

ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
SACRAMENTO

Minutes

Issue #11

January 21, 1988

ROLL CALL

Present: Alexander, Barnes, Barrena, Beckwith, Brackmann, Burger, Cook, Cordero, Dillon (Parliamentarian), Farrand, Figler, Gillott, Hamilton, Kellough, Kenny, Lee, Martell, Maxwell, Palmer, Radimsky, Reh fuss, Rios, Sauls, Savino, Seward, Stephens, Stroumpos, Sullivan, Swanson, Tooker, Torcom, White, Wycosky, Yousif

Absent: Banks, Fitzwater, Harralson, Kaltenbach, Koester, Madden, Mills, Moore, Phelps, Rice, Rodriguez, Rombold, Scheel, Shannon, Tobey, Tzakiri, Van Auker

INFORMATION

A moment of silence was observed in memory of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

ACTION ITEMS

*AS 88-01/FA, Ex., Flr. MERITORIOUS PERFORMANCE AND PROFESSIONAL PROMISE AWARDS POLICY (Revises AS 85-13, amended by AS 86-12)

The Academic Senate recommends amendment of the Meritorious Performance and Professional Promise Awards Policy.

Carried.

California State University, Sacramento

MERITORIOUS PERFORMANCE AND PROFESSIONAL PROMISE AWARD (MPPP)

Guidelines

March 22, 1985

I. PREFAMBLE

This policy is designed to implement Articles 31.117 through 31.125 of the Memorandum of Understanding for Unit Three (faculty), agreed to in December, 1984

effective July 1, 1987. In any instance of conflict between the Memorandum of Understanding and this policy, the Memorandum of Understanding shall govern.

II. ELIGIBILITY

All persons covered by the Memorandum of Understanding for Unit Three are eligible to apply or be nominated either for a meritorious performance incentive award or for a professional promise incentive award. No individual may receive more than one type of incentive award in any given year. When a faculty member has received a Meritorious Performance and Professional Promise Award, any subsequent Award to that faculty member must be based on considerations other than those on which an earlier Meritorious Performance and Professional Promise Award was based. This means a faculty member may apply under the same category in subsequent years if significantly different material is submitted as evidence for consideration.

Work accomplished by assigned time is not precluded, but the applicant must declare on the application form the number of assigned time units involved. The MPPP Committee will take this information into consideration.

III. AWARD CATEGORIES AND CRITERIA

A. Meritorious Performance Incentive Awards

Meritorious Performance Incentive Awards shall be given in recognition of outstanding accomplishments and/or performance in one of the categories and-as-an incentive-for-continued-excellent-performance primarily-in-one-of-the-areas listed below. All persons covered by the Memorandum of Understanding for Unit Three are eligible to apply or be nominated for a Meritorious Performance Incentive Award.

1. Superior-teaching,-as-demonstrated-by-excellent classroom-instruction,-significant-curricular development,-development-of-effective instructional-materials,-and/or-other-indicators-
2. Significant-professional-accomplishments,-as demonstrated-by-juried,-refereed,-and/or-reviewed work,-exhibitions,-performances,-and/or-other creative-work,-continuing-research,- grant-supported-activities,-consulting-activity of-a-scholarly-character,-offices-held-in professional-organizations,-panels-and-workshops

~~organized-for-professional-meetings;~~
~~participation-in-professional-meetings-(e.g.,~~
~~delivered-papers,-addresses,-etc.);-and/or-other~~
~~indicators.~~

3. Outstanding service to the University community, as demonstrated by exceptional leadership in University governance and campus life at department, school, campus, and/or system levels; and/or other meritorious service consonant with the University's mission.

Category 1. Superior Contribution to Instruction as Measured By One or More of the Following Criteria:

Criterion 1. Outstanding classroom instruction as measured by:
- student evaluations
- peer review
- professional recognition
- results of standardized tests

Criterion 2. Significant curricular development as measured by:
- development of a new program or option within a program
- outreach effort development
- new course development
- development of an interdisciplinary course or program

Criterion 3. Development of effective instructional materials as measured by:
- new classroom materials which have been developed and evaluated for effectiveness
- new types of teaching methodologies which have been developed and evaluated for effectiveness
- development of a model or product which is adopted by other campuses

Criterion 4. Other indicators of superior teaching: The item or accomplishment must show evidence of application and evaluation.

Category 2. Superior Professional Accomplishments as Measured by One or More of the Following Criteria:

- Criterion 1. Juried, refereed and/or reviewed work.
- Criterion 2. Exhibitions, performances and/or other creative work.
- Criterion 3. Continuing research as documented by a periodic progress report.
- Criterion 4. Grant-supported and fellowship activity.
- Criterion 5. Consulting activity of a scholarly character.
- Criterion 6. Elected or major appointed offices held in a professional organization.
- Criterion 7. Primary responsibility for organizing a panel and/or workshop for a professional meeting.
- Criterion 8. Presentation of a paper or address at or participation on panels at professional meetings.
- Criterion 9. Other significant professional accomplishments. The item or accomplishment submitted must show evidence of active participation or primary responsibility.

Category 3. Outstanding Service to the University Community as Measured by One or More of the Following Criteria:

- Criterion 1. Exceptional leadership in university governance and campus life at the department level.
- Criterion 2. Exceptional leadership in university governance and campus life at the school level.
- Criterion 3. Exceptional leadership in university governance and campus life at the university level.
- Criterion 4. Exceptional leadership in university governance at the system level.
- Criterion 5. Other meritorious service consonant

with the university mission.

B. Professional Promise Incentive Award

Professional Promise Incentive Awards shall be given to promote activities that enhance the intellectual, cultural, or professional life of the faculty member, or the intellectual, cultural atmosphere of the University. Under this category faculty are encouraged to develop their "good ideas" in one of many possible areas such as instructional innovation, creative work, speculative or exploratory inquiry, or other endeavors which support the cultural enrichment or the professional diversification of the faculty member; the advancement of University programs and goals; or the enhancement of the University mission. All persons covered by the Memorandum of Understanding for Unit Three are eligible to apply or be nominated for a Professional Promise Incentive Award.

IV. THE APPLICATION

An application for an MPPP award shall not exceed three (3) double-spaced typewritten pages. If necessary, an appendix containing such materials as the applicant or nominee chooses to submit which sustain and/or support a claim to meritorious performance or professional promise incentive awards, may be included.

The application shall include the following:

- A. completed application form (see Appendix) and letters of nomination, if any
- B. current curriculum vita
- C. application statement which will not exceed three double-spaced typewritten pages. The statement should specify in which award category the application is being made and should relate the applicant's contributions to the award category.
- D. appended documents which show how the criteria have been met.

The guidelines for application (A-D above) must be followed or the application will be eliminated from consideration.

V. SELECTION PROCESS

- A. **Initiation: The Role of the Individual.** A unit member who wishes to be considered for an MPPP award shall submit an application to the department chair or appropriate administrator not later than ~~(date to be specified later)~~ the published deadline date.

Not later than two (2) calendar weeks prior to the deadline for submission of applications, members of the University community may nominate Unit Three members by writing a supporting letter which indicates the category and accomplishment to be considered to the department chair or appropriate administrator. In such an instance of nomination, the department chair or appropriate administrator shall promptly inform the nominated person and invite him/her to submit prior to the deadline additional materials to be appended to the letter an application as described in Section IV of these guidelines.

- B. **The Role of the Department.** On the Monday following the application deadline, the department chair or appropriate administrative equivalent shall inform the faculty in his/her unit of the names of all individuals in his/her unit who have applied or been nominated for an MPPP award and forward all MPPP applications/nominations and supporting materials, if provided, to an appropriate School or administrative unit committee.

- C. **Review at the School or other appropriate administrative unit level.** The schools in developing their procedures shall:

1. have the faculty approve through a school established process the school's policies and procedures
2. have a process which is available and distributed to the faculty prior to the beginning of the MPPP process
3. utilize the application form and materials specified in this document
4. establish standards by which to evaluate the applicants
5. provide for deliberation by the total committee for evaluating the applicants

School or other appropriate administrative unit MPPP Committees shall consist of five (5) elected Unit Three members. Wherever possible, school committees shall have no more than one member from any one department. All MPPP Committees must be composed exclusively of unit members who are not themselves applicants/nominees or nominators. Schools or other administrative units shall devise appropriate committee election procedures which shall be approved by a majority vote of unit members, or by a majority vote of the representative governance body of the unit.

Each MPPP committee shall review all applications and nominations in terms of the criteria in III. above and shall ~~select~~ recommend a number of applicants equal to not to exceed the number of awards available to that unit ~~plus a ranked list of at least two (2) alternates~~. The remaining meritorious applicants should be listed in rank order. These applications/nominations shall be forwarded to the Dean or other appropriate administrator with the committee's recommendations, not later than fifteen (15) working days following the deadline for transmission of the applications/nominations to the School or appropriate administrative unit committee.

- D. **Review by the Dean or other appropriate administrator.** The Dean or other appropriate administrator shall review, in terms of the criteria in III. above, all forwarded applications/nominations within ten (10) working days after their receipt.

Each recommended application/nomination with which the administrator concurs shall be implemented as recommended.

Each recommended application/nomination with which the administrator does not concur shall be forwarded to the President with the Committee's and administrator's recommendations.

- E. **Role of the University Committee and the President.** This section applies only in instances where the Dean or other appropriate administrator and the respective MPPP Committee fail to agree.

The President shall transmit both sets of recommendations for review by a University-wide faculty committee that will be comprised of three (3)

members chosen by the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate and two (2) by the President; within ten (10) working days it shall forward its recommendation, based upon its consideration of the criteria in III. above, to the President for his/her consideration in making a final determination. If the President disagrees with the university-wide committee, within ten (10) working days he/she shall state his/her reasons therefor and shall return the denied application to the originating faculty committee with the request to forward immediately the alternate recommendation to the Dean or appropriate administrator as provided in Article 31.16 of the Memorandum of Understanding for Unit Three.

VI. IMPLEMENTATION

All positive recommendations for Meritorious Performance Incentive and Professional Promise Incentive Awards shall be forwarded to the Office of Faculty and Staff Affairs for implementation. A final list of recipients with category of award shall be distributed to the campus community.

VII. PROHIBITIONS

- A. No MPPP award may be made to any faculty without a positive recommendation from the appropriate MPPP Committee (See Article 31.19).
- B. The collective and separate judgment of the faculty and the President shall not be grievable except on procedural grounds (See Article 31.19).

VIII. SUMMARY OF ACTIVITY

Each recipient of an MPPP Award for professional promise must submit a report to the Dean or appropriate administrator describing how he/she fulfilled the aims laid out in his/her MPPP Award proposal. These reports must be submitted within one calendar year of the receipt of the award. In the case of awards for meritorious performance, the application may be considered the report.

IX. POLICY REVIEW

The Faculty Affairs Committee of the Academic Senate shall review this policy ~~in the Fall of 1985~~ and recommend to the Academic Senate any appropriate revisions as well as a timetable for the ~~1985-86~~ 1988-89

MPPP Awards program and subsequent cycles. The review shall include consideration of the role of departmental faculty in the process.

NOTE: ~~For the implementation of this policy for the 1984-85 academic year, special dates are being established. In future years the guidelines in Section V.A. (SELECTION PROCESS, Initiation) will be followed.~~

MPPP Guidelines
Appendix

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO
MERITORIOUS PERFORMANCE AND PROFESSIONAL PROMISE AWARDS
APPLICATION FORM

Section A:

Name: _____ Department: _____ Current Academic Year _____

Date of Initial Faculty Appointment (including part-time appointments): _____ (Month/Year)

Section B:

Have you previously received a Meritorious Performance Incentive Award or a Professional Promise Incentive Award?

____ Yes (attach copy of previous application statement)

____ Date of Award: _____

____ Award Category: _____

____ Activity/Accomplishment for which award was granted: _____

____ No

Section C:

Award Category Currently Applying Under (check one only):

____ Meritorious Performance Incentive Award (Superior Teaching)

____ Meritorious Performance Incentive Award (Significant Professional Accomplishments)

____ Meritorious Performance Incentive Award (Outstanding Service to the University Community)

____ Professional Promise Incentive Award

Indicate specific activities or accomplishments to be considered:

Period of time covered by this application: _____

Section D:

In order to provide a comprehensive overview of your workload, please provide the following information:

Do any of the activities/accomplishments that serve as a basis for this application result in income in addition to your regular salary?

____ Yes ____ No (If so, briefly describe.)

(continued on Page 10)

Appendix (continued)

For the period of time covered by this application, to a maximum of four years, show by semesters the classes you taught and their total WIU's; amount of assigned time for that semester, if any; whether you were full-time or part-time; and, if part-time, number of units for which you were employed. If you were on leave (with or without pay) during any of these semesters, indicate the nature and purpose of the leave.

Year/ Semester	Classes Taught (indicate course #) and # of WIU's	Assigned Time in WIU's (if any)	Part-time (indicate # of units employed)	
			Full-Time	
1) Year _____ Fall _____ Spring _____				
2) Year _____ Fall _____ Spring _____				
3) Year _____ Fall _____ Spring _____				
4) Year _____ Fall _____ Spring _____				

The guidelines for application must be followed or the application will be eliminated from consideration.

AS 88-02/Ex., Fir. INCENTIVE FUNDING APPROACHES (AB 2016)

The Academic Senate endorses the position on selected elements of AB 2016, entitled "Higher Education Talent Development," as stated in the memorandum from CSUS Senate Chair Barrera to Bernard Goldstein, CSU Academic Senate representative to the CPEC Advisory Committee on State Incentive Funding Approaches for Promoting Quality in California Higher Education [Attachment].

Carried.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Janice McPherson
Janice McPherson, Secretary


*President's approval requested.



California State University, Sacramento

6000 J STREET, SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95819-2694

ACADEMIC SENATE


M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: January 25, 1988

TO: Bernard Goldstein, Assessment Specialist
Academic Senate, CSU

FROM: Juanita Barrera, Chair
Academic Senate *Juanita Barrera*

SUBJECT: AB 2016--Higher Education Talent Development

A special meeting of the CSUS Academic Senate was held on January 21, 1988, to discuss issues related to AB 2016 (Higher Education Talent Development) and to formulate a response to questions posed in your November 2, 1987, memorandum on the subject of "Incentive Funding Approaches for Promoting Quality in California Higher Education." I have been instructed by the Senate to submit the following.

The CSUS Academic Senate recognizes the value of various forms of testing, surveys, and other measures of assessing and improving program quality. In fact, numerous assessment programs are in place on this campus. For example, considerable effort is put forth on a program review process that incorporates a variety of assessment tools. Also, to a certain extent, pre- and post-testing ("value added assessment") programs are also in place. For example the English Placement Examination and Entry Level Mathematics examination are administered to entering students and students are required to complete a course in English composition and quantitative reasoning with a C- grade or better and also pass the Writing Proficiency Examination as requirements for graduation.

Although various assessment programs are in place and the faculty are, in general, supportive of such programs, the CSUS Academic Senate has serious reservations regarding the adoption of a state-level assessment and incentive funding program. The first is the immense cost of such a program, both in terms of the logistical costs of administering and evaluating a series of tests and surveys and in the thousands of hours that would be

involved in preparing acceptable examinations if, indeed, that would be possible. A second concern is that funding needs might result in questionable practices (e.g., teaching to the test, rather than to the strength of the faculty, or shifting the emphasis within the University merely to maximize rewards), in short, to let funding, rather than good pedagogy, lead to program change. Finally, many faculty believe that such programs are not cost effective, and that approaches, other than adoption of additional assessment programs and incentive funding strategies, should be explored as a means of achieving the goals of AB 2016. For example, many faculty believe that direct funding for academic support programs would have a greater impact on increasing student retention, particularly retention of underrepresented minority students, than adoption of an incentive funding strategy that would "reward" campuses, after the fact, for demonstrating improvement in retention rates.

In summary, while the CSUS Academic Senate recognizes the value of assessment programs, we also recognize the potential for abuse, particularly when results are tied to an "incentive funding" reward system. Of even greater concern, are the high costs of implementing additional assessment programs, the lack of assurance in AB 2016 that supplemental funding will be provided for assessment, and the low cost effectiveness of assessment and incentive funding strategies compared to funding strategies that provide direct support of programs designed to improve student retention and the quality of academic programs.

JB/CD

cc: Dr. Gerth
Dr. Burger