

1994-95  
ACADEMIC SENATE  
California State University, Sacramento

AGENDA  
Thursday, December 8, 1994  
Forest Suite, University Union  
2:30-4:30 p.m.

## INFORMATION

1. Moment of Silence:  
GERALD D. WOLCOTT  
Professor of Criminal Justice Emeritus  
CSUS 1969-92
2. Paul R. Goodwin, Vice President of the public opinion research company Fairbank, Maslin, Maullin & Associates, will present findings from an opinion research project conducted with college-bound high school students and their parents examining their image of the CSU system and how they make their college choices.  
Time Certain: 2:50 p.m.
3. Report on November 3-4, 1994, CSU Academic Senate Meeting - Statewide Senator Erwin Kelly
4. Spring 1995 Schedule of Meetings (tentative):  
February 2, 9, 16, 23  
March 2, 9, 16, 23, 30  
April 6, 20, 27  
May 4, 11, 18, 25

## CONSENT CALENDAR

AS 94-104/Ex. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS--University

Associate Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies, Advisory Committee for the Selection of:

JOSE CINTRON, Committee on Diversity and Equity Representative

Dean, School of Education, Advisory Committee on the Selection of:

(Pending), At-large

XIN REN, Representative, Committee on Diversity and Equity

Disabilities, University Committee for Persons with:  
KWAI-TING LAN, E&CS, 1995

AS 94-105/Ex. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS--Senate

Alternative Approaches to Institutional Operation, ad hoc Committee on:

- ANDREW BANTA
- RITA CAMERON-WEDDING
- JAMES HILL
- MICHAEL LEWIS
- JAMES McCARTNEY
- ROLLIN POTTER

Committee on Diversity and Equity:  
MARGARET CLEEK, SBA, 1995

Scholarly Activities, ad hoc Committee on:  
ROSALIND VAN AUKER, Library Faculty

AS 94-106/CC, GPPC, Ex. CURRICULUM REVIEW--DEPARTMENT OF ART

The Academic Senate recommends approval of the BA and MA in Art for six years or until the next program review and commends the Art Department for its impressive work in answering concerns raised in the program review process. Improvements in developing advising materials and procedures are especially to be commended. The Department is encouraged to continue improvement in the variety of scheduling patterns and the listing of specific meeting times for all classes except thesis, special problems, and directed research classes.

AS 94-107/CC, GPPC, FisA, Ex. GRAPHIC DESIGN, B.A. IN

The Academic Senate recommends approval of the B.A. in Graphic Design and notes with approval the recommendation of the School of Arts and Sciences Budget and Finance Committee that no new resources be utilized to implement the program.

AS 94-109/Ex. *University Academic Plan--Advisory Com. to the Vice President for Academic Affairs*

**REGULAR AGENDA**

AS 94-103/Flr. MINUTES

Approval of the Minutes of the meeting of November 17 (#8) and December 1 (#9), 1994.

*considering w/ the time period for the convoca*  
December 8, 1994

AS 94-108/Ex., CODE PLURALISM--CAMPUSWIDE CONVOCATION ON

Tc: 4:10pm

*Carried*

As a major first action step in the pursuit of the University's Strategic Plan Goal of Pluralism, the Academic Senate recommends President Gerth call a campuswide Convocation on Pluralism, whereby scheduled classes would be cancelled--facilitating the expected participation of all faculty and allowing interested students to attend. The Convocation, as described below, shall be scheduled for the afternoon of March 1, 1994, to coincide with the campus visit of Maya Angelou.

AS 94-108A/Ex., CODE PLURALISM--SENATE SPONSORED PROGRAM ON

*Carried*

The Academic Senate, on behalf of the Faculty of CSUS, committed to actively pursuing the University's Strategic Plan Goal of Pluralism, i.e., "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.", will sponsor a convocation and 2-3 follow-up "Teach-ins" for faculty, staff, and students during the Spring semester, 1995.

The convocation and "Teach-ins" will promote "respect for diverse cultures, awareness of important social and moral issues, and concern for others" (excerpt from the Mission Statement of CSUS).

The convocation will cover the following topic areas:

- Human Rights and Moral Courage
- Core Values of a "Peoples University"
- Backlash
- Cultural Diversity--understanding it, learning from it, and learning to live peacefully and richly in a culturally diverse world--for all peoples
- The Culture of Multiculturalism--what are the values of this culture, what does it look like, how might we describe it, does the culture of Multiculturalism mean the individual must give up his/her birthright to ethnic or racial identity? Is the University Community willing to embrace this new culture?

The follow-up "Teach-ins" will cover the following topics:

- Stepping Outside your own Paradigm--too threatened or too tired, ignorant or racist? (or why we disenfranchise others)
- The Cost of Making a Mistake (or The Risk of Being Called a Racist) and The Cost of Avoidance (not communicating ideas and how to fix the mistakes)
- Pedagogical Strategies and Techniques for teaching to a multicultural group of students

The Academic Senate asks the Faculty, Staff, and Students to join together in this effort so that we might self-reflect and determine for ourselves, or recommit ourselves, to the type of community described in the University's Mission Statement and its Strategic Plan.

The responsibility for developing and implementing this event will be entrusted to a steering committee composed of the Director of the Faculty Development Resource Center and members from the Committee on Diversity and Equity, the ad hoc Committee on Pluralism, and the Senate Executive Committee.

Further, the Academic Senate requests the involvement of the Diversity Workteam of ASI.



# California State University, Sacramento

SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95819-6032

Sylvia Navari  
Page two  
November 14, 1994

5.05E: This recommendation is not approved. I understand the goal of providing consistent information to faculty. However, the language in the recommendation--"specifically stated and described"--suggests that every single example of activity in any of the four areas must be explicitly and specifically spelled out in the ARTP document. Such language is overly restrictive and could jeopardize the inclusion of appropriate activities, not specifically identified, which candidates for promotion, retention, or tenure may wish to have evaluated. In addition, the recommendation as it is currently stated would not allow a primary or secondary committee to take into consideration other information in a faculty member's file that may be relevant to the evaluation process, e.g., unprofessional conduct or academic dishonesty.

5.05G.2: I do not accept this recommendation. As you know, on two previous occasions, I have been unwilling to accept recommendations from the Senate that would have established a university standard requiring secondary committees to use primary committee standards. I have rejected these recommendations previously, because I believe it is essential that the faculty within a school have the opportunity to set school-wide standards. Each school has an established procedure for bringing this issue to the attention of its faculty. In addition, there are circumstances (i.e., accreditation standards) in which it would be critical for a school to be able to set uniform secondary committee values. This factor is best assessed by faculty in each school. I welcome suggestions on how best to accomplish this.

5.06G: While I am sympathetic to the goals of this recommendation to provide accurate information to faculty applicants concerning the University's retention, tenure and promotion policy, I cannot approve it in its present form. First, the language "make clear" is inherently subjective, to the point that it would be problematic as it would be operationalized across 45 departments. Second, Article 15.3 of the MOU already requires that criteria and procedures be made available before faculty members begin their first evaluation process. This MOU provision appears in our UARTP Policy in section 9.01E.

Distributed  
12/8/94  
Acad. Senate

California State University, Sacramento  
6000 J Street  
Sacramento, California 95819-6036

November 14, 1994

M E M O R A N D U M

NOV 15 1994  
Academic Senate Received  
413

TO: Sylvia Navari  
Chair, Academic Senate

FROM: Donald R. Gerth

SUBJECT: Request for Presidential Approval--Amendments to University Appointment, Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Policy, April 27, 1994

I have studied carefully the recommendations forwarded to you concerning changes to the University Appointment, Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Policy. Two primary criteria were used in evaluating these recommended changes: 1) Clarity--are the recommended changes clear and likely to aid faculty as they move through the retention, tenure and promotion cycle? and, 2) Consistency--are the recommendations consistent with prior decisions and promotion, retention, and tenure goals?

I address each proposed section below, with my action.

5.05A: This section is approved for inclusion, although it does not appear to provide any substantive information.

5.05B: It appears that these enumerated factors apply to qualities and capacities expected in research and scholarship. Yet the proposed placement of this language in this section of the ARTP document would extend these factors to evaluation of teaching as well as university and community service. It is not clear to me how they would be applied to teaching or service. Therefore, I am not able to approve this section at this time. I am willing to reconsider approval after receiving the necessary clarifying information.

6.06H: This recommendation is approved with the following modifications: In the first sentence, "applicant" is deleted and "new full-time appointee" is substituted. "Applicant" language would require each department to run copies of Department, School, and University policies for each interviewee--at least 100 total copies for the 1993-94 recruitment process. I view this as an unreasonable burden to place on departments. I am directing Dean Wagner to incorporate into a recruitment guide, the need for departments to have these documents available for review by applicants as a part of the interview process.

In addition, the section should end with a period after "first pay period" and delete the remainder of the section. The balance of the item is deleted because it is written in language that is intrinsically subjective, therefore opening up the opportunity for multiple interpretations and ambiguity in the retention, tenure, and promotion process.

To avoid confusion with the requirements of Section 9.01E of the UARFP Policy, a reference to 9.01E will be included at the end of this section. In addition, the following statement will be added to Section 9.01E:

On this campus, new full-time faculty unit employees will be provided this information before the end of the faculty unit employee's first pay period.

DRG/khm

c. Vice President Koester  
Dean Wagner



# California State University, Sacramento

SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95819-6036

ACADEMIC SENATE



## MEMORANDUM

DATE: April 27, 1994

TO: Donald R. Gerth, President

FROM: Sylvia Navari, Chair  
Academic Senate  
278-6393; FAX 278-3358

SUBJECT: Request for Presidential Approval--Amendments to University Appointment, Retention, Tenure and Promotion (ARTP) Policy

The faculty, by referendum, is recommending for your approval amendments to Sections 5.05 and 6.06 of the University policy governing ARTP (attached).

As you well know, changes to the RTP policy were instigated by the perceived lack of attention to scholarship on this campus and a concern expressed by WASC regarding the place of scholarship on this campus.

The faculty chose not to solve the above problem by altering the University ARTP policies governing the category of Scholarly or Creative Achievements. However, the faculty did choose to amend the ARTP policy in response to procedural problems discovered during the course of the RTP debate.

While some might believe the outcome of the "RTP debate" fruitless, to the contrary, the debate pointed out problems in our processes that the faculty wish to resolve. The passage by the faculty, of amendments to Sections 5.05 and 6.06 each address procedural problems identified during the course of Senate debate and the small group meetings the Senate Chair held for faculty in the RTP cycle.

Your approval of these amendments will benefit particularly new faculty in the years ahead.

SN:j

Attachment

cc: W. Dillon, Chair, University ARTP Committee  
J. Koester, Vice President for Academic Affairs  
D. Wagner, Dean, Faculty and Staff Affairs

Attachment  
Request for Presidential Approval--Amendments to University Appointment, Retention, Tenure and Promotion (ARTP) Policy  
April 27, 1994

University ARTP Policy amendments approved by faculty referendum are as follows (strikeover = deletion; underscore = addition):

5.05 Criteria for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion

- A. A unit shall exercise the discretion conferred by this section in a manner consistent with the mission of the University as a regional comprehensive university that places primary emphasis on teaching performance in the evaluation of faculty unit employees for retention, tenure or promotion.
- B. Purpose of Evaluation for Retention, Tenure or Promotion  
Evaluation is the act of ascertaining in each faculty unit employee seeking retention, tenure or promotion the presence to an acceptable extent of certain qualities and capacities. Generally speaking, these are: 1. breadth and depth of knowledge, 2. invention or creativity, and 3. an ability to investigate primary sources of understanding, to make and defend judgments and to articulate of otherwise present and apply them in an appropriate context.
- A-C. Although evaluative criteria are the same for retention and tenure, the evidence to support a recommendation to grant tenure shall be considerably more substantial than that to support a recommendation to retain a probationary employee. If a faculty unit employee is not likely to be awarded tenure, then he/she should not be reappointed. If he/she does not have the potential for promotion to associate professor or beyond, he/she should not be awarded tenure. However, the granting of tenure does not guarantee future promotion.
- B-D. The criteria set forth below have been adopted by the university to govern retention, tenure, and promotion. Each primary evaluation level shall establish a value for each criterion in relation to the values it establishes for the other criteria. It may do so by means of a qualitative or a quantitative statement. The first criterion, "Competent Teaching Performance," shall be the primary and essential, but not sufficient, criterion in the evaluation process at each level of review.
- E. No requirement not clearly and specifically stated and described in the discussion of Competent Teaching Performance, Scholarly or Creative Achievements, Contributions to the University or Contributions to the Community in a unit's ARTP document shall be applied to a faculty unit employee seeking retention, tenure or promotion.

GE. Competent Teaching Performance

DG. Scholarly or Creative Achievements

1. Evidence may include, but not be limited to:

- 1a. accomplishments in research and/or creative projects.
- 1b. publication of articles, books, reviews, music, script, software, and research papers consistent with the mission of the university. Publication of instructionally-related research (the category of research specifically authorized for the CSU in the Master Plan for Higher Education) shall be weighted as heavily as any other type of research at all levels of evaluation.
- 3c. an active program of scholarly or creative work in progress, appropriate to the discipline.
- 4d. membership and appropriate participation in activities of professional organizations.
- 5e. presentation of professional lectures.
- 6f. creative activity culminative in a professionally-evaluated public display or performance such as might occur in music, art, drama, poetry, reading, etc.
- 7g. the products of consultancies, whether paid or unpaid, of a professional nature related to the individual faculty member's area of academic expertise.
- 8h. a statement describing the support, or lack of it (released time and/or funding) for the reported scholarly or creative achievements.

2. Notwithstanding any other provision of the University ARTP policy, a secondary unit shall not be permitted to 1) determine for itself the means or evidence by which faculty unit employees seeking retention, tenure or

promotion may demonstrate an acceptable level of scholarly or creative activity, or 2) establish its own relative value of scholarly or creative activity. Rather, secondary units and administrators at all levels of review shall make their evaluations and their recommendations or decisions in a way that reflects in substance the means and evidence for demonstrating scholarly or creative activity, and the relative values of the criteria which the primary units have specified.

EH. Contributions to the Community

FL. Contributions to the Institution

GL. Possession of Appropriate Academic Preparation

6.06 Probationary Appointments

A-F.

G. Each primary unit shall make clear to each applicant for a probationary appointment at the time of interview the performance requirements for retention, tenure and promotion specified in the currently approved ARTP document of the unit, the secondary unit which evaluates the faculty unit employees in the primary unit, and the University.

H. Each primary unit shall provide to each applicant who is appointed to that unit a copy of the currently approved ARTP policies and procedures of: 1) the unit, 2) the secondary unit which evaluates the faculty unit employees in the primary unit, and 3) the University. The primary unit shall provide these copies before the end of the faculty unit employee's first pay period and shall expressly draw the attention of the faculty unit employee to their contents and significance in general and particularly with respect to the performance requirements for retention, tenure or promotion.



## WHAT THE ACADEMIC SENATE DID THIS SEMESTER, FALL, '94

Just in case you really want to know what you were involved in this semester as an Academic Senator:

- \*The Senate met 10 times (including the retreat)
  - \*Acted on the University Strategic Plan--identified and prioritized Senate responsibilities, developed and implemented a work plan
  - \*Established the Faculty Merit Scholarship Fund
  - \*Requested the Statewide Academic Senate review and modify the procedure for selecting the Trustee Outstanding Professor (**note: the Faculty Affairs Committee of the Statewide Senate found our concerns legitimate and are recommending a change in the process**)
  - \*Recommended changes to the process and guidelines for the assignment and reassignment of existing university space
  - \*Amended the University's Academic Advising Policy
  - \*Changed the university's course and program change proposal review process
  - \*Changed the Amplified Sound Policy
  - \*Changed our Standing Rules and Committee Structure
  - \*Made 100 plus committee appointments
  - \*Changed the university's policy on grading of Co-curricular courses
  - \*Amended the university's policy on repeating courses
  - \*Amended several policy's pertaining to graduate programs
  - \*Created ad hoc Committees on Alternative Scheduling, Pluralism, Institutional Operations (aka Tri-mester), Scholarly Activity (the first two are meeting, the latter 2 yet to convene)
- NEXT SEMESTER: Response of President to UARTP referendum, Program Review Process, Alternative Scheduling, WASC self-study, policy for building new buildings on campus, ???

**HAVE A SAFE AND RELAXING HOLIDAY AND SEMESTER BREAK!**