

1993 - 94 ACADEMIC SENATE  
OF  
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY  
SACRAMENTO

Minutes  
May 19, 1994

Issue #23

**ROLL CALL**

Present: Amer, Baldini, Barrena, Bennett, Burgess, Chopyak, Cintron, Cleveland, Cook, M. Dillon, W. Dillon (Parliamentarian), Dokimos, Ernst, Fitzgerald, Goldstene, Gonzalez, Henderson, Jacobs, A. Jensen, Kelly, Klucas, Knapp, Koester, Kostyrko, Lewis, Martin, Meyer, Miller, Murphy, Navari, C. Nelson, R. Nelson, Noble, Ostiguy, Plummer, Rice, Rios Kravitz, Seid, Strasser, Takeuchi, Tobey, Tsai, Tucker, Van de Berg, White

Absent: Carter, Driesbach, Eden, Giles, Gunston-Parks, Heffernan, Hubbard, Jakob, R. Jensen, Kho, Michael, Mulira, Olson, Pyne, Schulte, Serrano, Swift, Tewell, Tooker, Urone, Ware, Wilcox, Zhou

**INFORMATION**

1. A Moment of Silence was observed in memory of:

VINCE BEAL  
Senior  
CSUS 1992-94

2. Spring Schedule of Meetings:  
May 26 CANCELLED
3. Statewide Academic Senator Juanita Barrena reported on the May 5-6, 1994, CSU Academic Senate meeting.

**ACTION ITEMS****\*AS 94-40/UWC, G.E., Ex. G.E.--SECOND SEMESTER COMPOSITION REQUIREMENT  
(Amends AS 91-42 as amended in AS 91-109.2)**

The Academic Senate recommends that the "Policies Pertaining to the General Education Program and Course/Proficiency Requirements for Graduation with the Baccalaureate Degree," Section II, B.1.a, page 24, be amended as follows (underscore = addition):

**II. COURSE/PROFICIENCY REQUIREMENTS FOR GRADUATION WITH THE  
BACCALAUREATE DEGREE****B. COURSE/PROFICIENCY REQUIREMENTS IN WRITING**

1. ...
2. Second Semester Composition Requirement

- a. Course Requirement

All students, except those fully certified under IGETC<sup>1</sup>, shall be required to complete a second semester composition course with a C- grade or better. This requirement may also be met with course credit earned with a specified score on the English Equivalency Examination. The requirement is a graduation requirement, not a G.E. requirement. Composition/critical thinking courses taken to satisfy CSU G.E. Breadth Requirements or IGETC requirements do not necessarily satisfy the requirement. Second semester composition courses taken at other institutions may satisfy the requirement if they are determined by the CSUS English Department to be equivalent. If a course is used to satisfy the second semester composition requirement then it may not also be used to satisfy a G.E. Requirement.

Further, the Academic Senate directs its University Writing Committee to review the maze of writing requirements imposed upon the students of CSU, Sacramento, and to make recommendations for change, if appropriate, that streamline the requirements while maintaining the educational integrity underlying the existing systemwide and campus policies on writing competency.

Carried unanimously.

---

<sup>1</sup>Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC)

**\*AS 94-42/G.E., Ex. FOREIGN LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY GRADUATION  
REQUIREMENT (Amends AS 91-42 as amended by AS 91-63)**

The Academic Senate recommends that CSU Sacramento "Policies Pertaining to the General Education Program and Course/Proficiency Requirements for Graduation with the Baccalaureate Degree," August 1991, Section II.C.1.(a) and (b), "Foreign Language Graduation Proficiency Requirement" and Section II.C.3.a.4) and b.4), "Policy on Substitutions for Foreign Language Graduation Requirements" (pages 28-31), be amended as follows (strikeover = deletion; underscore = addition):

**SECTION II: COURSE/PROFICIENCY REQUIREMENTS FOR GRADUATION WITH  
THE BACCALAUREATE DEGREE**

**C. FOREIGN LANGUAGE REQUIREMENTS**

...

**1. Foreign Language Graduation Proficiency Requirement:**

(a) ...

(1) ...

(2) ...

(3) ...

(4) American Sign Language: Complete (with a grade of C- or higher) three semesters, or the equivalent, of American Sign Language (ASL).

(b) ...

(1) ...

(2) ...

(3) ...

(4) American Sign Language: Complete (with a grade of C- or higher) three semesters, or the equivalent, of American Sign Language (ASL).

2. ...

**3. Policy on Substitutions for Foreign Language Graduation Requirements**

**a. Basic Requirement**

...

1) ...

2) ...

3) ...

~~4) As an alternative to a foreign language, students who are deaf, hard of hearing, or speech impaired may satisfy the basic foreign language graduation requirement (but not the admission requirement for foreign languages) by completing (with a C- or higher) an intermediate (second semester) course in American Sign Language (ASL).~~

b. Graduation Proficiency Requirement

...

1) ...

2) ...

3) ...

4) ~~As an alternative to a foreign language, student who are deaf, hard of hearing, or speech impaired may satisfy the foreign language proficiency graduation requirement by completing (with a grade of C or higher) an advanced course (which requires the ability to communicate) in American Sign Language (ASL).~~

Carried unanimously.

AS 94-43/CODE, Ex. AFFIRMATIVE ACTION AND DIVERSITY POLICY AND PRACTICE AT CSU, SACRAMENTO--RESOLUTION RELATIVE TO

WHEREAS, A faculty member of California State University, Sacramento, and a state senator formally inquired of the California State Attorney General whether California State University affirmative action policy were legal; and

WHEREAS, On January 13, 1994, the State Attorney General rendered Opinion No. 93-205 concluding that--

The California State University may voluntarily consider racial, ethnic, and gender characteristics in employing its faculty to remedy the effects of its own past discriminatory employment practices. Where evidence of such practices, which must be convincing, is based upon statistical disparity, the comparison must be between the composition of its faculty and the composition of the qualified population in the relevant labor market. The consideration must be closely related to the degree, nature, and extent of such prior discrimination.

; and

WHEREAS, In his Opinion, the State Attorney General cited Federal and State statutory premises legally justifying affirmative action; and

WHEREAS, The State Attorney General's Opinion is not in conflict with existing California State University affirmative action policy; and

- WHEREAS, The Western Association of Schools and Colleges, the accrediting agency of this University, includes diversity concerns pervasively among its standards; and
- WHEREAS, Diversity refers to representation of differing peoples, views, and lifestyles; is an appropriate condition and realistic expression of the campus community; reflects the liberal arts tradition; and is essential to quality higher education; therefore be it
- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate reaffirm the affirmative action and diversity policies and practices of California State University, Sacramento (PM 93-05).

Carried unanimously.

\*AS 94-36/FA, Ex., Flr. PERIODIC REVIEW OF TENURED FACULTY (Amends AS 84-64 and PM 85-06)

- WHEREAS, the purpose of periodic review of tenured faculty as stated in the M.O.U. (May 19, 1994, Academic Senate Agenda Attachment A) is to maintain and improve a faculty unit employee's effectiveness; and
- WHEREAS, current periodic review procedures vary widely in scope and rigor among departments; and
- WHEREAS, the M.O.U. not only does not specify that review be limited to student evaluation of teaching effectiveness, but also offers evidence of considerably broader intent; and
- WHEREAS, the Statement on Faculty Professional Ethics adopted by the Academic Senate on September 9, 1993 (AS 93-57) enumerates faculty responsibilities in the areas of scholarship and service, as well as teaching; and
- WHEREAS, any useful measure of a faculty member's effectiveness needs to address all relevant facets of performance; and
- WHEREAS, the M.O.U. specifies a stronger role for the Dean in the process than does the University policy; and

WHEREAS, the University should adopt guidelines for the implementation of M.O.U. provisions that:

- address all relevant facets of performance (teaching, scholarship and service), as assessed by students, peers and the Dean;
- aim for greater uniformity in standards of evaluation; and
- aim to fulfill the spirit of the exercise by devising means--primarily by way of serious collegial collaboration--for helping one another maintain a high level of performance.

therefore, be it

RESOLVED: that the Academic Senate recommends that the CSUS "Periodic Review of Tenured Faculty - Guidelines" be amended (see Attachment).

Carried. (Hand Vote: Yes - 24; No - 4)

\*AS 94-44/Ex. CSUS STRATEGIC PLAN

The Academic Senate endorses the goals of the Strategic Plan (and their accompanying narratives) as states which the University ought to pursue and receives for its consideration those elements of the Strategic Plan identified as "Proposed Action Steps" (May 19, 1994, Academic Senate Agenda Attachment E).

In receiving the "Proposed Action Steps," the Academic Senate understands that these elements are the suggested objective means by which the University pursue the goals to which it commits itself, but that they are neither the only means, nor are they in and of themselves absolute objectives--that each requires further deliberation, consultation, and operational development if each is to become an objective to which the University community is committed.

Further, the Academic Senate directs its Executive Committee to identify, in consultation with the Office of Academic Affairs, which of the "Proposed Action Steps," if implemented, require Senate action in whole or in part (those that would require changes to University polices), and those which, if implemented, would directly affect faculty across the University and thereby ought to have substantial comment from the Academic Senate (the only formal University mechanism wherein faculty, elected by their respective departments, come together as a decision-making body for and on behalf of the faculty community). The Executive Committee shall report the results of its work, inclusive of a proposed work plan for the Academic Senate, to the Academic Senate at its 1994-95 Retreat.

Additionally, the Executive Committee is to ascertain, for informational purposes, the person or unit who has the primary responsibility for each proposed action item.

Carried.

AS 94-45/GPPC SPECIAL MAJOR--GRADUATE PROGRAM (Unit Requirements)

The Academic Senate recommends that the minimum upper division and graduate level units required for a Special Major shall be increased from 30 to 36.

Defeated.

AS 94-46A/GPPC, Ex. SPECIAL MAJOR--GRADUATE PROGRAM (Internships)

The Academic Senate recommends that three units of 295 (internship) coursework may, with the consent of Graduate Studies, count toward the 15 unit minimum.

Defeated. (Hand Vote: Yes - 11; No - 13)

AS 94-46B.1/Flr.

The Academic Senate refers AS 94-46B/GPPC, Special Major--Graduate Program (Internships) back to the Graduate Policies and Programs Committee.

*[AS 94-46B/GPPC SPECIAL MAJOR--GRADUATE PROGRAM (Internships)  
The Academic Senate recommends that internship credit shall not be given for students already working professionally in the field of the proposed internship (see Attachments D-1 and D-2).]*

Carried.

The hour of adjournment having been reached, the following items were remanded to the Executive Committee for disposition:

- AS 94-10/Ex. STANDING RULES--Changes to Existing Rules . . . . Page 3, March 10 Agenda
- AS 94-10B ACADEMIC PROGRAMS REVIEW COMMITTEE, CREATE  
..... Page 4, March 10 Agenda



AS 94-10D STUDENT RETENTION AND EDUCATIONAL EQUITY COMMITTEE (as Standing Subcommittee of Academic Policies Committee), CREATE  
 ..... Page 5, March 10 Agenda

AS 94-10A CURRICULUM COMMITTEE, CREATE Page 3, March 10 Agenda

AS 94-10C ACADEMIC SUPPORT COMMITTEE, CREATE . . . . Page 4, March 10 Agenda

AS 94-10E FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE . . . . . Page 5, March 10 Agenda

AS 94-10F UNIVERSITY WRITING COMMITTEE--Standing Subcommittee of General Education Committee . . . . . Page 6, March 10 Agenda

AS 94-10G VISITING SCHOLARS COMMITTEE--Subcommittee of Faculty Professional Development Committee . . . . . Page 6, March 10 Agenda

AS 94-39/Flr. MINUTES . . . . . Page 5, May 19 Agenda

AS 94-41/UARTP, Ex. UNIVERSITY ARTP POLICY--AMEND SECTIONS 4.04 and 9.01.C  
 ..... Page 2, May 19 Agenda

The meeting was adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

*Janice L. McPherson*  
 Janice McPherson, Secretary

\*Presidential approval requested.

\*\*Request for Presidential approval postponed, following receipt on May 23, 1994, of notice of intent to submit to initiative process to cause a vote on this action by all eligible faculty.



PERIODIC REVIEW EVALUATION OF TENURED FACULTY - GUIDELINES

Page 1 of 4

The policy on Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty is based on the following assumptions:

An excellent education for students depends upon an excellent faculty;

Faculty excellence encompasses intellectual vitality and currency, as well as skills in teaching;

Faculty excellence is best achieved when individuals engage in ongoing professional development, supported by colleagues willing to commit time and energy to fostering one another's professional well-being;

An extensive and varried array of professional development opportunities must be available to meet individual needs and interests;

Faculty should be able to look forward to periodic performance evaluation as an opportunity to come together with colleagues to 1) reflect on professional accomplishments, strengths, and weaknesses, and 2) forge directions for professional development during the following five years.

The Office of Faculty and Staff Affairs has responsibility for ensuring a department's conformity to University policy on the periodic evaluation of tenured faculty. Should a question of interpretation arise, it shall be brought to the Faculty Affairs Committee, which retains jurisdiction over matters of policy and interpretation of policy, in the form of recommendations.

Individual members of the faculty would always be wise to examine appropriate portions of the University Manual and more general policy documents (in this case including the Memorandum of Understanding) to understand the content and the extent of rights and obligations arising under these procedures.

1-I. Purpose of Evaluation: To assist tenured faculty members to maintain or improve their ~~teaching~~ effectiveness.

2-II. Frequency of Evaluation of Instructional Performance: Tenured faculty shall be evaluated at intervals of no greater than five years. An evaluation for purposes of ~~retention, tenure or~~ promotion shall fulfill the requirement. If a periodic performance evaluation reveals that effectiveness has not been maintained, subsequent evaluations will be conducted every two years until the peer review committee (Section IV. A.) determines that effectiveness has improved sufficiently.

PERIODIC REVIEW EVALUATION OF TENURED FACULTY - GUIDELINES

Page 2 of 4

~~3-III.~~ Each Academic School Dean, as the appropriate administrator, is delegated the responsibility for monitoring the Periodic Review Evaluation of Tenured Faculty process in his/her school and for ensuring that the reviews evaluations conducted by the faculty committees and department chairs are in compliance with the procedures contained in this policy.

~~4-IV.~~ Procedures:

- aA. Each faculty member subject to review shall be evaluated by an elected peer review committee consisting of at least three tenured full-time department faculty of equal or greater rank and the department chair. A department member scheduled for this evaluation may not serve on any periodic review evaluation of tenured faculty committee during the year in which he/she is subject to review evaluation.
- ~~b.~~ ~~The department chair shall not serve on nor meet with the peer review committee but will conduct an independent review and submit a separate evaluation.~~
- eB. The Department shall develop a schedule of those faculty to be reviewed evaluated, in what order and in which year.
- dC. State law and University policy guarantee to faculty the right of confidentiality. Consequently, substantive deliberations having to do with periodic review evaluation of post tenure faculty unit employees are open only to committee members.
- eD. The peer review committee ~~and the department chair~~ shall consider the following subject matter in conducting the reviews evaluations:
  1. Student evaluations taken since the last review evaluation of the faculty member's performance.
  2. Signed, written statements from students, and other signed, written statements concerning the faculty member's teaching effectiveness only if the faculty member has been provided an exact copy of each statement at least five days before the review evaluation.
  3. ~~Material submitted by the faculty member being evaluated.~~ The peer review committee shall also consider evidence of ongoing participation in department, school and/or university governance and continued involvement in activities which

indicate that faculty is maintaining currency in his/her field. This evidence may include, but is not be limited to, the following:

Teaching materials  
Curriculum development  
Participation in professional meetings  
Professional lectures, seminars, workshops  
Consultant work  
Publications  
Leave activities

- ~~f~~E. The faculty member being evaluated shall have the right to meet with the peer review committee prior to the submission of the committee's report.
- ~~g~~. ~~The faculty member being evaluated shall have the right to meet with the department chair prior to submission of his/her evaluation.~~
- ~~h~~F. The committee shall prepare a written, signed evaluation report containing an assessment of the evidence. It shall provide a written copy of this report to the faculty member at least five days before the custodian places it in the Personnel Action File.
- ~~i~~G. ~~The department chair~~ Dean shall prepare a written, signed evaluation report containing an assessment of the evidence. He/she shall provide a written copy of this report to the faculty member at least five days before ~~the custodian~~ placing it in the Personnel Action file.
- ~~j~~H. ~~The department chair~~ Dean, ~~and the chair of the peer review committee, or the faculty member may request a meeting of all three parties shall meet with the faculty member to discuss his/her the faculty member's strengths and weaknesses along with suggestions, if any, for his/her improvement. Examples of ways in which faculty might improve their effectiveness include:~~
- ⌘ participation in University faculty development programs
  - ⌘ consultation with colleagues
  - ⌘ participation in professional conferences

PERIODIC REVIEW EVALUATION OF TENURED FACULTY - GUIDELINES

Page 4 of 4

- \*I. The evaluation statements of the committee and the Dean shall be placed in the Personnel Action File. The faculty member has the right to submit written ~~rebuttals~~ responses to them and these ~~rebuttals~~ responses shall also be placed in the Personnel Action File.
- †J. ~~The Academic Dean will not normally conduct an evaluation of tenured faculty under these procedures.~~ However, ~~a~~ A faculty member may appeal the evaluations of the faculty committee and/or the ~~department chair~~ Dean by requesting, in writing, that the ~~Dean~~ Vice President for Academic Affairs conduct an independent review evaluation.