be eligible to vote in this election. For purposes of these procedures, the Library, Athletics and Academic Affairs/Student Affairs (for Counselors) are each treated as a college. Each of these three units will elect 2 unit employees to the Faculty Merit Increase Appeals Panel.
3. Faculty unit employees who are appealing Faculty Merit Increase decisions shall not serve on the committee during that year.
4. Using members of the elected Faculty Merit Increase Appeals Panel, a Faculty Merit Increase Appeals Committee will be formed.
5. The elections shall be completed and names reported to Faculty and Staff Affairs by Monday, November 15.